



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)
Check only one box per Program Office instructions.
 Annual Performance Report Final Performance Report

OMB No. 1894-0003
 Exp. 06/30/2017

General Information

1. PR/Award #: **U282A150023** 2. Grantee NCES ID#: **39**
(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 characters.) (See instructions. Up to 12 characters.)
3. Project Title: **84.282A Public Charter Schools**
(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)
4. Grantee Name *(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.):* **Ohio Department of Education**
5. Grantee Address *(See instructions.):* **25 S. Front St., Columbus, OH 43215**
6. Project Director *(See instructions.)* Name: **RaShaun Holliman, Director, Office of Community Schools**
 Ph #: **(614) 387-2197**
 Email Address: **Rashaun.Holliman@education.ohio.gov**

Reporting Period Information (See instructions.)

7. Reporting Period: From: **09/14/2016** To: **03/31/2017**

Budget Expenditures (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)

8. Budget Expenditures

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds <i>(Match/Cost Share)</i>
a. Previous Budget Period	\$32,671,373	
b. Current Budget Period	\$32,671,373	
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>		

Indirect Cost Information (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)

9. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? ___ Yes No
 If yes, please indicate which of the following applies to your grant?
- b. ___ The grantee has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government:
 The period covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement is from: ___/___/___ to: ___/___/___
 The approving Federal agency is: ED ___ Other *(Please specify):* _____
 The Indirect Cost Rate is _____ percent
 The Type of Rate *(For Final Performance Reports Only)* is: ___ Provisional ___ Final ___ Other *(Please specify)*
- c. ___ The grantee is not a State, local government, or Indian tribe, and is using the de minimus rate of 10 percent of modified total direct costs (MTDC) in compliance with 2 CFR 200.414(f).
- d. ___ The grantee is funded under a Restricted Rate Program and is you using a restricted indirect cost rate that either:
 ___ Is included in its approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement; or
 ___ Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2).

- e. The grantee is funded under a Training Rate Program and:
 Is recovering indirect cost using 8 percent of MTDC in compliance with 34 CFR 75.562(c)(2); or
 Is recovering indirect costs using its actual negotiated indirect cost rate.

Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) (See instructions.)

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached? Yes No N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)

11. Performance Measures Status

- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? Yes No
- b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? _____ / _____ / _____

12. By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate and the expenditures, disbursements, and cash receipts are for the purposes and objectives set forth in the terms and conditions of the Federal award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information, or the omission of any material fact, may subject me to criminal, civil or administrative penalties for fraud, false statements, false claims or otherwise. (U.S. Code Title 18, Section 1001 and Title 31, Sections 3729-3730 and 3801-33812).

Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true, complete, and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of data reported.

Steve Gratz

Name of Authorized Representative

Sr. Executive Director

Title

Signature

Date: 4 / 14 / 17



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Executive Summary**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # (11 characters): **U282A150023**

(See Instructions)

Ohio Department of Education

2017 Annual Report

Executive Summary

The mission of the Ohio Department of Education (the Department) is to provide leadership and resources to foster educational excellence for every student, educator and school.

In support of this mission, the Department developed an innovative plan to increase student academic achievement by increasing the number of high-performing, site-based community schools across the state, with a special focus on strategically replacing poor-performing schools, opening community schools in high need locations that serve educationally and economically disadvantaged students, and supporting high-quality educational models aligned to student needs. The Department was awarded a total of \$71 million through the Public Charter Schools Program Grant (2015) to achieve the following objectives proposed in the approved application:

Objective 1: Provide high-quality educational options to Ohio's most disadvantaged students by stimulating the creation of high-quality schools.

Objective 2: Stimulate the creation of high-performing community schools that operate successfully under the CSP grant utilizing quality practices.

Objective 3: Increase academic performance of students attending community schools, with a focus on schools opened under the CSP grant.

This document represents the first annual report under this award, and the Department has made substantial progress toward achieving objectives related to the high-risk designation by the United States Department of Education (USDoE). The progress to date includes formalizing a Charter School Program Grant Advisory Committee,

releasing the first sponsor evaluation ratings, proposing revisions to administrative rules for the sponsor evaluation system, revising sponsor evaluation instruments and technical assistance for the next round of sponsor evaluations, revoking sponsorship authority of sponsors receiving overall ratings of "poor," and requiring quality improvement plans for sponsors receiving overall ratings of "ineffective."

Furthermore, the Department is finalizing a comprehensive plan for the CSP subgrant competition that includes the following processes: sponsor evaluation, subgrantee eligibility screening, request for application, competitive award, payments, subgrantee adherence to requirements, and state adherence to requirements.

Central to ensuring that developers and operating community schools have the greatest likelihood of success is the role of the sponsor evaluation. Eligibility to apply for subgrants is limited to developers and community schools authorized by sponsors rated "effective" or "exemplary" on the overall sponsor evaluation. Ohio envisions awarding planning grants of up to \$100,000 to community school developers; year 1 implementation grants of up to \$350,000 to schools in their first year of operation; and year 2 implementation grants of up to \$250,000 to schools in their second year of operation.

Section C of the Department's Annual Performance Review delves into the substantial progress the Department has made since USDoE released the CSP grant for the Department to begin its grant activities on Sept. 14, 2016.

SECTION A

Objective 1: (*Problem Identification and Grant Setup*) Provide high-quality educational options to Ohio's most disadvantaged students by stimulating the creation of high-quality applications for the creation of new schools.

Measure 1.1: Percentage of community schools meeting or exceeding the standard of a combined score of B on all applicable grade measures:

- Value-Added (Overall, Value-Added for Lowest 20 percent, Value-Added for Students with Disabilities and Value-Added for Gifted);
- Performance Index;
- Indicators Met;
- Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO);
- K-3 Literacy Improvement;
- 4-year Graduation Rate;
- 5-year Graduation Rate;
- Prepared For Success.

Target: 80 percent of schools meet the standard on the overall performance component score or make improvement.

Measure 1.1 Reported Actual: For school year 2015-2016, which is the most recent available report card data, there were 12 site-based community schools that received an equivalent of a B on the overall performance component scores. This represents 3.52 percent of the 341 site-based schools that were included in the calculation. The calculation excludes e-schools and schools with no applicable components.

Percent of site-based schools that meet the standard on the overall performance component score or make improvement						
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Total site-based schools	341					
Number	12					
Percentage	3.52%					

Measure 1.2: The percentage of applications (planning and implementation) received from eligible participants that earn 75 percent or more total points on the application evaluation rubric.

Target: 80 percent of applications received 75 percent or more total points on the application evaluation rubric.

Measure 1.2 Response: The Department has not collected any data for measure 1.2, as the Department is awaiting approval from USDoE for the request for application (RFA). The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with the award announcement in July 2017. After the announcement of the subgrantee awards, information related

to measure 1.2 will be made available. Notwithstanding the approval of the RFA, the Department has made significant progress in preparing for the release of the RFA as outlined below.

The Department developed a CSP subgrant rubric for the application narrative sections and supporting appendices: Executive Summary, Subgrant Goals, Budget and Evaluation Methods, School Community, Educationally Disadvantaged Students, Educational Model, School Goals, Outreach and Engagement, School Personnel and External Support, Governance and Management Plan, and Business Capacity and Continued Operation. Also, an evaluation rubric was developed for the competitive preference priorities: Strategic Replacement, High-Need Location, Educationally Disadvantaged Students, and Proven Educational Models. The points awarded for the competitive preference priorities are added to the overall score, but the final, total points possible, do not increase.

The Office of Community Schools staff, in consultation with the data management team and accountability team, will develop business rules for calculating scoring data for CSP subgrant applicants as it relates to the application rubric. The Data Governance Committee will review the business rules and Department policies, procedures, and guidelines. The grant manager will extract scoring data for CSP subgrant applications following each subgrant competition and award cycle upon the approval of business rules by the Data Governance Committee.

Measure 1.3: The percentage of eligible proposed schools awarded a CSP planning subgrant that earn 75 percent or more total points on the plan evaluation rubric that measures successful planning activities.

Target: 80 percent of awarded subgrantees earn 75 percent or more total points on the plan evaluation rubric.

Measure 1.3 Response: The Department has not collected any data for measure 1.3, as the Department is awaiting approval from USDoE for the RFA. The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with the award announcement in July 2017. After the announcement of the subgrantee awards, information related to measure 1.2 will be made available. Notwithstanding the approval of the RFA, the Department will develop a planning subgrant evaluation rubric that considers the following factors, among others:

- Whether the subgrantee has made substantial progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the project;
- Whether the subgrantee has expended funds in a manner that is consistent with its approved application and budget;
- Whether the subgrantee has submitted all required reports to the Department or its independent monitor;
- Whether the subgrantee is in compliance with the preliminary agreement and/or charter contract between the authorized sponsor and the governing authority;
- Whether the subgrantee has outstanding litigation; and
- Whether the subgrantee is operating in compliance with the assurances in its approved application, including those applicable to federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance from the Department [34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23].

The Department will monitor each subgrantee that receives a planning grant throughout the grant period. The plan evaluation rubric will be scored at the end of the planning grant period.

Measure 1.4: Percentage of schools opened with CSP subgrant funds that are located in priority geographic areas and/or serving economically disadvantaged students.

Target: 90 percent of the schools opened with CSP subgrant funds are located in priority geographic areas and/or are serving economically disadvantaged students.

Measure 1.4 Response: The Department has not collected any data for measure 1.4, as the Department is awaiting approval from USDoE for the RFA. The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with the award announcement in July 2017. The information related to measure 1.4 will be available after the completion of the scoring and the Department's announcement of the subgrantee awardees. Notwithstanding the approval of the RFA, the Department has made significant progress in preparing for the release of the RFA as outlined below.

The Office of Community Schools staff, in consultation with the data management team, will develop business rules for defining priority geographic areas and will use existing policies regarding the identification of economically disadvantaged students. The Data Governance Committee will review the business rules and Department policies, procedures, and guidelines. The data managers will analyze data for CSP subgrant recipients annually in order to determine the percentage of schools that opened in priority geographic areas and/or serving economically disadvantaged students upon the approval of business rules by the Data Governance Committee.

Subgrantees awarded an implementation grant in the first competition will be included in the calculations in April 2018. Subgrantees that receive planning grants will not be included in the calculations for this measure until they have officially opened following the planning grant period.

Measure 1.5: Percentage of students attending schools opened with CSP subgrant funds (planning and implementation) that are identified as economically disadvantaged or a racial minority.

Target: 100 percent of the schools opened with CSP subgrant funds maintain a 60 percent or higher population of students who have been identified as economically disadvantaged or a racial minority.

Measure 1.5 Response: The Office of Community Schools staff, in consultation with the data management team, will develop business rules for extracting data for CSP subgrant recipients that have opened schools, and the Data Governance Committee will review the business rules and department policies, procedures, and guidelines. The data managers will annually extract data for applicable CSP subgrant recipients for students identified as economically disadvantaged or a racial minority upon the approval of business rules by the Data Governance Committee.

The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with award announcement in July 2017. As the measure relates to schools that have opened, only schools receiving an implementation subgrant in this first competition will be included in the calculations for the April 2018 reporting period.

Objective 2: (*Operationalizing the Subgrants*) Stimulate the creation of high-performing community schools that operate successfully under the CSP program utilizing quality practices.

Measure 2.1: The percentage of community school sponsors evaluated as Exemplary or Effective based on the legislatively required evaluation.

Target: Annual increase in the percentage of community school sponsors evaluated as Exemplary or Effective leading to 75 percent by 2021.

Measure 2.1 Reported Actual: The Ohio General Assembly passed charter reform legislation on Oct. 7, 2015. House Bill 2 was signed by Ohio Gov. Kasich on Nov. 1, 2015, with the legislation effective on Feb. 1, 2016. The bill drastically reformed Ohio's charter school laws by increasing accountability and transparency in the charter sector. HB 2 changes affect charter school governing authorities, authorizers (sponsors), charter management organizations (CMO), and the Ohio Department of Education. HB 2 provisions impact the implementation of the state's CSP grant project. The Department's letter to Director Stefan Huh, dated Nov. 18, 2015, enumerates the legislation's impacts on the operation of the CSP grant.

Ohio fully implemented the new sponsor evaluation protocol for the 2015-2016 school year in June 2015. The Department published the results of the sponsor evaluation on Oct. 15, 2016. There were 65 sponsors that were included in the 2015-2016 sponsor evaluation. There were no sponsors rated as Exemplary. Five sponsors, which represents 8 percent of the total sponsor count at the time of the evaluation, received ratings of Effective. Moving forward, the Department will use the 2015-2016 sponsor evaluation results as its baseline.

Sponsor Evaluation Summary						
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-2021
Exemplary	0					
Effective	5					
Ineffective	39					
Poor	21					
Percentage Exemplary or Effective	8%					

Measure 2.2: Percentage of schools that open under the CSP grant that score 80 percent or more total points on the implementation rubric.

Target: 80 percent of applicable schools score 80 percent or more total points on the implementation rubric.

Measure 2.2 Response: The Department has not collected any data for measure 2.2, as the Department is awaiting approval from USDoE for the RFA. The Department’s first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with the award announcement in July 2017. The information related to measure 2.2 will be available after scoring has been completed and the subgrantee awardees have been announced. Notwithstanding the approval of the RFA, the Department has made significant progress in preparing for the release of the RFA as outlined below.

The Department will develop an implementation subgrant evaluation rubric that considers the factors outlined below. The Office of Community Schools staff, in consultation with the data management team as well as federal programs, fiscal, legal counsel, etc., will develop business rules for scoring CSP subgrant recipients according to the implementation rubric. The Data Governance Committee will review the business rules for consistency with department policies, procedures and guidelines. The grant manager will extract data annually for CSP subgrant recipients based on the implementation rubric results upon the approval of business rules by the Data Governance Committee. Notwithstanding the approval of the RFA, the Department will develop a planning subgrant evaluation rubric that considers the following factors, among others:

- Whether the subgrantee has made substantial progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the project;
- Whether the subgrantee has expended funds in a manner that is consistent with its approved application and budget;

- Whether the subgrantee has submitted all required reports to the Department or its independent monitor;
- Whether the subgrantee is in compliance with the charter contract between the authorized sponsor and the governing authority;
- Whether the subgrantee has outstanding litigation; and
- Whether the subgrantee is operating in compliance with the assurances in its approved application, including those applicable to federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance from the Department [34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23].

Those subgrantees that receive implementation grants will be monitored throughout the implementation grant period. The department will complete the implementation subgrant evaluation rubric at the end of each grant period.

Measure 2.3: The percentage of schools opened under the CSP grant that show improvement in their scores on the quality practices area of the CSP subgrant implementation rubric.

Target: 100 percent of the schools that open under the CSP grant but did not receive all points on the quality practice area of the CSP subgrant implementation rubric, show improvement in that area.

Measure 2.3 Response: The Department has not collected any data for measure 2.3, as the Department is awaiting approval from USDoe for the RFA. The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with the award announcement in July 2017. The information related to measure 2.3 will be available after the Department has completed the scoring and announced the subgrantee awards. Notwithstanding the approval of the RFA, the Department has made significant progress in preparing for the release of the RFA.

The Department will develop an implementation subgrant evaluation rubric that considers the factors outlined below. The Office of Community Schools staff, in consultation with the data management team, will develop business rules for extracting data to score CSP subgrant recipients as it relates to the quality practices section of the implementation rubric. The Data Governance Committee will review the business rules for consistency with department policies, procedures, and guidelines. The grant manager will annually extract data to score CSP subgrant recipients based on the quality practices section of the implementation rubric results upon the approval of business rules by the Data Governance Committee. Notwithstanding the

approval of the RFA, the Department has developed a planning subgrant evaluation rubric that considers the following factors:

- Whether the subgrantee has made substantial progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the project;
- Whether the subgrantee has expended funds in a manner that is consistent with its approved application and budget;
- Whether the subgrantee has submitted all required reports to the Department or its independent monitor;
- Whether the subgrantee is in compliance with the charter contract between the authorized sponsor and the governing authority;
- Whether the subgrantee has outstanding litigation; and
- Whether the subgrantee is operating in compliance with the assurances in its approved application, including those applicable to federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance from the Department [34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23].

The Department will monitor all subgrantees that receive implementation grants throughout the implementation grant period.

The Department will complete the implementation subgrant evaluation rubric at the end of each grant period. Since this is a measure of improvement on the rubric, these data will be available after the second full grant period.

Measure 2.4: Percentage of schools operating under the CSP grant that achieve or exceed the report card related performance targets set forth in their contracts or are making improvement toward the identified targets.

Target: 80 percent of schools meet their identified performance targets or make improvement.

Measure 2.4 Response: The Department has not collected any data for measure 2.4, as the Department is awaiting approval from USDoE for the RFA. The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with the award announcement in July 2017. The information related to measure 2.4 will be available after the Department has completed the scoring and announced the subgrantee awards. Notwithstanding the approval of the RFA, the Department has made significant progress in preparing for the release of the RFA as outlined below.

The Department will identify the performance targets for each CSP subgrant recipient by reviewing the executed charter contract between the governing authority of the community school and the sponsor. The grant manager, in consultation with legal counsel and the data management team, will develop business rules for extracting data for CSP subgrant recipients. The Data Governance Committee will review the business rules for consistency with department policies, procedures, and guidelines. The data managers will annually extract accountability data for CSP subgrant recipients for measurable performance targets in the charter contract upon the approval of business rules by the Data Governance Committee. The Department finalizes and publishes local report card data by Sept. 15 annually. The Department will calculate measure 2.4 following the report card release.

Objective 3: Increased academic performance by students attending community schools, with focus on schools opened under the CSP grant.

Measure 3.1: The percentage of community schools identified as high performing.

Target: 5 percent annual increase in the percentage of community schools identified as high performing.

Measure 3.1 Reported Actual: For school year 2015-2016, for which there is the most recent available report card data, there were 13 site-based community schools determined to be high performing. This number represents 3.72 percent of the 349 site-based community schools in the state. These baseline numbers include site-based dropout prevention and recovery schools, as report card measures are now available for these schools. For the purpose of the CSP grant and consistent with the Department's initial application and response to USDoE on Feb. 24, 2016, e-schools are not included in the data since they are not eligible for the CSP subgrant. Community schools without graded measures are included in the calculation

for measure 3.1.

Percentage of site-based community schools identified as high performing						
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Total site-based schools	349					
Number	13					
Percentage	3.72%					

Measure 3.2: The number of high performing community schools operating in the state.

Target: Annual increase in the number of high performing community schools leading to a total of 400 high performing community schools by 2021.

Measure 3.2 Reported Actual: For school year 2015-2016, which is the most recent available report card data, there were 13 site-based community schools that are determined to be high performing. This baseline number includes site-based dropout prevention and recovery schools, as report card measures are now available for these schools. Community schools without graded measures are included in the calculation for measure 3.2.

Number of high performing site-based community schools operating in the state						
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Number	13					

Measure 3.3: The percentage of community school students attending high performing schools.

Target: 70 percent of community school students are attending high performing schools by 2021.

Measure 3.3 Reported Actual: For school year 2015-2016, which is the most recent available report card data, there were 3,170 students enrolled in site-based community schools that are determined to be high performing. This number represents 3.95 percent of the 80,298 students attending site-based community schools in the state. These baseline numbers include site-based dropout prevention and recovery schools, as report card measures are now available for these schools. For the purpose of the CSP grant and consistent with the Department’s initial application and response to USDoE on Feb. 24, 2016, e-schools are not included in the data since they are not eligible for the CSP subgrant. Community schools without graded measures are included in the calculation for measure 3.3.

Percentage of community school students attending high performing schools						
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Total CS student count	80,298					
Number	3,170					
Percentage	3.95%					

Measure 3.4: By the end of the grant, the ranking of schools that opened under the CSP grant when compared to a group of public schools identified as having similar demographic characteristics are in the upper quartile of schools with similar demographic characteristics (For each school, a comparison group will be identified using grade levels served, student demographic data and comparability of community characteristics of the district in which the community school is located, etc.) All schools in the identified comparison group will be ranked based on report card metrics such as performance index score, K-3 literacy improvement, annual measurable objectives, and 4- and 5-year graduation rate.

Target: 85 percent of schools opened with CSP subgrant funds are in the upper 25 percent of schools in their comparison group.

Measure 3.4 Response: The Office of Community Schools staff, in consultation with the data management and accountability teams, will develop business rules used to determine the comparison group for each school that opens under the CSP grant and the resulting data extractions. The Data Governance Committee reviews the business rules and department policies, procedures, and guidelines. The data managers will extract data annually for applicable CSP subgrant recipients in order to report on this measure.

The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with the award announcement in July 2017. The Department finalizes and publishes local report card data by Sept. 15 annually. The Department will calculate this measure following the report card release.

SECTION B

To date, the Department has not expended any awarded grant funds.

The Department's ability to complete grant activities and expend grant funds was held while USDoE performed a supplemental review of the Department's grant application and proposed activities. The USDoE completed the supplemental review on Sept. 14, 2016, at which point the Department began grant activities under high-risk special conditions.

Due to the delay in beginning grant activities, the Department has not yet held a subgrant award competition. The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017, with the award announcement in July 2017. Additionally, changes in Ohio law have affected our anticipated pipeline.

One of the special conditions requires the Department to hire an independent monitor that will review Ohio's administration of the grant based on defined, agreed upon procedures. Requests were received and scored based on established criteria. The process culminated in the selection of a final applicant as the independent monitor, Kennedy Cottrell Richards LLC, and a contract is being negotiated. The independent monitor will be funded utilizing grant administrative funds.

Together, these factors have resulted in a substantial decrease in the anticipated administrative funds available to the Department. Due to this decrease, the Department has elected to take a fiscally conservative approach to expending CSP grant dollars on administrative costs. Therefore, the Department has utilized state resources to fund all grant activities to date.

The Department anticipates an eligible applicant pipeline for round one as follows:

- 4 – Planning Subgrant Applicants
- 9 – Year 1 Implementation Subgrant Applicants
- 5 – Year 2 Implementation Subgrant Applicants

CSP Projected Applicant Pipeline					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Planning Grant	-	4			
Year 1 Implementation Grant	-	9			
Year 2 Implementation Grant	-	5			

SECTION C

Instructions for Section C – Additional Information

Ohio's overarching goal for the Charter School Program grant is to increase the number of new, high-performing, site-based general education schools while increasing the percentage of students enrolled in all high-performing, site-based schools.

While the specific goals of the CSP grant remain the same, they were clarified and strengthened in the supplemental grant application submission. Specifically, the goals to be achieved by 2021 for the CSP grant are as follows:

1. Increase the percentage of students enrolled in high-performing, site-based community schools to 70 percent;
2. Create up to 115 new, high-performing, site-based community schools, serving approximately 25,000 students;
3. Including both existing and new community schools, the Department envisions 400 high-performing community schools across the state;
4. Improve the academic performance of existing community schools by holding sponsors accountable for the academic performance of their community schools through the sponsor evaluation process; and
5. Decrease the number of existing poor-performing community schools by holding sponsors accountable for the academic performance of their community schools through the sponsor evaluation process.

There have been many significant changes since Ohio submitted its CSP grant application in July 2015. In November 2015, the Ohio General Assembly overwhelmingly passed House Bill 2, a landmark revision to the state's community school oversight system. The law gives the Department greater authority to ensure that only high-quality sponsors can oversee schools and provides incentives to sponsors that have track records of success. Due to the extensive changes required under HB 2, the timeline for implementing elements of Ohio's CSP grant was revised.

HB 2 requires the Ohio Department of Education to evaluate sponsors of community schools in three categories: academic performance of students enrolled in community schools sponsored by the same entity; adherence by a sponsor to the quality practices prescribed by the Department; and compliance with all applicable laws and administrative rules by an entity that sponsors a community school. In October 2016, the new, high-quality evaluations of all sponsors were completed. In total, 65 sponsors received overall ratings: five "effective," 39 "ineffective," and 21 "poor." Sponsors receiving "poor" ratings will have their sponsorship authority revoked, while sponsors receiving "ineffective" ratings shall not sponsor new community schools per Ohio Revised Code 3314.016.

On Sept. 14, 2016, USDoe completed its supplemental review and permitted Ohio to implement CSP grant activities under high risk and special conditions. Since that time, the Department has diligently worked to respond to the requirements outlined in the September USDoe letter. The following activities have occurred:

- Developed and submitted to USDoe a request for application for review;
- Drafted a competitive award process and requested feedback from USDoe;
- Posted a list of all community schools and supporting data on the Department's website;
- Engaged participants for the CSP grant implementation advisory committee;
- Created elements of a comprehensive plan for the CSP subgrant competition;
- Released the sponsor evaluation ratings;
- Revised the structure and instruments, compliance tool and quality rubric, for the upcoming sponsor evaluations;
- Placed all "ineffective" rated sponsors on quality improvement plans;
- Revoked the sponsorship authority of sponsors that did not choose to appeal the revocation as outlined in ORC 3314.016(B)(7)(c);
- Drafted proposed administrative rules that will directly and indirectly impact the sponsor evaluation as well as other aspects of community school operations;
- Attended the CSP grant conference in Washington, D.C.;
- Drafted a revised CSP grant budget;
- Received a monitoring visit from WestEd and USDoe;
- Participated in weekly conference calls with USDoe;

The Department has made substantial progress on the high-risk special conditions outlined in the Sept. 14, 2016, USDoe letter. The following information represents the work completed for each high-risk condition to date.

1. On route payment: The Department assures that all subgrantee payment requests are routed to USDoe for approval prior to any funds being released.
2. Independent monitor: The Department engaged the Ohio Department of Administrative Services for a request for application regarding the hiring of an independent monitor. Requests were received and scored based on established criteria. The process culminated in the selection of a final applicant, and a contract is being negotiated. The independent monitor will perform agreed upon procedures that address grant implementation risk as well as monitoring the Department and its subgrantees.

3. Performance reports: The Department submitted timely quarterly and semiannual reports addressing all grant activities and expenditures during the grant period. Quarterly reports included information pertaining to the sponsor evaluation, updates on community school audit findings and applicable resolutions, and updates to the Department's CSP subgrantee competition timeline.
4. Grant Implementation Advisory Committee: The state superintendent created the advisory committee to provide and ensure additional accountability with respect to the implementation of the Department's CSP grant. The committee's responsibilities include co-signing the semiannual reports. Members are developing a governance document that will outline how they will govern themselves and how they will support the Department with the CSP grant. The advisory committee met on March 30 and April 13, 2017, to review the request for application, peer review process, and approve the quarterly and annual reports.

The following individuals have agreed to serve as members of Ohio's Grant Implementation Advisory Committee:

- Stephane Lavertu, Committee Chair, Associate Professor, Ohio State University, Glenn College of Public Affairs
- Chad Aldis, Vice President for Ohio Policy and Advocacy, Thomas B. Fordham Institute;
- Stephen Dackin, Superintendent of School and Community Partnerships, Columbus State Community College;
- Kaleigh Lemaster, Executive Director, School Choice Ohio;
- Peggy Young, President, Ohio Association of Charter School Authorizers;
- Todd Ziebarth, Senior Vice President, National Alliance of Public Charter Schools.

5. Comprehensive Plan

- a. Sponsor evaluation: The Department issued its first sponsor evaluation ratings in October 2016 for the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years. In the 2015-2016 school year, a total of 65 sponsors received ratings; five “effective,” 39 “ineffective,” and 21 “poor.” Revisions of technical assistance documents and evaluation instruments (compliance with all laws and rules and the quality rubric) were completed and posted to the Department’s webpage. Procedures for the sponsor evaluation process have been drafted for inclusion in the comprehensive plan.
- b. Subgrantee eligibility: The request for application includes the subgrantee eligibility screening criteria. A technical review checklist is included in the subgrantee application, which includes eligibility criteria. Applicants not meeting eligibility requirements in the technical review will not progress to the peer review process for scoring

and, thus, will not be awarded a CSP subgrant. Procedures for the subgrantee eligibility have been drafted for inclusion in the comprehensive plan.

- c. Request for application: The Department created a RFA and submitted it to USDoe for review. Feedback was received from USDoe and incorporated into the full application. The revision will be submitted to USDoe for review and approved April 5, 2017. Procedures for the RFA were drafted and will be included in the comprehensive plan.
 - d. Subgrant award process: The Department drafted a subgrantee award process that includes a technical review, peer review, Needs Assessment Advisory Group priorities, scoring analysis, and award notification. The award process was submitted to USDoe for feedback. Procedures for the subgrant award process were developed for inclusion in the comprehensive plan.
 - e. Processing payments: The Department submitted fiscal procedures as they pertain to grant payments. USDoe reviewed the fiscal procedures to ensure the Department has a thorough payments process for subgrantees. These procedures will be included in the comprehensive plan.
 - f. Adherence to all program requirements and terms of the approved applications: The Department is drafting procedures for subgrantee adherence to requirements as well as procedures for state adherence. These procedures will be submitted to USDoe as part of the comprehensive plan for review and approval.
6. Monitoring protocol: The Department has researched the grant application, clarifications to USDoe, and special and high-risk conditions to create a crosswalk of requirements. Additional research on monitoring protocols and procedures from other state CSP grantees assists the Department in drafting a comprehensive process. The Department will submit the monitoring protocol to USDoe for feedback and approval prior to awarding any subgrants (July 2017).
 7. Centralized listing of all community schools: The Department developed a comprehensive list of community schools that includes sponsor information, accountability data, and other pertinent facts, and posted this list to the Department's website. The Department's data management team will update the list annually.
 8. Prohibition of dropout prevention and recovery community schools: The Department created eligibility criteria that exclude dropout prevention and recovery schools from applying for CSP subgrant funds. The eligibility criteria are included in the RFA and the technical review checklist.

Per Ohio's CSP grant application, only community schools authorized by effective or exemplary rated sponsors are eligible to apply for the CSP subgrant. As a result of the sponsor evaluation, Ohio has five sponsors eligible to authorize new schools. The Department's first subgrant competition will begin no later than May 15, 2017. The deadline for submission is June 15, 2017, with the review process to commence between June 16 and June 30. CSP subgrants will only be awarded to eligible applicants meeting the quality cut score. Successful applicants will be awarded subgrants for planning not to exceed \$100,000 and implementation subgrants not to exceed \$350,000 for year one implementation and \$250,000 for year two implementation.

Under ORC 3314.02(D), sponsors and governing authorities of new community schools must adopt preliminary agreements by March 15 and sign contracts by May 15. To date, the Department has received notification of nine new community schools beginning operations in the 2017-2018 school year and two community schools scheduled for the first year of operation in 2018-2019. Each of these new community schools are authorized by sponsors rated effective. If each school meets the eligibility criteria outlined in the Department's RFA, they will be able to apply for either a planning or implementation year 1 subgrant. Community schools in their first or second years of operation during the 2016-2017 school year meeting the CSP subgrant eligibility criteria, including authorization by an effective- or exemplary-rated sponsor also may apply for implementation year 2 subgrants.

The Department clarified its definition of a high-performing community school in its Nov. 18, 2015, response to USDoE as follows:

1. If the charter school is a dropout prevention and recovery model, its rating should be "Overall Exceeds Standards."
2. If the charter school serves any combination of ninth through 12th grades, the Four-Year Graduation Rate must meet the equivalent of A or B and the Performance Index must meet either the equivalent of A, B or C or must have increased for the previous three years of operation.
3. If the charter school serves any combination of fourth through eighth grades, the overall Value-Added measure must meet the equivalent of A or B and the Performance Index must meet either the equivalent of A, B or C or must have increased for the previous three years of operation.
4. If the charter school serves only a combination of kindergarten through third grades, the K-3 Literacy measure must meet the equivalent of A or B.

Per the aforementioned definition, the Department has provided a full analysis using the 2015-2016 accountability data as the baseline in Section A, Objective 3 of this report. For the purpose of the CSP grant and consistent with the Department's initial application and response to USDoE on Feb. 24, 2016, e-schools are not included in the data and drop out recovery schools are currently excluded under the special conditions.