

Attachment 4: Accountability Plan

Pursuant to the Sponsorship Contract, the Performance Framework enclosed herein ensures that each CMSD-sponsored charter school provides high-quality education to their students. The Framework includes the academic, organizational, and financial standards by which sponsored schools will be evaluated.

The Performance Framework will be used to evaluate whether a charter school’s contract should be renewed. It will also be used throughout the life cycle of the school to communicate the school’s performance to its staff, governing authority, sponsor, and other stakeholders. The Framework will provide the basis of the annual report that CMSD must provide annually to the Ohio Department of Education.

In addition to establishing performance criteria for charter schools, the Cleveland Metropolitan School District performance framework holds the Cleveland Metropolitan School District accountable to charter schools. The Cleveland Metropolitan School District is accountable for implementing a rigorous and fair oversight process that respects the autonomy that is vital to charter school success.

It is this *mutual obligation* that drives the Cleveland Metropolitan School District Performance Framework– a collaborative effort with the common objective of providing Ohio students with a high quality education that prepares them for post-graduation academic and career success.

Finally, the Performance Framework is a living document, subject to continuous review and improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
Section 1: Academic Performance Framework	2
Section 2: Organizational Performance Framework	8
Section 3: Financial Performance Framework	11

Section 1: Academic Performance Framework

Pursuant to the Sponsorship Contract, the Accountability Frameworks include the agreed-upon goals that the Governing Authority and Sponsor will use to evaluate the performance of the Community School during the term of this contract. Recognizing that state-mandated assessments and ratings are subject to change, the parties reserve the right to review and reconsider performance-related metrics within the Academic Performance Framework.

Guiding Principles of the Framework

- 1) The framework meets state expectations for how authorizers/sponsors hold their schools accountable:
 - a. The framework considers student performance, student growth, and attendance.
 - b. The framework compares the performance of schools to state standards as well as to schools serving similar student populations (based on mobility rates, percent of special education students, and percent of limited English proficiency students).
- 2) The framework recognizes schools that exceed or meet standards, while also fairly evaluating and taking account of progress made by schools that do not meet standards.
- 3) The framework provides a dashboard of information that provides information on how schools are performing during the term of their contract.
- 4) The same framework can be applied to multiple schools allowing for an even playing field.

Framework Indicators

In order to meet guiding principles outlined, the framework looks at the same indicators in multiple ways. It is tiered, looking at primary indicators of performance as well as secondary indicators of performance.

To be considered for contract renewal, the Governing Authority is expected to have met or exceeded the primary academic indicators, as specified herein. Secondary indicators will be considered as well, but primary indicators will factor more heavily into decisions about renewal or non-renewal, as well as decisions regarding probation, suspension, and termination. Any school that meets the primary indicators will be considered to be meeting the minimum academic expectations of the sponsor with regards to academic performance.

The decision tree below shows a high level view of how the framework operates.

1. Consider school performance along all three primary indicators.
 - a. If a school 'exceeds' or 'meets' the primary indicator for a particular metric, STOP. The school's score will be based on the primary indicator.

- b. If a school receives a ‘does not meet’ or ‘falls far below’ for a particular metric, continue with the decision tree.
- 2. Consider the school’s target for the particular metric.
 - a. If a school equals or exceeds the target, STOP. The school receives a rating of ‘meets’ for this metric.
 - b. If the school does not equal or exceed the target, continue with the decision tree.
- 3. Consider the school’s performance on the metric compared to similar schools.
 - a. The school receives a final score based on how far above average they are on this metric, when compared to other similar schools.
 - i. Schools far above average ‘exceed’ the standard
 - ii. Schools above average ‘meet’ the standard
 - iii. Schools below average ‘do not meet’ the standard
 - iv. Schools far below average ‘fall far below’ the standard

Ratings on all of the primary and secondary indicators will be provided to each school every year. While the secondary indicators may not be used to evaluate a school, depending on their performance on the primary indicators, the secondary indicators provide useful information that contextualizes a school’s information. This data can be used in conversations between the sponsor and school to monitor progress and help ensure all schools are on track to meet or exceeds standards at the time of contract renewal.

Primary Indicators

Three primary indicators are utilized: one year value-add, performance index, and attendance rates. The cut points for ratings on these indicators are determined based on state grading standards. One-year value add is used rather than the three year average to provide a more real-time view of how a school performed in a given year.

	Exceeds	Meets	Does Not Meet	Falls Far Below
Value-Add	2 or above	Between -1 and 1.99	Between -2 and -1.01	Below -2.01
Performance Index	A or B	C	D	F
Attendance	94% or above	93% to 93.99%	90% to 92.99%	Below 90%

Secondary Indicators

The secondary indicators compare the performance indicator and one-year value-add score for each CMSD-sponsored school to a comparison group of Ohio charter schools. Each CMSD-sponsored school has been placed in a peer group with no more than 10 other Ohio charter schools that are similar to the school in terms of percentage of special education students, economically disadvantaged students, and mobile students.

CMSD expects all of its schools to work toward continual improvement, even if they are already meeting state standards. Thus, for schools that are meeting the primary indicators in value-add and performance index, these secondary indicators will set reasonable targets based upon comparable schools to monitor continual improvement. While these targets will not always be used in an evaluation of a school, depending on if a school meets standards according to the primary indicators, targets can provide schools with information on what their overtime trends are. For schools that are not meeting or exceed the primary indicators, these secondary indicators will help CMSD and the Governing Authority gauge progression toward those state goals.

Each year, CMSD and the Governing Authority will meet to discuss performance on the Academic Framework. The comparison schools and the goals will be adjusted accordingly, based on the most recent data from the state report cards.

The goals for secondary indicators for each non-dropout recovery, CMSD-sponsored school are set forth on the following page. Targets are created using the previous year data so that schools know ahead of time what they should aim for in the coming year. Targets work by first identifying how much a measure varies within a peer group of schools. Targets are then derived by taking a school's performance and adding 0.5 of a standard deviation. Statistical convention has shown that movements of 0.5 standard deviations or more are substantively large. Generally, depending on where a school sits compared to its peer group, there will also be evidence that other schools performed at this level.

In some cases, a school will be the highest performer among its peers and also at an absolute level. In such cases, it is both unlikely and unreasonable to expect a school to grow more. For example, a school with a value-add score of 5.3 is far above standard from an absolute standpoint and it is potentially difficult to meet a target set above this value. In cases where schools do not meet their target, the sponsor will consider how far above the average a school is compared to their peers. In this way, the framework ensures that schools that might not meet their targets are not penalized if they are among the best performers on that indicator, when compared to similar schools. The formula for calculating this score is $(\text{School Performance} - \text{Peer Average Performance}) / \text{Peer Standard Deviation}$.

Peer comparison scores translate into ratings as follows:

Greater than .68 – Exceeds Standard

Between 0 and 0.68 – Meets Standard

Between 0 and -0.68 – Does not Meet Standard

Less than -0.68 – Falls far below Standard

These cut points roughly divide the distribution into quartiles, so that schools in the top 50% are meeting the standard.

The tables on the following pages show school performance from 2013-14 along both the primary and secondary indicators, using the decision tree and cut points described above.

Primary Indicators

Performance Index

School Name	Performance Index Score	PI Percent	PI grade	Primary Indicator Rating
Cleveland E Prep	88.9	74.08%	C	Meets
Village Prep	92.2	76.83%	C	Meets
Near West Intergenerational	96.3	80.25%	B	Exceeds
E Prep Woodland Hills	85	70.83%	C	Meets
Citizens Academy	97.8	81.50%	B	Exceeds
Citizens Leadership Academy	93.2	77.67%	C	Meets
Citizens Academy East	96	80%	B	Exceeds

Value-Add

school name	Value-Add, One Year	Primary Indicator Rating
Cleveland E Prep	7.8	Exceeds
Village Prep	-4.5	Falls Far Below
Near West Intergenerational	1.8	Meets
E Prep Woodland Hills	7.6	Exceeds
Citizens Academy	-0.2	Meets
Citizens Leadership Academy	-3.5	Falls Far Below
Citizens Academy East	N/A	N/A

Attendance Rate

school name	Attendance Rate	Primary Indicator Rating
Cleveland E Prep	94%	Exceeds
Village Prep	93%	Meets
Near West Intergenerational	95%	Exceeds
E Prep Woodland Hills	95%	Exceeds
Citizens Academy	94%	Exceeds
Citizens Leadership Academy	95%	Exceeds
Citizens Academy East	95%	Exceeds

Secondary Indicators

Performance Index

school name	Performance Index Score	2013-2014 PI Target	Target Met or Not Met	PI Peer Comparison	Secondary Indicator Rating	Peer PI Average	Peer PI Std Dev
Cleveland E Prep	88.9	91.8	Not Met	1.26	Exceeds	77.3	9.2
Village Prep	92.2	N/A	N/A	1.42	Exceeds	82.1	7.1
Near West Intergenerational	96.3	106.8	Not Met	0.321	Meets	94.5	5.6
E Prep Woodland Hills	85	89	Not Met	-0.51	Does Not Meet	89.1	8.1
Citizens Academy	97.8	105.7	Not Met	1.91	Exceeds	75.2	11.8
Citizens Leadership Academy	93.2	101.5	Not Met	0.34	Meets	90.2	8.8
Citizens Academy East	96	N/A	N/A	2.1	Exceeds	80	7.8

Value-Add

school name	Value Add, One Year	2013-2014 VA Target	Target Met or Not Met	VA Peer Comparison	Secondary Indicator Rating	Peer VA Average	Peer VA Std Dev
Cleveland E Prep	7.8	13.0	Not Met	1.92	Exceeds	0.11	4
Village Prep	-4.5	N/A	N/A	-1.06	Falls Far	-0.15	4.1

					Below		
Near West Intergenerational	1.8	1.3	Met	0.54	Meets	0.67	2.1
E Prep Woodland Hills	7.6	9.8	Not Met	1.68	Exceeds	0.06	4.5
Citizens Academy	-0.2	2.0	Not Met	0.43	Meets	-1.7	3.5
Citizens Leadership Academy	-3.5	2.4	Not Met	-1.26	Falls Far Below	-0.34	2.5

Attendance Rate

school name	Attendance Rate, 2013-2014	2013-2014 Attend Target	Target Met or Not Met	Attendance Peer Comparison	Secondary Indicator Rating	Peer Attend. Average	Peer Attend. Std Dev
Cleveland E Prep	94%	94%	Met	0	Meets	94%	.01
Village Prep	93%	N/A	N/A	-1	Falls Far Below	94%	.01
Near West Intergenerational	95%	95%	Met	0	Meets	95%	.003
E Prep Woodland Hills	95%	95%	Met	2	Exceeds	93%	.01
Citizens Academy	94%	95%	Not Met	1.3	Exceeds	90%	.03
Citizens Leadership Academy	95%	95%	Met	0	Meets	95%	.01
Citizens Academy East	95%	N/A	N/A	0	Meets	95%	.002

Part 2. Organizational Framework

The purpose of the organizational performance framework is to establish and communicate the compliance-related standards by which CMSD will monitor and evaluate its sponsored schools.

CMSD aims to maximize school operational autonomy by articulating the base set of state and federal laws, rules, and regulations and contractual obligations that apply to its sponsored schools. CMSD will provide all of its sponsored schools with a calendar of requirements for the upcoming school year by July 15 of each year. This list will include the legal authority (for example, state law or charter contract) for each requirement. Both the school and the sponsor recognize that new requirements may arise as laws change, and thus some requirements may be added to the list after July 15. CMSD will make its best efforts to provide schools with advanced notice of such requirements.

CMSD will primarily use an online compliance management system (such as Epicenter) to track compliance. As described below, “On-Time” means that a requirement has been submitted to the sponsor by the due date. The sponsor may adjust deadlines for schools in certain situations; these decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis. Schools are advised to communicate with their sponsor regularly in the event that they foresee such a delay in order to avoid a late submission. “Records compliance” means that a compliance requirement was received and was substantially accurate.

Some compliance-related requirements cannot be assessed via an online compliance management system. CMSD will also conduct fall and spring site visits, as required by law. CMSD will provide schools with advanced notice of the site visits.

The indicators and ratings appear on the following pages:

Organizational Indicators	Exceeds the Standard	Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard	Falls Far Below the Standard
Compliance Records Accuracy/Completeness	90 percent or higher	79 to 89 percent	78 to 60 percent	59 percent or below
Compliance Records On-Time Submission Rate	90 percent or higher	79 to 89 percent	78 to 60 percent	59 percent or below
Financial Records compliance	90 percent or higher	79 to 89 percent	78 to 60 percent	59 percent or below
Financial Records On-Time Submission Rate	90 percent or higher	79 to 89 percent	78 to 60 percent	59 percent or below
Annual Audit	Two consecutive years of no findings, findings for recovery, noncompliance citations, questioned costs, or material weaknesses, as set forth in the audit	No findings for recovery, noncompliance citations, questioned costs, or material weaknesses, as set forth in the audit	Audit contains three or more of the following: findings, noncompliance citations, questioned costs, or material weaknesses, or findings for recovery (less than \$5,000 combined), as set forth in the audit.	Audit contains three or more of the following: findings, noncompliance citations, questioned costs, or material weaknesses, or findings for recovery (\$5,000 or more combined), as set forth in the audit.
LEA Special Education Performance	The school materially complies with applicable rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract with regard to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability AND, by the Spring Site Visit, the school has substantially responded to all concerns identified during the Fall Site Visit.	The school materially complies with applicable rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract with regard to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability AND, by the Spring Site Visit, the school has responded to some concerns identified during the Fall Site Visit.	The school does not materially comply with applicable rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract with regard to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability but, by the Spring Site Visit, the school has responded to some or all of the concerns identified during the Fall Site Visit.	The school does not materially comply with applicable rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract with regard to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability and, by the Spring Site Visit, the school has not responded to the concerns identified during the Fall Site Visit.
Educational Program (As defined in the Charter Contract)	The school is implementing all material terms of	The school is implementing most of the	The school is implementing some of the	The school is not implementing the material terms of

	its education program, as evidenced by classroom observations and conversations with school and CMO staff.	material terms of its education program, as evidenced by classroom observations and conversations with school and CMO staff.	material terms of its education program, as evidenced by classroom observations and conversations with school and CMO staff.	its education program, as evidenced by classroom observations and conversations with school and CMO staff.
Site Visit Walkthrough	The school is meeting 85 percent or more of the applicable indicators on the walkthrough checklist.	The school is meeting between 60 percent and 84 percent of the applicable indicators on the walkthrough checklist.	The school is meeting between 40 percent and 59 percent of the applicable indicators on the walkthrough checklist.	The school is meeting less than 40 percent of the applicable indicators on the walkthrough checklist.

Part 3. Financial Performance Framework

The purpose of the CMSD Financial Performance Framework is to measure and evaluate the financial health of all CMSD sponsored charter schools. The framework is an accountability tool that will be used on a monthly basis, as required by law, to guide discussions between CMSD and CMSD sponsored charter schools. The monthly meetings regarding the framework are not summative, but rather provide the basis for discussions. School ratings on the financial framework will be published annually and submitted to the school's governing authority, parents, and the Ohio Department of Education, pursuant to section 3301-102-05 of the Ohio Administrative Code.

CMSD will provide monthly written reports with feedback and proactive recommendations, as appropriate, that help the schools achieve greater efficiencies, or that result in timely interventions, if needed. Collecting this data is paramount to ensuring that each sponsored school maintains the public trust and its fiduciary responsibility by maintaining a quality school that spends public funds appropriately and adheres to the laws, rules, and charter requirements as governed by their respective boards.

The measures in this framework are designed to be complementary; no single measure provides a full picture of the financial health of a school. Together, however, the measures provide a comprehensive assessment of the school's financial health and viability based on a school's historic trends, near-term financial situation, and future viability.

It is important to note that if a school receives a "below standard" rating, it may or may not be in financial distress. The Financial Performance Framework is meant to flag any areas for further investigation. In the event an area is flagged, the Sponsor may request additional documentation from a school. The rating may be adjusted if sufficient evidence is provided. An example of additional information taken into consideration for rating purposes could be a long-term strategic partnership that acts as an additional funding source for the school. The Sponsor will provide schools with a preliminary report before ratings are published so as to give schools time to respond.

Monthly Review Process

To ensure execution of the aforementioned framework and compliance with Ohio Revised Code 33314.023, sponsored schools must agree to participate in a monthly review process to measure and review the financial and enrollment records. CMSD will work to encourage a culture of learning and sharing of best practices to help ensure that all sponsored schools are supported to meet the financial goals outlined in the framework.

Framework Structure

The financial framework consists of four specific indicators: (1) *Days Cash*, (2) *MTD Enrollment Variance*, (3) *Reserve Ratio's Index*, and (4) *Liquidity Ratio's Index*. Each metric consists of a specific criterion that helps to determine the financial health and viability of sponsored schools and is designed to complement, not replace, the existing financial review process of each sponsored school. These metrics, combined with the existing financial data of each school, will provide the CMSD with a comprehensive assessment of a school's financial health and viability.

Metrics

As indicated above, the financial framework will consist of the following indicators:

- (1) *Days Cash: Measure of how much unrestricted cash a school has in relation to its monthly operating expenses.*
- (2) *MTD Enrollment: Actual month-to-date enrollment divided by enrollment projection in board-approved budget.*
- (3) *Reserve Ratios Index: Ratio of reserve fund balance to total expenditures. Measures available funds to cover unexpected costs or to compensate if future revenues are less than expected.*
- (4) *Liquidity Ratios Index: Measures assets to liabilities. Indicates a schools ability to meet its liabilities as covered by its assets.*

Metrics Criterion

Each metric will be evaluated on one of three criteria to ensure progress can be tracked adequately:

Metric	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
Days Cash	60 or more days cash	30-59 days cash	Less than 30 days cash
MTD Enrollment Variance	Enrollment equals or is greater than 95 percent of budgeted enrollment	Enrollment is between 90 and 94.9 percent of budgeted enrollment	Enrollment is less than 90 percent of budgeted enrollment
Reserve Ratios Index	More than 0.75	0.40 to 0.75	Below 0.40
Liquidity Ratios Index	More than 1.1	1.0 to 1.1	Less than 1.0