CMSD Charter Schools Office
Sponsored Schools Annual Meeting

October 31, 2018
BCS Offices
12:30 p.m.-2:00 p.m.
Introductions

• Matt Rado, Director of Charter Schools, CMSD
• Tom Hutton, Outside Consultant (Education Adjuncts)
• Nick D’Amico, Executive Director of School Performance, CMSD
• Shemekia Love, Administrative Assistant, CMSD
Agenda

1. Background/Overview (Matt)
2. Contracts
   • Overview of accountability frameworks
     • Understanding the state report card and the academic framework (Nick)
     • Organizational and Financial Frameworks (Matt)
     • Intervention Protocol (Matt)
   • Scoring renewal applications (Tom)
   • Types of Revisions (Tom)
   • Timelines (Tom)
3. Other items (Matt)
   • Sponsor Rating
   • SponsorSHIP newsletter
   • Annual Reports
   • Annual Sunshine Training
4. Next Steps
Background

• The Accountability Framework
  – Agreement between board and sponsor for how we will ensure the school will provide high-quality education
  – Three components: Academic, Organizational, and Financial
  – Used to communicate with boards, schools, parents, and community about how schools are doing
  – How we hold schools accountable and evaluate whether a school should be renewed
  – Rigorous and fair, but designed to preserve school autonomy
  – A living document

• 44. CONTRACT REVIEW. The Governing Authority or representatives authorized by it shall meet with the CMSD at least once yearly before the end of the School's fiscal year to review the terms and provisions of this Contract, at a time and place acceptable to both parties.

• Four schools are up for renewal this year: CLA, VPC, NWIS, Promise
• Six schools are up for renewal next year: CA, CAE, CAS, EPC, EPWH, Stonebrook
• One school is up for renewal in 2020: VPW
• Additional meetings will occur for next year’s renewal schools between now and the spring
Academic Framework

- Understanding the state report card and the academic framework (Nick)
Objectives

• Provide a high level overview of the academic framework for charter schools.

• Build an understanding of:
  – The report card metrics our framework relies on
  – The different lenses by which we look at these metrics.
Performance Index

• The performance index is a measure of student achievement.

• Schools score points based on the performance level a student achieves.
Performance Index

• Input: Student achievement on state assessments
• Includes data for all K8 tested subjects. HS includes only ELA and Math subjects.
• Student performance is weighted
  – Students scoring above a level of proficiency provide more points.
  – Students scoring below proficiency score fewer points.
Performance Index

• Calculating PI:
  – Determine the percentage of students scoring at each proficiency level (Advanced, Accelerated, Proficient, Basic, Limited).
  – The percentage of students in each category is multiplied by a weight to generate points.
  – These points are summed for a final PI grade.
## Performance Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Plus</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>21.5 * 0.6 = 12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untested</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Performance Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Plus</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untested</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.9 / 120</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>73.9 / 120 (61.6%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gap Closure

• Measures improvement in performance of student subgroups.

• Goal of measure is to either increase subgroup performance OR to reach the state goal.

• Students can count in multiple categories.

• Subgroup has to meet minimum size requirement to be included in calculations.
# Gap Closure

## Table: Gap Closure by Category and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># of students 2018</th>
<th>PI 2018</th>
<th>Target PI 2018</th>
<th>Long Term Target</th>
<th># of students 2017</th>
<th>PI 2017</th>
<th>Improvement Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>NC (24)</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Gap Closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of students 2018</th>
<th>PI 2018</th>
<th>Target PI 2018</th>
<th>Long Term Target</th>
<th># of students 2017</th>
<th>PI 2017</th>
<th>Improvement Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(67 – 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(64 – 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>NC (24)</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(54 – 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Goal Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gap Closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of students 2018</th>
<th>PI 2018</th>
<th>Target PI 2018</th>
<th>Long Term Target</th>
<th># of students 2017</th>
<th>PI 2017</th>
<th>Improvement Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Students</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(67 – 63) / (100 – 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(64 – 53) / (92.4 – 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>NC (24)</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(54 – 51) / (79.7 – 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students with Disabilities</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Goal Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gap Closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of students 2018</th>
<th>PI 2018</th>
<th>Target PI 2018</th>
<th>Long Term Target</th>
<th># of students 2017</th>
<th>PI 2017</th>
<th>Improvement Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>NC (24)</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gap Closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of students 2018</th>
<th>PI 2018</th>
<th>Target PI 2018</th>
<th>Long Term Target</th>
<th># of students 2017</th>
<th>PI 2017</th>
<th>Improvement Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>NC (24)</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POINTS POSSIBLE** 400

**POINTS EARNED** 162.5 (40.6%)
Gap Closure

• Minimum subgroup size will be decreasing year over year.
  • 2018 = N of 25
  • 2019 = N of 20
  • 2020 and beyond = N of 15
Gap Closure

• Moving your performance index will move your gap closure measure.

• Emphasizes need to pay attention to *all students*. 
Value Add

• ODE growth measure bases expectations on whether a student maintained their position relative to every other student in the state of Ohio.
Value Add

Average Spring 2016 Score for a school
Value Add

Average Spring 2017 Score for a school
Value Add

Average Spring 2017 Score for a school
Value Add

Average Spring 2017 Score for a school
Importance of Performance Frameworks

• Strongly recommended by NACSA
• Performance frameworks set expectations for performance and compliance
• Performance frameworks are enforced through monitoring, evaluation, and intervention决策-making
• Essentially, performance frameworks capture the “autonomy for accountability” idea at the heart of the charter movement
CMSD Academic Framework

• Includes both a report card indicator, primary indicator and secondary indicators

• Report card indicator is tied to overall report card grade.

• Primary indicators are tied to report grades on individual metrics.

• Secondary indicators consider comparisons to similar schools and improvements over time.
CMSD Academic Framework

• Philosophy of the framework is to provide a school as many opportunities to demonstrate quality.

• If a school meets the report card or primary indicators, secondary indicators are not used in evaluations.

• Secondary indicators only used to help, not to hurt schools.
Sponsor Performance Review: Adherence to Quality Practices

• Metrics and targets must be specific and rigorous

• Targets must include all students and subgroups of students

• At a minimum, targets are set that compare the school’s student performance to the state, to schools serving similar students, and/or schools in the same geographical area
CMSD’s Proposed Academic Performance Framework

Five categories
– Attendance
– Value Add
– Performance Index
– Gap Closing
– School-specific
• Gap Closing, Value Add and Performance Index goals tied to state benchmarks.

• School specific goals determined by comparisons to schools serving similar populations of students.
• Performance against goals measured with four different categories.
  – Exceeds Expectations
  – Meets Expectations
  – Does Not Meet Expectations
  – Falls Far Below Expectations
Value-Add

- Value-add as reported on the state report card (3 year average value add).
  - Exceeds: Value-add score of 2 or higher
  - Meets: Value-add score between -1 and 1.99
  - Does not Meet: Score between -1.01 and -2
  - Falls far below: Score less than -2
Performance Index

- Performance Index as reported on the state report card.
  - Exceeds: A or B grade
  - Meets: C grade
  - Does not Meet: D grade
  - Falls far below: F grade
Attendance

• Attendance rate, as reported to state (days attended/days accountable for)
  – Meets: 94% or greater
  – Does not meet: 93.9% or lower

• Based on average state attendance
School-specific goals

• Rigorous yet achievable goals set to help schools target improvement.

• Four different subcategories
  – 1 year Value-add goal
  – Performance index goal
  – Subgroup proficiency (special education, economically disadvantaged)
  – School selected goals (0 to 2)
School-specific goals

• School specific goals are determined by finding other community schools in Ohio’s Urban 8 which serve similar student populations.

• Schools matched on following criteria:
  – % Special Education
  – Mobility Rates
  – % Economically Disadvantaged
School-specific goals

• Use a statistical procedure to find most similar schools, based on these characteristics.

• Ensures that schools not compared to others with systematic and non-random differences in student populations.
Matching Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% SPED</th>
<th>% Econ Disad</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Match Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matching Example

• Higher the match score, the more likely differences in student populations are not due to random chance.

• Typical cutoff used in research is a score between 1.5 and 2.

• Each school receives a unique group of similar schools.
## Matching Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% SPED</th>
<th>% Econ Disad</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Match Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting Goals

• Once schools are matched, performance can be compared.

• Distribution of performance among similar schools can be used to determine what a reasonable yet rigorous goal would be.
Goal Setting Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Value-Add (1 year)</th>
<th>% Reading Proficient, SPED</th>
<th>% Math Proficient, SPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting Goals

• Use school performance data to determine what the average performance is of similar schools.

• Schools can set targets based on whether they are above or below the average.

• Size of the target will vary, based on how other similar schools have performed.

• Each school will have unique goals, based on unique groups of matched schools.
## Goal Setting Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Value-Add (1 year)</th>
<th>% Reading Proficient, SPED</th>
<th>% Math Proficient, SPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Average</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Goal</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting Goals

• When below the average, target towards the average.

• When above or at the average, target a standard distance above the average.

• Goals based on performance that has been observed from other schools with similar groups of students.
Organizational Framework

- Compliance-related standards by which we monitor and evaluate schools
  - Come from ODE, contracts, state law
  - Designed to maximize autonomy
  - Organized into nine categories
    - Review examples
  - Collected during site visits and throughout the year
  - 100 possible points
    - Results shared after site visits and annually
      - Just finished fall site visits
Financial Framework

• Measure and evaluate financial strength of schools
  • Use multiple measures to evaluate financial health
• Evaluated monthly, quarterly, and annually
• Monthly review:
  • Days cash; area of concern: less than 20
  • Current Ratio; area of concern: less than 1
  • Enrollment; area of concern: below 90%
• See Accountability Framework for addl’ details
Intervention Protocol

• Aligned with contracts, state law, and oversight policy
• Separate from “Corrective Action Plans” which are part of ODE compliance review
• “…preserves school autonomy and school responsibility for developing and executing remedies to identified deficiencies or violations.”
• Tiered interventions: Notice of Concern, Notice of Breach, Probation, Suspension, and Termination
• Please review Attachment 4, pp. 21-23
Relation to contract renewal

*From our policy on renewal, nonrenewal, and termination:*

- The Board shall base the community school sponsorship contract renewal process and renewal decisions on **thorough analysis of a comprehensive body of objective evidence defined by the Performance Framework incorporated into the sponsorship contract.**
- Such evidence shall include at least all of the following:
  - Multiple years of student achievement and multiple measures of student achievement;
  - Financial audits;
  - Site visit reports and/or other compliance reports; and
  - Status reports on corrective action plans or other required interventions, if necessary.
Renewal Application Process

• NOTE! This may be revised for next year!
• Partly dictated by ODE's evaluation criteria for sponsors
• Five-stage process:
     a. School's Annual Report may double as this
  2. Sept.: Charter Renewal Application
     a. Can comment on Preliminary Report
  3. Sept./Oct.: Additional information-gathering:
     a. Renewal Site Visit
     b. Additional year's performance data
     c. Any additional information requests
Renewal Application Process

4. **Nov.**: Final Renewal Performance Report  
   a. **Dec.**: Recommendation to Board of Education & vote

5. **Starting in Jan.**: Renewal or non-renewal  
   a. Renewal: preparation of new contract  
   b. Non-renewal: non-renewal/termination process  
      - Note: State law prohibits a school that is non-renewed for failing to meet academic performance requirements (or failing to meet generally accepted fiscal management principles) from contracting with a new sponsor
Scoring Renewal Applications

• Currently four sections:
  A. Performance Review
  B. Context and Clarification
  C. A Closer Look
  D. Future Plans
• 150 points possible
• Application must receive a minimum of 99 points to be considered for renewal
• Scoring 99 still does not guarantee a recommendation
Scoring Renewal Applications

• Section A, Performance Review: up to 100 points total
  – A1, Academic Performance: up to 50 points
  – A2, Financial Performance: up to 25 points
  – A3, Organizational Performance: up to 25 points
  – CMSD will provide this section in the form of the Final Renewal Performance Report

• Section B, Context and Clarification: not scored
  – Affords applicant an opportunity to provide additional information on data that were included in the Preliminary Renewal Performance Review from CMSD
Scoring Renewal Applications

• Section C, A Closer Look: up to 35 points total
  – C1, Renewal Site Visit: up to 15 points
  – C2, Status Update on Financial Performance: up to 10 points
  – C3, Status Update on Remedial Action Plans: up to 10 points

• Section D, Future Plans: up to 15 points
  – Gives applicant an opportunity to submit important information that is relevant to the school’s next contract term, if any; especially any big changes to school
This year's application
This year's application
This year's application
This year's application
New contracts and revisions

Types of revisions:

• Annual review of changes in state and federal law
• Changes prompted by ODE sponsor evaluations
  • *E.g.*, mission-specific performance measures
• Renewal or new/transfer schools
• Alternative performance frameworks
• More school-specific changes: *e.g.*, Promise Academy change regarding blended learning
New contracts and revisions

Timeline:

• Nov. 7: New and transfer recommendations to CMSD Board
• Nov. 20: CMSD Board votes
• Nov.: Share renewal recommendations with schools
• Dec. 11: Renewal recommendations to CMSD Board
• Dec. 18: CMSD board votes
• Nov. - Feb.: Contract revisions
• By Mar. 15: Preliminary agreements, Contract adoption
• By May 15: Signing of contracts
New contracts and revisions

One contract revision for sure: add requirements of HB 21 that governing authority:

• Specify process used to verify residence and address for students enrolling in or attending school;
• Require student’s district of residence be verified on enrollment;
• Requires student’s district of residence be verified annually;
• Require monthly review of residency records of enrolled students; and
• Require parents, guardians or independent students aged 18+ to notify school of change parent's/student's residence
Other Items

- Other items
  - Renewal recommendation report
  - Sponsor Rating
  - SponsorSHIP newsletter
  - Annual Reports
  - Board Sunshine Training
ODE Annual Report

- Must be submitted to ODE and parents by 11/30 each year
- ODE dictates ratings and performance categories including an overall rating
- CMSD will include historical performance and prospects for renewal

CMSD Annual Report

- More aligned to CMSD frameworks
- Summarizes academic record over contract term
- Detailed reports to be released in early 2019
Other Items, Ctd.

- Annual sunshine training by June 30
- Will do a meeting in February, primarily to prep for ODE compliance

Questions?