BASA REPORT CARD COMMITTEE

REPORT CARD ITEM(S): Graduation Rate

CONCERN(S):

1. The continual change of graduation requirements

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. Graduation Requirements Recommendations:

    a. Flexibility for the Class of 2019 and beyond similar to the current pathways available to the Class of 2018. Maintain the existing pathways for the Class of 2019 and beyond.

    b. 1 EOC exam in each core area, with a requirement for students to meet basic proficiency score similar to previous Ohio Graduation Test requirements.

    c. Maintain different pathways, move away from ACT readiness or remediation free to a reduced ACT score to qualify for graduation.

    d. How can we use some type of soft skill workforce development, module assessment, based on experience in an internship to gain the necessary employ ability skills. Potentially connected to a community service requirement or capstone.

    e. Maintain 18 point total. Phase in the requirement over an extended period of time. Allow districts the chance to build awareness of students/families. Districts need time to implement effective interventions/options for students).

    f. Develop the profile of a "Successful Graduate". Require students to accomplish a series of "badges" representing their College and Career Readiness Portfolio.

2. Graduation Rate Recommendations:

    a. Align with the federal minimum, and track only the 4 year Graduation Rate.

    b. Consider districts with high mobility rate knowing districts are held accountable for students who are mobile. We experience great difficulty tracking students who move who are still in the 9th grade cohort.

    c. 23 SWD students need to be removed from the calculation completely. Only track at the state level.

BASA REPORT CARD COMMITTEE

REPORT CARD ITEM(S): Achievement Component *(accompanying documents in appendix A & B)*

CONCERN(S):

1. **Performance Index Letter Grade Cut Scores/Scale** - A score of 120 is not realistic and should not be considered the score upon which PI percentages are calculated. When only 8 school districts earned an "A" on the 2017 Local Report Card, for Performance Index, it indicates a problem with the way grades are calculated. A system that is fairer to school districts can be established through considering a curve approach and equalizing the points awarded to tests that score as basic or limited.

2. **Performance Index Calculation for Performance Levels** - The multiplier used to calculate the points earned for performance levels is based on a scale that has unequal interval: Not Tested 0, Limited 0.3, Basic 0.6, Proficient 1.0, Accelerated 1.1, Advanced, 1.2, and Advanced Plus 1.3. The points deducted for non-proficiency are greater in proportion to the points earned for being above proficiency. Therefore, schools/students are penalized more for off-track performance than they are rewarded for achieving above the set standards. * A consistent scale would be the use of a 0.1 multiplier continuum across the performance levels with 0 still being assigned for non-testing. For example, 0.8, 0.9, 1.0, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 for the performance levels Limited through Advanced Plus respectively.

3. **Adding Test-Retake Indicator** - We absolutely do not want the retakes to count in the indicators met. The proposed ODE solution is that a retake indicator will be added. We do not support this as the report card does not need to be further complicated. Also, these students who are retaking assessments are already being accounted for in multiple ways on the state report card, for example on the graduation rate and gap closing. If the retake data must be reported, then report it but not as an additional indicator. We would like to read the law/code that is influencing ODE's decision on this.

4. **Gifted Indicator – Input and Final Results** - Realistically, the gifted indicator is unattainable for many districts without significant increase in personnel costs or more of a focus on the bureaucracy of written plans rather than prioritizing teaching and learning.

5. **Use of the A to F Report Card Labels/Rating** - A letter grade is misleading. Yes, everyone knows what letter grades are, but state report card grades do not equitably convert from the traditional 90/80/70/60 scale. For example, 75% is a C, which means 25% of the material is incorrect or missing in a traditional system. If that is the case, then why is the report card grade a C when a district meets one year of growth on the value added measure? They are appropriately on target but receive a C standards based report cards are more descriptive to the public and allow parents and community members to have a better understanding of the measure. If the goal is to report what is happening, a standards based approach is the best way to do that. It isn't intended to soften the communication, it is meant to make it more accurate and easier to understand.

6. **K through 3 Literacy** - This measure is confusing and does not clearly and accurately report the progress of students toward proficient literacy. A typical observer takes this measure to mean the district's overall efforts in addressing literacy and not the focus on helping struggling readers. The reporting of the information in the K through 3 literacy indicator is not a requirement under federal ESSA guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. **Performance Index Letter Grade Cut Scores/Scale** - An approach that "curves" the Performance Index letter grade cut scores provides a more reasonable way to calculate the letter grade. In addition, there should be an equalization of points assigned to those tests below proficient and those which score above proficient.

2. **Performance Index Calculation for Performance Levels** - A consistent scale needs to be established for the Performance Index "multiplier" that is used to calculate points earned at each of the performance levels.

3. **Adding Test-Retake Indicator** - We are not supporting adding another indicator to the state report card at this time. Thus, we feel the retake indicator should not be added as proposed.

4. **Gifted Indicator – Input and Final Results** - The gifted indicator should only include performance index and value added calculations and eliminate the input calculations (identifying and serving). The 117 performance index cut score for gifted students seem unrealistic and unattainable, similar to our concern referenced above about performance index levels. These performance index scores could be calibrated based on the performance of gifted students across the state.

5. **Use of the A to F Report Card Labels/Rating** - Replace the current letter grade system of A to F with Exceeds the Standard, Meets the Standard, Approaching the Standard, and Does Not Meet the Standard.

6. **K through 3 Literacy** - Eliminate this measure and design an entirely new one that better reflects schools' literacy instruction.

BASA REPORT CARD COMMITTEE

REPORT CARD ITEM(S): Prepared for Success

CONCERN(S):

1. The **Prepared for Success** component narrowly defines success as preparing for a four-year college or university program. The component does not reflect each district's unique demographics, and therefore, more comprehensive definition of success.

   The members of the subcommittee concur that the Prepared for Success component is skewed for honors students and students preparing for a four-year college or university program. Five of the six measures focus on college readiness. Although the state asserts that "using multiple measures for college and career readiness enables districts to showcase their unique approaches to prepare students for success after high school," the Prepared for Success grade does not reflect each district's unique approaches.

   This narrow definition of Prepared for Success perpetuates inequities in secondary schools as resources are invested in measures of four-year college preparation more than other post-secondary opportunities including but not limited to trade school/apprenticeships; entrepreneurship, including agriculture/farming; and military service. The Prepared for Success measure also fails to account for, students with special needs who receive job training in years five through seven of high school (students who defer their diploma to receive additional training and preparation).

   The Prepared for Success measure fails to account for students with special needs who receive job training in years five through seven of high school.

2. **The two-tier system** for earning points is confusing and contradicts other state initiatives. For example, a student could earn at least three college credits in high school but still not receive a remediation-free ACT or SAT score, nor earn an honors diploma. Numerous examples were shared of students earning 30-plus college credits but earning neither the remediation free-score nor qualifying for an honors diploma. If the state is going to continue to promote College Credit Plus, there must be an acknowledgment that some of these students can earn dozens of college credits, drain funds from local resources, but still not meet the other two qualifying factors on the current Prepared for Success indicator.

   a. Additionally, the bonus points are only for college preparation measures, further supporting the assertion that this component of the report card is skewed for districts that have a higher percentage of their graduates who are preparing for a four-year college program and not equally important careers such as running a family farm. The current grade reflects demographics and DNA, not unique measures of college and career preparation.

3. A significant number of students attend off-site career-tech programs that award **industry credentials**. These students are included in the graduation cohort for a district; however, by leaving the home campus and attending a career-tech center, the student has limited access to honors, AP, and IB courses, and therefore, does not earn points for the district in the current system. Additionally, not all industries use credentials as validation of knowledge and skills. The component is skewed favorably for districts that send small numbers of students to career-tech campuses.

4. **Ohio uses different definitions of success:** Prepared for Success is measured differently for Career-Technical Planning Districts and is called "Post-Program Outcomes Component for CT Planning Districts." The measures graded measures are the percent of graduates who are employed in apprenticeships, in the military, or enrolled in advanced training within six months after graduation. If these measures are indicators of success for students in CT Planning Districts, then it follows that they should be indicators of success for students who attend comprehensive high schools.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. **Prepared Success** - Expand the measures of prepared for success to include the following:
    a. Earns 3+ college credits in a core subject area
    b. Score a 3 or better on an AP or IB exam
    c. Documentation of enlistment in the military (must be added)
    d. Industry credentials
    e. Honors diploma
    f. ACT remediation-free scores
    g. Career-preparation program credential (must be added)
    h. Ohio Means Jobs Readiness Seal
    i. Enrolled in advanced training within six months after graduation
2. Eliminate the **two-tier point system**:
    a. Award one point for the list of expanded indicators
    b. Expand the measures of prepared for success

BASA REPORT CARD COMMITTEE

REPORT CARD ITEM: K-3 Literacy

CONCERN(S):

1. Ohio Revised Code requires the K-3 Literacy measure to be based upon the full English Language Arts (ELA) third grade score (instead of the reading subscore) while the Department of Education set up the K-3 Literacy measure to address reading only. This conflict has not been problematic in years past because the old Ohio Achievement Assessment (used last year) only had a reading component at grade 3 (the PARCC ELA assessment that was scheduled for grade 3 last year included both reading and writing but was scrapped prior to being administered). The following are reasons why this conflict presents a problem:

    a. The stated purpose of the measure is for reading. The K-3 Literacy Technical Document and another ODE publication on the measure all relate to reading only.

    b. The K-2 tests that are being measured on the K-3 literacy measure assess reading only. Under the O.R.C. language, the final measure in grade 3 will involve both reading and writing.

    c. Reading Improvement Monitoring Plans (RIMPS) are written only for students who are not on grade level with reading. The K-3 Literacy measure uses RIMPS as part of its calculation. Students on RIMPS may be reading at grade level by third grade but now the district may be penalized on this report card measure because a student who was reading on grade level does not write on grade level.

    In conversations with representatives of ODE, the conclusion was that due to O.R.C. questions regarding revising the K-3 Literacy Technical Document and other references to include writing have not received a clear response. Concerns abound regarding the implementation time table.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. Remove the K-3 Literacy mark altogether.

2. If it must stay:

    a. Use the Third grade Reading Guarantee data as the K-3 Literacy mark

    b. REPORT information, do not evaluate (issue a grade)

    c. Remove “On track/Not on track” measures- replace with end of year measures

    d. Paper pencil assessments for K-2 so technology does not factor into performance

    e. Do not go to a universal diagnostic and lose local control

    f. Identify what “on track’ and “not on track” actually mean. What are they “not on track” for? Clearly not passing the 3 grade test when all pass.

BASA REPORT CARD COMMITTEE

REPORT CARD ISSUE: Gap Closing

CONCERN(S):

Developing a Shared Understanding of the New Gap Closing/AMO Measurement

1. The subgroup N-size will be reduced from 30 to 25 for 2017-18, 20 in 2018-19, and 15 in 2019-20 and beyond (HB 216 change?).

2. The new Gap Closing/AMO measurement moves from proficiency percentage to PI score.

    a. The goal is to have all subgroups achieve a PI of 100.

    b. PI yearly targets are specified through 2025-26 per subgroup.

    c. AMO points on the report card can be earned as they have been earned in the past for ELA, Math, and Graduation:

        i. 100 Points: Subgroup hits or exceeds the annual PI target

        ii. 100 Points: PI score improvement from previous year is greater than the gap

        iii. Partial Points: [Improvement / Gap] x 100

3. A fourth component of AMO has been added for English Language Learners Progress. ODE shared that more internal discussion needs to happen to get clarity on this measure.

4. The State Board still needs to meet and determine the Gap Closing/AMO grading scale for points earned with the goal of finding a scale that does not land the majority of districts as an “F”.

Committee Feedback on the New Gap Closing/AMO Measurement

1. If we are going to continue to report a Gap Closing/AMO measurement, PI is a better achievement measure to utilize than the proficiency measure.

2. Although PI is a better measure, it is still solely based on an achievement measure that does not account for the totality of school/teacher influence (i.e., student growth). By only viewing the AMO/Gap Closing measure through an achievement lens of district/school performance per subgroup, we question whether this measure and ensuing grade in its current structure is meeting its intended purpose.

3. Although the PI score is more sensitive to test performance than proficiency, based on the current structure/ weighting of the PI measure, as an example, you would need four (4) students to score *Accelerated* to fill the gap left by one (1) student that scored Basic. Translating this into practice, one may still interpret the new PI goals as a “proficiency” rate that needs to be met.

4. With a decreasing N-size in the next three years with the goal to report more subgroup data, there are concerns about the statistical significance of a subgroup with such a small N-size.

5. It appears that there is still a demotion component on the overall grade, which is not supported by the committee.

6. PI is not a measure that resonates with teachers and therefore limits the strategic influence and/or motivation of teacher performance.

7. As an example, based on the simulation of the Gap Closing/AMO measurement for Strongsville City Schools under the new PI system using 2016-17 data, excluding the subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged, SCS would have received an A, rather than the D received on the district report card. However, after further analysis it was determined for this simulation that the grade of an A had more to do with the implementation of new PI goals (targets) versus the former proficiency goals. Using the new PI system with the 2016-17 proficiency goals would have only raised the grade from a D to a C.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. *What is the intended purpose and practical application of the AMO/Gap Closing measure? How is this measure providing relevant data to improve practice, while holding districts and schools accountable for the results?*

    a. The state needs to clarify levels of importance for value added versus AMO/Gap Closing. Based on the weighting of the overall report card grade, it can be inferred that value added (20%) is of slightly greater importance than AMO/Gap Closing (15%).

    b. If point (a) is accurate, one would infer that efforts should be focused on ensuring all students (inclusive of subgroups) attain a minimum of one year's growth in one year's time.

2. *How can we turn the confusing AMO/Gap Closing measure into an "equity" measure, which provides meaningful data that has practical applications in influencing teacher behavior?*

    a. Determine a metric to capture student growth in subgroups and the progress being made to close the gap over time.

    b. Add a fourth way in which AMO/Gap Closing "points" can be earned using available valued added data. Currently, we report value added data for Students with Disabilities and recommend determining a manner in which value added data can be generated and utilized for the other subgroups.

    c. Report AMO/Gap Closing as a formative measure without grades for all areas excluding Graduation. If the goal is to "close the gap" so that students are college and career ready, the Graduation measure is the summative measure that clearly defines a district's success or lack thereof in this area.

    d. Incorporate local data (e.g., MAP, AIMSweb, STAR) from ODE approved assessments or local programs/ practices that have been documented to reduce gaps between student subgroups.

3. *What other considerations should be taken into account with regard to enhancing the AMO/Gap Closing measure?*

    a. With the reduction on the N-size, consideration needs to be given to students that fall into multiple subgroups with a small N-size (i.e., subgroups with an N < 30) and the influence one student can have on the overall AMO/Gap Closing measure. There could be similar justification for a separate subgroup just as the state has created a separate achievement indicator for EOC exam repeat test takers.

    b. As listed earlier, there are concerns with the current PI multiplier/weighting system and the impact this has on reverting back to a proficiency-based measure with lower targets. Furthermore, there are questions as to why we are not examining AMO/Gap Closing based on student performance in comparison to all students in the state, as is the case for quintile placement for value added. With both concerns listed, we suggest using the value added methodology and apply it to AMO/Gap Closing measure as detailed below.

        i. Convert all scaled scores to an NCE score

        ii. Rank/Order student performance across the state by subgroup based on NCE

iii. Place students in one of five quintiles by subgroup based on their statewide performance

iv. Use the PI structure to determine the AMO/Gap Closing measure points as follows:

✓ Quintile 5: Percentage of test count per level x 1.2
✓ Quintile 4: Percentage of test count per level x 1.1
✓ Quintile 3: Percentage of test count per level x 1.0
✓ Quintile 2: Percentage of test count per level x 0.9
✓ Quintile 1: Percentage of test count per level x 0.8
✓ Untested: Percentage of test count per level x 0.0

v. Employ the four (4) methods to earn points, which include the three (3) pre-existing methods and the recommended addition of a value added measure.

BASA REPORT CARD COMMITTEE

REPORT CARD ITEM: Progress

CONCERN(S):

1. **Academic Indicator Growth** - Federal policy requires, “This measure may include individual student growth or another statewide, valid, and reliable indicator of student learning.”

2. **ORC code 3302.03 (C)(1)(e) and 3302.03 (C)(1)(f)** currently read, “In adopting benchmarks for assigning letter grades for overall score on value-added progress dimension under division (C)(1)(e) of this section, the state board shall prohibit the assigning of a grade of “A” for that measure unless the district’s or building’s grade assigned for value-added progress dimension for all subgroups under division (C)(1)(f) of this section is a “B” or higher.

3. **The Gifted Growth**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Academic Indicator Growth** - Consider replacing the current way of defining growth. Currently Ohio uses a Standard Error (Index value) model.

    a. If we attempted to review the science of growth measures and an accompanying standard error (SE) and how SE generates a growth calculation via the growth index (like a t-value), we would end up right where most are currently, confused! This model is impossible for most to comprehend. The model is statistically rigorous and fairly accurate. That being said, the standard error model seems far too difficult for comprehension to the general public.

        i. Recommendation: Use a different model. Find a model that gets to a practical significance instead of a statistical significance. Possible ideas include:

            1. A Standard Deviation (SD) distribution of test results

            2. Compute and use an Effect Size

            3. Use Percentiles

            4. Use something different than standard error

    b. ODE needs to find a system that our teachers can explain. If not, remove the value-added model all together from the accountability system.

2. **ORC code 3302.03 (C)(1)(e) and 3302.03 (C)(1)(f)** - A revision would eliminate the frustration articulated by many in the field that have had the following example occur in their school system:

    a. A - Overall Grade

    b. A - Gifted Grade

    c. A - Lowest 20% Grade

    d. C - Student with Disabilities Grade

    e. B - Component Grade due to above prohibition. Grade should be an “A”

3. Amend the **Gifted Growth**