

# 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric Change Log

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<b>Glossary of Definitions</b>	
Word Update 1	Changed definition of "high-stakes review" from "A rigorous evaluation of a school's performance (academic, financial and organizational/operational) over the entire contract term." to "A rigorous evaluation of a school's performance (academic, financial and organizational/operational) <b>against the performance framework included in its contract with its sponsor</b> over the entire contract term."
Word Update 2	Changed definition of "measures" from "General categories of performance" to "Categories of performance <b>included within the key components making up the Ohio School Report Cards, Dropout Prevention and Recovery Report Cards and the Career-Technical Report Cards. The measures, some of which are graded and some of which are rated, vary for each type of report card and are used to provide information regarding student academic success and progress.</b> "
Word Addition 1	Added definition for "review year"
<b>A. Commitment and Capacity</b>	
A.01	Revised the third key indicator, changing it from "The strategic plan is in operation for a majority of the review year." to "The strategic plan is in operation <b>by Jan. 1</b> of the review year."
	3-point requirements changed from "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted a strategic plan that includes goals, strategies and action steps that align with sponsoring priorities –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that the strategic plan was in operation for a majority of the review year." to "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted a strategic plan that includes goals, strategies and action steps that align with sponsoring priorities –and– The sponsor submitted evidence the strategic plan was in operation <b>by Jan.1</b> of the review year."
A.02	Revised the first key indicator, changing it from "The improvement process occurs annually according to a defined process and is implemented by March 1 of the review year." to "The improvement process occurs annually according to a defined process and is implemented <b>prior to Jan. 1</b> of the review year."
	3-point requirements changed from "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that for the majority of the review year it develops and implements action steps based on the findings from its improvement process." to "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that <b>prior to Jan. 1</b> of the review year it develops and implements action steps based on the findings from its improvement process."
A.03	Second key indicator, third key indicator and 4-point requirements: Changed the word "leaders" to " <b>administrators</b> "

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
A.04	<p>3-point requirements changed from            "2-Point Requirements –and–The sponsor’s conflict of interest policy requires the submission of conflict of interest statements from each board member (when applicable) and staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities at the onset of each sponsoring responsibility –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of collecting signed conflict of interest statements by Sept. 30 of the review year from each board member and staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities as listed in the organizational chart in standard A.05."            to            "2-Point Requirements –and–The sponsor’s conflict of interest policy requires the submission of conflict of interest statements from each board member (when applicable), <b>as well as</b> staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities <b>once they begin those sponsoring responsibilities</b> –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of collecting signed conflict of interest statements by Sept. 30 of the review year (<b>or within 14 calendar days of a person starting the position if hired after Sept. 30</b>) from each board member and staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities as listed in the organizational chart in standard A.05."</p>
A.05	No changes
A.06	<p>2-point requirements changed from            "The sponsor submitted evidence that demonstrates a majority of the sponsoring staff identified in standard A.05 of this rubric participated in at least one professional development session prior to the second half of the review year."            to            "The sponsor submitted evidence that demonstrates a majority of the sponsoring staff identified in standard A.05 of this rubric participated in at least one professional development session prior to <b>Jan. 1</b> of the review year."</p>
A.07	No changes
<b>B. Application Process and Decision-Making</b>	
B.01	<p>Revised second bullet of the first key indicator, changing it from            "Directions on the content and format required"            to  <b>"Requirements for the submission of the application"</b></p>
	Revised the first key indicator, adding "sponsoring priorities" to the list of bulleted items
B.02	No changes
B.03	Revised the key indicator regarding schools seeking a change in sponsor, removing "school governing authority meeting minutes" from the list of bulleted items
B.04	<p>Revised the second key indicator, changing it from            "Résumés and/or bios demonstrate that at least one application reviewer has several years of <b>community school and/or</b> sponsoring experience."            to            "Résumés and/or bios demonstrate that at least <b>two</b> application reviewers have several years of sponsoring experience."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
B.05	<p>2-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating and scoring individual application criteria that align with the application requirements –and– There is <b>some</b> evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating and scoring individual application criteria that align with the application requirements –and– There is evidence <b>all</b> reviewers receive training on the protocols."</p> <p>3-point requirements changed from                      "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted written protocols for evaluating applications that include a rubric for all selection criteria –and– The sponsor's rubric includes a "cut score" that identifies the lowest possible points that an applicant can earn to receive a preliminary agreement –and– <b>New reviewers receive training on the protocols and rubric.</b>"                      to                      "2-Point Requirements –and–The sponsor submitted written protocols for evaluating applications that include a rubric for all selection criteria –and– The sponsor's rubric includes a "cut score" that identifies the lowest possible points that an applicant can earn to receive a preliminary agreement."</p>
B.06	<p>Revised the second key indicator, changing it from                      "The sponsor approves only those applicants that earn at least 75 percent of possible points."                      to                      "The sponsor <b>enters into preliminary agreements with</b> only those applicants that earn at least 75 percent of possible points."</p>
<b>C. Performance Contracting</b>	
C.01	<p>Revised all five key indicators, changing the first few words of each one from "Contracts include" to "Contracts <b>contain a performance framework that includes</b>"</p> <p>1-point, 2-point, 3-point and 4-point requirements: Changed phrasing in each paragraph using the phrase "contracts include" or "contracts do not include" to "<b>contracts have a performance framework that includes</b>" or "<b>contracts do not have a performance framework that includes</b>"</p>
C.02	<p>Revised the second key indicator, changing it from                      "Contracts have a renewal process that includes a performance framework defining the measures, metrics and targets for renewal <b>beyond those listed in Ohio Revised Code 3314.03(A)(4) and ORC 3314.07(B)(1) through (4).</b>"                      to                      "Contracts have a renewal process that includes a performance framework defining the measures, metrics and targets for renewal."                      1-point requirements changed from                      "The majority of reviewed contracts do not specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to renewal –or– <b>The majority of reviewed contracts do not include a performance framework that defines the measures, metrics and targets required of schools for contract renewal.</b>"                      to                      "The majority of reviewed contracts specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to renewal."</p>
C.03	<p>4-point requirements changed from                      "3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of updating its contract template for the selected schools based on changes in federal and/or state law and its review of school data and Ohio's accountability system. –or– The sponsor submitted evidence that its review of federal and/or state law, school data and Ohio's accountability system for the selected schools did not require contract modifications during the review period."                      to                      "3-Point Requirements –and– <b>The sponsor submitted evidence its review of federal and/or state law, school data and Ohio's accountability system resulted in updating its contract template for the selected schools.</b> –or– The sponsor submitted evidence its review of federal and/or state law, school data and Ohio's accountability system for the selected schools did not require contract modifications during the review period."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<b>D. Oversight and Evaluation</b>	
<b>D.01</b>	<p>Revised the standard statement, changing it from                      "The sponsor's oversight and evaluation processes are transparent, and the sponsor shares how it will monitor academic, operational and financial performance."                      to                      "The sponsor's oversight and evaluation processes are transparent, and the sponsor <b>communicates</b> how it will monitor academic, operational and financial performance."</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted at least one documented policy and process for its oversight and evaluation system – but– There is no evidence that this information was shared with the sponsor's schools."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted at least one documented policy and process for its oversight and evaluation system, –but– There is no evidence this information was <b>communicated with at least one</b> of the sponsor's schools."</p>
<b>D.02</b>	<p>Revised the failure statement, changing it from                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF <b>CONDUCTING</b> AN ENROLLMENT REVIEW AND A FINANCIAL REVIEW FOR AT LEAST ONE OF ITS SELECTED SCHOOLS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."                      to                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF AN ENROLLMENT REVIEW AND A FINANCIAL REVIEW FOR AT LEAST ONE OF ITS SELECTED SCHOOLS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of <b>conducting</b> monthly enrollment reviews and monthly financial reviews –but– The sponsor did not submit evidence of providing feedback to its schools after conducting such reviews. "                      to                      "<b>For at least one of its selected schools</b>, the sponsor submitted evidence of monthly enrollment reviews and monthly financial reviews, –but– The sponsor did not submit evidence of providing feedback to its schools after conducting such reviews."</p>
	<p>2-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of <b>conducting</b> monthly enrollment reviews and monthly financial reviews –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of providing feedback to its schools after conducting such reviews."                      to                      "<b>For each of its selected schools</b>, the sponsor submitted evidence of <b>at least one monthly enrollment review and one monthly financial review</b>. –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of providing feedback to <b>each of its selected schools</b> after such reviews."</p>
	<p>3-point requirements changed from                      " 2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted at least six examples of financial review results and six examples of enrollment review results for each selected school –and– The sponsor submitted <b>detailed</b> policies and processes for conducting enrollment and financial reviews."                      to                      " 2-Point Requirements –and– <b>For each of its selected schools</b>, the sponsor submitted at least six examples of financial review results and six examples of enrollment review results. –and– The sponsor submitted policies and processes for conducting enrollment and financial reviews."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
D.03	<p>Revised the standard statement, changing it from                      "The sponsor conducts on-site reviews (beyond the monthly enrollment and financial reviews) at least twice per year and three months apart while school is in session, which include an examination of the school's compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures."                      to                      "The sponsor conducts on-site reviews (beyond the monthly enrollment and financial reviews) at least twice per year while school is in session (with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year), which include an examination of the school's compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures."</p>
	<p>Revised the failure statement, changing it from                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF HAVING CONDUCTED AT LEAST TWO ON-SITE REVIEWS (BEYOND THE MONTHLY ENROLLMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEWS), AT LEAST THREE MONTHS APART FOR EACH SELECTED SCHOOL WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION, WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."                      to                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF AT LEAST TWO ON-SITE REVIEWS (BEYOND THE MONTHLY ENROLLMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEWS), WITH ONE REVIEW DURING THE FIRST HALF OF THE REVIEW YEAR AND THE OTHER REVIEW DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE REVIEW YEAR, WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of having conducted at least two on-site reviews (beyond the monthly enrollment and financial reviews), at least three months apart while school is in session, for all selected schools regarding the school's compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures –and– During the on-site review, data are collected from a school employee on the day of the review."                      to                      "For each selected school, the sponsor submitted evidence of at least two on-site reviews (beyond the monthly enrollment and financial reviews) while school is in session, with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year. "</p>
	<p>2-point requirements changed from                      "1-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of an on-site visit protocol. "                      to                      "1-Point Requirements –and– Across at least two on-site reviews while school is in session (with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year), the sponsor reviewed the school's compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures. –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of an on-site visit protocol. –and– During the on-site reviews, data are collected from a school employee on the day of the review."</p>
D.04	<p>Revised the standard statement, changing it from                      "The sponsor provides its schools with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment reports) after each site visit, conducted at least twice and three months apart while school is in session, and it follows up with schools regarding any areas needing improvement."                      to                      "The sponsor provides its schools with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment reports) after each site visit, conducted at least twice while school is in session (with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year), and it follows up with schools regarding any areas needing improvement."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<p><b>D.04</b> <i>continued</i></p>	<p>Revised the failure statement, changing it from                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING ITS SCHOOLS WITH A SITE VISIT REPORT CONDUCTED WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."                      to                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING <b>EACH OF ITS SELECTED SCHOOLS</b> WITH A REPORT (BEYOND THE MONTHLY FINANCIAL AND ENROLLMENT REVIEW REPORTS) FOLLOWING AN ON-SITE REVIEW WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted at least one instance of providing its schools with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following onsite reviews conducted while school is in session <b>regarding the school's compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures.</b>"                      to                      "<b>For each of its selected schools, the sponsor submitted evidence of providing a report</b> (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following <b>an on-site review</b> conducted while school is in session."</p>
	<p>2-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of providing each selected school with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following each of two on-site reviews conducted while school is in session and at least three months apart regarding the school's compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures –and– If the sponsor identifies an area needing improvement, the report cites that the school must take action."                      to                      "<b>For each of its selected schools</b>, the sponsor submitted evidence of providing a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following each of at least two on-site reviews conducted while school is in session <b>(with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year) that together covered</b> the school's compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures. –and– If the sponsor identifies an area needing improvement, the report cites that the school take appropriate action."</p>
<p><b>D.05</b></p>	<p>Revised the failure statement, changing it from                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF COLLECTING DATA RELATED TO ALL APPLICABLE CONTRACTUAL ACADEMIC, FINANCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL/OPERATIONAL MEASURES FOR AT LEAST ONE SCHOOL YEAR FOR THE MAJORITY OF SCHOOLS SELECTED FOR REVIEW WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."                      to                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF COLLECTING DATA RELATED TO ALL APPLICABLE CONTRACTUAL ACADEMIC, FINANCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL/OPERATIONAL MEASURES FOR AT LEAST ONE SCHOOL YEAR FOR <b>THE MAJORITY OF ITS SELECTED SCHOOLS</b> WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of collecting data related to all applicable contractual academic, financial and organizational/operational measures for at least one school year for the majority of selected schools. –and– <b>The sponsor submitted evidence of conducting a review of the performance framework (i.e., academic, financial and organizational/operational) for at least one school year for the majority of its selected schools during the review year.</b>"                      to                      "<b>For the majority of its selected schools</b>, the sponsor submitted evidence of collecting data related to all applicable contractual academic, financial and organizational/operational measures for at least one school year."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<p><b>D.05</b> <i>continued</i></p>	<p>2-point requirements changed from "1-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of analyzing the data collected against contractual targets." to "1-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of analyzing the data collected <b>and evaluating the overall performance of the schools based on the outcomes of the data analysis.</b>"</p>
	<p>3-point requirements changed from "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of evaluating the overall performance of the schools based on the outcomes of the data analysis –and– The data analysis and evaluation include multiple years." to "2-Point Requirements –and– The data analysis and evaluation include multiple years."</p>
<p><b>D.06</b></p>	<p>Revised the failure statement, changing it from "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR'S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO STATE ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO INTERVENE, AS REQUIRED BY ORC 3314.023(E), <b>OR IDENTIFICATION OF AN UNADDRESSED DEFICIENCY (I.E., CONTRACT VIOLATION, ACADEMIC, FINANCIAL OR ORGANIZATIONAL/OPERATIONAL, ETC.), WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.</b>" to "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR'S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO STATE ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO INTERVENE, AS REQUIRED BY OHIO REVISED CODE 3314.023(E), WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from "The sponsor's reviewed contracts state its responsibility to intervene as required by ORC 3314.023(E) –and– <b>The sponsor submitted evidence that it communicated with its schools, apart from the contract, through separate guidance, the conditions that may trigger intervention and corrective action –and– There is no evidence of an unaddressed deficiency (i.e., contract violation, academic, financial and/or organizational/operational).</b>" to "The sponsor's reviewed contracts state its responsibility to intervene as required by Ohio Revised Code 3314.023(E).</p>
	<p>4-point requirements changed from "3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor's policy includes an investigation of the deficiency and its process includes procedures for investigating and documenting conditions that may trigger intervention and corrective action (i.e., contract violations, performance deficiencies, complaints, etc.) –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it follows the steps and actions specified in its process when its schools do not make progress in resolving identified deficiencies." to "3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor's policy includes an investigation of the deficiency and its process includes procedures for investigating and documenting conditions that may trigger intervention and corrective action (contract violations, performance deficiencies, complaints, etc.). –and– <b>If a deficiency is identified,</b> the sponsor submitted evidence it follows the steps and actions specified in its process when its schools do not make progress in resolving identified deficiencies."</p>
<p><b>D.07</b></p>	<p>Changed failure statement from "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING AT LEAST ONE OF ITS SCHOOLS WITH A REPORT REGARDING THE SCHOOL'S ACADEMIC, FISCAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL/ OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD." to "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING AT LEAST ONE OF ITS <b>SELECTED</b> SCHOOLS WITH <b>AN ANNUAL</b> REPORT REGARDING THE SCHOOL'S ACADEMIC, FISCAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL/ OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<p><b>D.07</b> <i>continued</i></p>	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides at least one of its school(s) with a report regarding the school's academic, fiscal and organizational/operational performance that is broad in nature."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence it provides at least one of its <b>selected</b> schools with <b>an annual</b> report regarding the school's academic, fiscal and organizational/operational performance that is broad in nature."</p>
	<p>2-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides each of its schools with an annual report for the most recently completed school year that summarizes the school's academic, fiscal and organizational/operational performance."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence it provides each of its <b>selected</b> schools with an annual report for the most recently completed school year that summarizes the school's academic, fiscal and organizational/operational performance."</p>
	<p>3-point requirements changed from                      "2-Point Requirements –and– "The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides each of its schools with an annual report that relates the school's performance against the performance framework in its contract –and– The sponsor's annual performance report on its school(s) includes multiple years of performance data."                      to                      "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence it provides each of its <b>selected</b> schools with an annual report that relates the school's performance against the performance framework in its contract. –and– The sponsor's annual performance report on its schools includes multiple years of performance data."</p>
<p><b>E. Termination and Renewal Decision-Making</b></p>	
<p><b>E.01</b></p>	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and a written renewal application that include one or two of the following: - A defined timeline; - Scoring rubric used to evaluate the application; - Review of the school's most recent state report card; - Review of recent financial audits; - Review of recent compliance monitoring reports; - Posted to its website."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and written renewal application that include <b>at least one</b> of the following: - A defined timeline; - Rubric used to evaluate the application; - Review of the school's most recent state report card; - Review of recent financial audits; - Review of recent compliance monitoring reports; - Posted to its website."</p>
	<p>3-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and a written renewal application that include: - A defined timeline; - Scoring rubric used to evaluate the application that includes an evaluation of the high-stakes review results that align to the performance framework in the contract; -Posted to its website. –and– The renewal application includes <i>at least three</i> of the following: - Multiple years of student achievement; - Multiple measures of student achievement; - Financial audits; - Site visit reports and/or other compliance reports; - If applicable, status reports on corrective action plans or other required interventions; - <b>If the sponsor renewed community schools during the review year, training for application reviewers.</b>"                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and written renewal application that include: - A defined timeline; - Rubric used to evaluate the application that includes an evaluation of the high-stakes review results that align to the performance framework in the contract; -Posted to its website. –and– The renewal application includes <i>at least three</i> of the following: - Multiple years of student achievement; - Multiple measures of student achievement; - Financial audits; - Site visit reports and/or other compliance reports; - If applicable, status reports on corrective action plans or other required interventions."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<p><b>E.01</b> <i>continued</i></p>	<p>4-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and a written renewal application that include all the following: - A defined timeline; - Scoring rubric used to evaluate the application that includes an evaluation of the high-stakes review results that align to the performance framework in the contract; -Posted to its website; - Multiple years of student achievement; - Multiple measures of student achievement; - Financial audits; - Site visit reports and/or other compliance reports; - If applicable, status reports on corrective action plans or other required interventions; - <b>If the sponsor renewed community schools during the review year, training for application reviewers.</b>"                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and written renewal application that include all the following: - A defined timeline; - Rubric used to evaluate the application that includes an evaluation of the high-stakes review results that align to the performance framework in the contract; - Posted to its website; - Multiple years of student achievement; - Multiple measures of student achievement; - Financial audits; - Site visit reports and/or other compliance reports; - If applicable, status reports on corrective action plans or other required interventions."</p>
<p><b>E.02</b></p>	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      " The sponsor submitted board minutes as evidence of the renewal decision-making process <b>–but– The sponsor did not submit evidence of that decision being informed by either a completed renewal application or school performance data.</b>"                      to                      "The sponsor submitted board minutes as evidence of the renewal decision-making process."                      2-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it required all schools up for renewal to submit renewal applications <b>–and– The sponsor granted renewal to one or more schools for which at least one of the following was true: - Failed to meet the academic achievement targets in their contract; - Failed to remedy documented issues of fiscal or operational viability; - Had unresolved noncompliance issues with one or more applicable laws or contract terms.</b>"                      to                      "<b>1-Point Requirements –and–</b> The sponsor submitted evidence that it required all schools up for renewal to submit renewal applications."                      3-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it granted renewal only to schools that earned at least 66 percent of possible points on the renewal rubric <b>–and– The sponsor’s renewal rubric includes both academic and non-academic measures –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions.</b>"                      to                      "<b>2-Point Requirements –and–</b> "The sponsor submitted evidence it granted renewal only to schools that earned at least 66 percent of possible points on the renewal rubric <b>–and– The sponsor’s renewal rubric includes both academic and non-academic measures –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions.</b>"                      4-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it granted renewal only to schools that earned at least 75 percent of possible points on the renewal rubric <b>–and– The sponsor’s renewal rubric includes both academic and non-academic measures –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions.</b>"                      to                      "<b>3-Point Requirements –and–</b> The sponsor submitted evidence it granted renewal only to schools that earned at least 75 percent of possible points on the renewal rubric <b>–AND EITHER– 1) The sponsor submitted evidence it granted renewal only to schools for which all of the following were true: - Met the academic achievement targets in their contract; - Had no unresolved compliance issues with any applicable laws or contract terms. - If there were any documented issues of fiscal or operational viability, the school remedied those issues. -OR- 2) If the school did not meet all contractual academic targets, contract terms, compliance requirements or documented issues of fiscal/operational viability, the sponsor submitted evidence regarding why such schools were granted renewal and how the decision to renew aligns with its renewal evaluation process and national sponsoring standards.</b>"</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
E.03	<p>Revised the failure statement, changing it from                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF COMMUNICATING ITS DECISION TO NON-RENEW A SCHOOL BY JAN. 15 TO THE SCHOOL DURING THE REVIEW YEAR OR ENSURING THE SCHOOL'S FAMILIES WERE NOTIFIED WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."                      to                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF 1) COMMUNICATING ITS DECISION TO NON-RENEW A SCHOOL BY JAN. 15 TO THE SCHOOL DURING THE REVIEW YEAR AND 2) ENSURING THE SCHOOL'S FAMILIES WERE NOTIFIED BY MAY 15 (IF THE NON-RENEWAL DECISION IS UPHELD) WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority by Jan. 15 but did not include any explanation –or– The sponsor did not submit evidence of ensuring the school's families were notified of the non-renewal decision as of May 30 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority by Jan. 15 but did not include any explanation. –or– The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school's families were notified of the non-renewal decision as of May 15 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision."</p>
	<p>2-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority by Jan. 15 citing statutory language only –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school's families were notified of the non-renewal no later than May 30 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority by Jan. 15 citing statutory language only. –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school's families were notified of the non-renewal no later than May 15 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision."</p>
E.04	<p>Revised the failure statement, changing it from                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR'S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO HAVE A TERMINATION PROVISION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."                      to                      "FAILURE OF EACH OF THE SPONSOR'S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO HAVE THE STATUTORY LANGUAGE FOR GROUNDS FOR TERMINATION OR FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO HAVE A WRITTEN TERMINATION POLICY APART FROM THE CONTRACT WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor has only the statutory language for grounds for termination in the reviewed contracts –and– There is no separate written policy apart from the language in the contract. –and– If the sponsor terminated a contract during the review year, the sponsor has not submitted evidence of following statutory requirements for termination."                      to                      "For each of its selected schools, the sponsor's reviewed contracts have the statutory language for grounds for termination –and– The sponsor has a separate written termination policy apart from the language in the contract."</p>
	<p>2-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor has the statutory language for grounds for termination in the reviewed contracts –and– The sponsor has a separate written policy that goes beyond statutory language in explaining the grounds for termination –and– If the sponsor terminated a contract during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of following statutory requirements and its written policy for termination."                      to                      "1-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor's separate written policy goes beyond statutory language in explaining the grounds for termination –and– If the sponsor terminated a contract during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of following statutory requirements and its written policy for termination."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<p><b>E.04</b> <i>continued</i></p>	<p>Added the following note to the standard:                      "The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools that was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e., e-schools, dropout prevention and recovery schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools, and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter. For the 2-point and 3-point requirements of this standard, the sponsor must also submit evidence for all schools whose contracts were terminated during the 2019-2020 review year."</p>
<p><b>E.05</b></p>	<p>Changed failure statement from                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO INCLUDE LANGUAGE IN ITS CONTRACT REGARDING ITS OBLIGATION TO OVERSEE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CLOSURE WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."                      to                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO INCLUDE LANGUAGE IN ITS CONTRACT WITH EACH OF ITS SELECTED SCHOOLS REGARDING THE SPONSOR'S OBLIGATION TO OVERSEE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CLOSURE WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p> <p>1-point requirements changed from "The sponsor includes language in its contract regarding its obligation to oversee community school closure –but– One or more of the sponsor's schools closed during the review year, and the sponsor did not submit evidence of informing parents and/or transitioning student records –and/or– One or more of the sponsor's schools closed during the previous review year, and the sponsor did not submit the Closing Assurances or Quarterly Closing Assurances if the Closing Assurances Form is not complete. "                      to                      "For each of its selected schools, the sponsor includes language in each contract regarding the sponsor's obligation to oversee community school closure, –but– One or more of the sponsor's schools closed during the review year, and the sponsor did not submit evidence of informing parents and/or transitioning student records. –and/or– One or more of the sponsor's schools closed during the previous review year, and the sponsor did not submit the Closing Assurances or Quarterly Closing Assurances if the Closing Assurances Form is not complete."</p> <p>2-point requirements changed from "The sponsor includes language in its contract regarding its obligation to oversee community school closure –and– For each of the sponsor's schools that closed during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of the following: - Informing parents; - Transitioning student records. –and– For each of the sponsor's schools that closed during the previous review year, the sponsor submitted the Closing Assurances or Quarterly Closing Assurances if the Closing Assurances Form is not complete. "                      to                      "For each of its selected schools, the sponsor includes language in each contract regarding the sponsor's obligation to oversee community school closure. –and– For each of the sponsor's schools that closed during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of the following: - Informing parents; - Transitioning student records. –and– For each of the sponsor's schools that closed during the previous review year, the sponsor submitted the Closing Assurances or Quarterly Closing Assurances if the Closing Assurances Form is not complete."</p> <p>3-point requirements changed from                      "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted the Department's closure guidance and its own closure policy and procedures apart from statutory language in the contract and the Department's closure guidance and procedures –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that its closure policy was adopted by its governing board and in effect by Sept. 30 of the review year –and– The policy and procedures include, but are not limited to, the following: - A "plan of action to be undertaken in the event the community school experiences financial difficulties or closes prior to the end of a school year" (ORC 3314.023(F)); - Disposition of school funds and assets; - Submission of Closing Assurances."                      to                      "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it has a closure policy that was adopted by its governing board and was in effect by Sept. 30 of the review year. –and– The policy and procedures include, but are not limited to, the following: - A "plan of action to be undertaken in the event the community school experiences financial difficulties or closes prior to the end of a school year" (ORC 3314.023(F)); - Disposition of school funds and assets; - Submission of Closing Assurances."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<p><b>E.05</b> <i>continued</i></p>	<p>Added the following note to the standard:                      "The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools that was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e., e-schools, dropout prevention and recovery schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools, and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter. For the 1-point, 2-point, 3-point and 4-point requirements of this standard, the sponsor must also submit evidence for all schools that closed during the 2018-2019 review year and the 2019-2020 review year."</p>
<p><b>E.06</b></p>	<p>Revised the standard title, changing it from "Renewal Application Reviewer Protocols" to "Renewal Reviewer Protocols"</p> <p>Revised the standard statement, changing it from                      "For schools seeking to renew, reviewers carefully and consistently examine renewal <b>application</b> materials and the results of the high-stakes review."                      to                      "For schools seeking to renew, reviewers carefully and consistently examine renewal materials and the results of the high-stakes review."</p> <p>Revised the first key indicator, changing it from                      "The sponsor has specific protocols for evaluating renewal <b>applications</b> that include a rubric with renewal criteria."                      to                      "The sponsor has specific protocols for evaluating renewal that include a rubric with renewal criteria."</p> <p>Revised the third key indicator, changing it from                      "The results of the high-stakes review are evaluated and account for at least 67 percent of the renewal <b>application</b> scoring."                      to                      "The results of the high-stakes review are evaluated and account for at least 67 percent of <b>contract</b> renewal scoring."</p> <p>Revised the fourth key indicator, changing it from                      "The rubric identifies the lowest possible points that <b>an applicant can</b> earn to have its contract renewed."                      to                      "The rubric identifies the lowest possible points that <b>a school must</b> earn to have its contract renewed."</p> <p>Revised the sixth key indicator, changing it from                      "Reviewers are trained on the protocols prior to reviewing applications."                      to                      "Reviewers are trained on the protocols prior to reviewing <b>contract renewals</b>."</p> <p>Revised the failure statement, changing it from                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT PROTOCOLS FOR EVALUATING RENEWAL <b>APPLICATIONS</b> OR EVIDENCE THAT REVIEWERS RECEIVE TRAINING ON THE RENEWAL <b>APPLICATION</b> PROTOCOLS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."                      to                      "FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT PROTOCOLS FOR EVALUATING <b>CONTRACT RENEWAL</b> OR EVIDENCE THAT REVIEWERS RECEIVE TRAINING ON THE RENEWAL PROTOCOLS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD."</p> <p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating renewal <b>applications</b> –or– There is <b>some</b> evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating <b>contract renewal</b>. –or– There is evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<p><b>E.06</b> <i>continued</i></p>	<p>2-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating and scoring individual renewal <b>application</b> criteria and the results of the high-stakes review that aligns with the performance framework –and– There is <b>some</b> evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating and scoring individual renewal criteria and the results of the high-stakes review that aligns with the performance framework. –and– There is evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols."</p>
	<p>3-point requirements changed from                      "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor's submitted written protocols for evaluating renewal <b>applications</b> include a rubric (per the definition contained in this Quality Rubric) for all renewal criteria and the high-stakes review results –and– The sponsor's rubric includes a cut score that identifies the lowest possible points that the school must earn to have its contract renewed –and– New reviewers receive training on the protocols and rubrics."                      to                      "2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor's submitted written protocols for evaluating <b>contract renewal</b> include a rubric (per the definition contained in this Quality Rubric) for all renewal criteria and the high-stakes review results. –and– The sponsor's rubric includes a cut score that identifies the lowest possible points the school must earn to have its contract renewed. –and– New reviewers receive training on the protocols and rubrics."</p>
	<p>4-point requirements changed from                      "3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it requires each reviewer to individually score and document the rating for each renewal criteria –and– All reviewers receive training on the protocols and rubrics annually, which includes reviewer calibration. –and– The results of the high-stakes review are evaluated and account for at least 67 percent of the renewal <b>application</b> scoring."                      to                      "3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence it requires each reviewer to individually score and document the rating for each renewal criteria. –and– All reviewers receive training on the protocols and rubrics annually, which includes reviewer calibration. –and– The results of the high-stakes review are evaluated and account for at least 67 percent of <b>contract renewal</b> scoring."</p>
<p><b>F. Technical Assistance</b></p>	
<p><b>F.01</b></p>	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides <b>reactive</b> technical assistance to its schools <b>when made aware of issues, problems or concerns.</b>"                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides <b>technical assistance to its schools.</b>"</p>
<p><b>F.02</b></p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p><b>F.03</b></p>	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it shares and/or offers information about professional development opportunities with its community schools once or twice per year –or– The sponsor mandates that its schools participate in specific professional development, beyond any training that is a requirement of the contract."                      to                      "The sponsor submitted evidence that it shares and/or offers information about professional development opportunities with its community schools <b>at least once</b> per year –or– The sponsor mandates that its schools participate in specific professional development, beyond any training that is a requirement of the contract."</p>

Rubric Standard	Changes from 2018-2019 Quality Practices Rubric to 2019-2020 Quality Practices Rubric
<p><b>F.04</b> <i>continued</i></p>	<p>Changed failure statement from                      “FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF ATTENDING AT LEAST ONE SCHOOL GOVERNING AUTHORITY MEETING OR EVIDENCE OF COMMUNICATING WITH SCHOOL GOVERNING AUTHORITY MEMBERS BEYOND MONTHLY FINANCIAL AND ENROLLMENT REVIEWS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.”                      to                      “FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF ATTENDING AT LEAST ONE SCHOOL GOVERNING AUTHORITY MEETING OR <b>TO SUBMIT</b> EVIDENCE OF COMMUNICATING WITH SCHOOL GOVERNING AUTHORITY MEMBERS BEYOND MONTHLY FINANCIAL AND ENROLLMENT REVIEWS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.”</p>
	<p>1-point requirements changed from                      “The sponsor submitted evidence of attending <b>at least one</b> school governing authority meeting –or– There is evidence that the sponsor communicates with and/or provides guidance to its schools’ governing authorities beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.”                      to                      “The sponsor submitted evidence of attending <b>one</b> school governing authority meeting –or– There is evidence the sponsor communicates with and/or provides guidance to its schools’ governing authorities beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.”</p>
	<p>2-points requirements changed from                      “The sponsor submitted evidence of attending <b>at least one</b> governing authority meeting per school –and– There is evidence that the sponsor communicates with and/or provides guidance to its schools’ governing authorities beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.”                      to                      “The sponsor submitted evidence of attending <b>one</b> governing authority meeting per school. –and– There is evidence the sponsor communicates with and/or provides guidance to its schools’ governing authorities beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.”</p>
	<p>3-point requirements changed from                      “The sponsor submitted evidence of attending <b>at least two</b> governing authority meetings per school –and– There is evidence that the sponsor communicates with and provides guidance to its schools’ governing authorities at least quarterly, beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.”                      to                      “The sponsor submitted evidence of attending <b>two</b> governing authority meetings per school. –and– There is evidence the sponsor communicates with and provides guidance to its schools’ governing authorities at least quarterly, beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.”</p>

\*Text in red font indicates either language that was included on the 2018-2019 quality rubric (and removed from the 2019-2020 rubric) or language that was added to the 2019-2020 quality rubric.