



Study Committee on Ohio School Report Cards

Committee Report
December 2019



December 13, 2019

Dear Speaker Householder and President Obhof:

Throughout the last several months, the Report Card Study Committee has actively engaged with members of the education community to gain input in proposed changes to the Ohio school report card.

Accordingly, enclosed is a report highlighting the findings and recommendations presented by witnesses to the Study Committee. Thank you for your attention to this important issue. We look forward to continuing to work together to provide all Ohioans with the very best value in their primary and secondary education.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Louis W. Blessing III".

Senator Louis W. Blessing III, Co-Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Don Jones".

Representative Don Jones, Co-Chair

Contents

- I. Statutory Authority and Committee Membership
- II. Public Hearings
- III. Current Structure of the State Report Card
 - A. Achievement
 - B. Progress
 - C. Gap Closing
 - D. Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers
 - E. Graduation Rate
 - F. Prepared for Success
 - G. Additional (Non-Graded) Information
 - H. Index of Statutory and Regulatory Prescriptions
- IV. Recommendations Provided to the Study Committee
 - A. Recommendations Per Sec. 265.510(D)
 - B. Recommendations Per Sec. 265.510(E)
- V. Appendices: Presentations Provided to the Study Committee

I. Statutory Authority and Committee Membership

The Study Committee on Ohio State Report Cards (the "Study Committee") was created in statute by Amended Substitute House Bill 166 of the 133rd General Assembly to review the State of Ohio's report card structure and purpose.

Pursuant to the Ohio Revised Code Section 265.510:

(A) There is hereby established a committee to study the state report card prescribed under section 3302.03 of the Revised Code, including how performance measures, components, and the overall grade under division (C) of that section are calculated and weighted. The committee also shall consider design principles for the state report card, the state report card's primary audience, and how state report cards address student academic achievement, including whether the measures are appropriately graded to reflect student academic achievement.

(B) The committee shall consist of the following members:

- The Superintendent of Public Instruction or designee;
- The chairperson of the standing committee of the House of Representatives that considers primary and secondary education legislation;
- The chairperson of the standing committee of the Senate that considers primary and secondary education legislation;
- Two members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;
- Two members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate;
- Three superintendents, one from a rural district, one from a suburban district, and one from an urban district, appointed by the Buckeye Association of School Administrators.

(C) Not later than thirty days after the effective date of this section, all appointments to the committee under division (B) of this section shall be made and the committee shall convene to elect a chairperson.

(D) In conducting its study, the committee shall investigate at least all of the following: (1) How many years of data should be included in, and how grades are assigned to, the progress component prescribed under division (C)(3)(c) of section 3302.03 of the Revised Code; (2) How to structure the prepared for success component prescribed under division (C)(3)(f) of section 3302.03 of the Revised Code, including considering additional ways to earn points; (3) How the gap closing component prescribed under division (C)(3)(a) of section 3302.03 of the Revised Code meets requirements established under federal law and applies to all schools; (4) How the graduation component prescribed under division (C)(3)(d) of section 3302.03 of the Revised Code includes students with disabilities and mobile students; (5) If the overall grades should be a letter grade or some other rating system that clearly communicate the performance of school districts and other public schools to families and communities.

(E) Not later than December 15, 2019, the committee shall submit a report to the General Assembly in accordance with section 101.68 of the Revised Code. In addition to addressing the topics prescribed under division (D) of this section, the report shall make recommendations, including any necessary changes to the Revised Code or Administrative Code, about at least all of the following: (1) How to calculate each graded measure included in the state report card; (2) How to assign a grade to each graded measure, including ranges of scores associated with letter grades or any other rating system determined appropriate by the committee; (3) How to weight the graded measures for school buildings that do not have all measures; (4) Which state report card calculations should be prescribed in statute and which should be prescribed in administrative rule; (5) What additional, non-graded information families and communities want to see on the state report card; (6) What additional items can be used for bonus points in the prepared for success component.

(F) For assistance in conducting its study and preparing its report, the committee shall both consult with independent experts and convene a group of stakeholders, including all of the following: (1) Educators; (2) Advocates; (3) Parents; (4) The business community.

Superintendent of Public Instruction Paolo DeMaria served in the role of the Superintendent or designee.

The Senate President appointed the following members to the Study Committee:

Senator Louis W. Blessing III, <i>co-chair</i>	R-Colerain Twp.
Senator Peggy Lehner	R-Kettering
Senator Teresa Fedor	D-Toledo

The Speaker of the House appointed the following members to the Study Committee:

Representative Don Jones, <i>co-chair</i>	R-Freeport
Representative Tracy M. Richardson	R-Marysville
Representative Lisa Sobecki	D-Toledo

The Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA) appointed the following members to the Study Committee:

Superintendent Cameron Ryba	Strongsville City School District
Superintendent Stephanie Starcher	Fort Frye Local School District
Superintendent Marlon Styles	Middletown City School District

II. Public Hearings

The Joint Committee held 3 public hearings. All agendas, testimony and additional information submitted to the committee are available in an attached appendix to this report. Facts, figures, and information not available in the appendixes are cited within the report.

Date	Presenter	Topic
11.06.19	Chris Woolard Senior Executive Director, Ohio Department of Education	Overview of report card accountability systems
11.13.19	Cameron Ryba, Stephanie Starcher, & Marlon Styles Superintendents, Buckeye Association of School Administrators	BASA report card recommendations
	Laura Kohler & Paolo DeMaria President, State Board of Education, & Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ohio Department of Education	SBOE recommendations for improving Ohio's School Report Cards
	Jeff Wensing Vice-President, Ohio Education Association	OEA feedback and presentation on Ohio's report card system
	Anthony Podojil, Ph.D. Executive Director, Alliance for High Quality Education	AHQE recommendations and proposed reforms to Ohio's report card
	Lisa Gray and Kevin Duff President, & Director of Policy and Research, Ohio Excels	Ohio Excels feedback on potential changes to the state report card system
	Darold Johnson Legislative Director, Ohio Federation of Teachers	OFT recommendations on Ohio's report cards
	Chad Aldis Vice President for Ohio Policy & Advocacy, Thomas B. Fordham Institute	Fordham Institute recommendations on Ohio's school report cards
12.04.19	Ann Sheldon Executive Director, Ohio Association for Gifted Children	OAGC Recommendations concerning Ohio's school report cards
	Ross May & Chad Henderly Urban Network Report Card Work Group	Urban Network Report Card Work Group's Report Card Draft Proposal

III. Current Structure of the State Report Cards

Background

Ohio began issuing report cards in 1998 following passage of SB 55 of the 122nd General Assembly. The report card was significantly reformed in 2012 with the passage of HB 555 of the 129th General Assembly, which replaced the former grading scale with an A-F rating system utilizing six component classifications and fifteen performance measures to determine the performance of school buildings and districts (several of which were used under the previous rating system).¹ These changes are largely reflected in Ohio’s current report card, with some changes on individual measures having been made in subsequent years that maintained the framework of an A-F grading system.

Each district and school has received a letter grade on its annual report card since the first report card with A-F ratings was published in 2013, with a summative overall letter grade being issued since 2018. The overall grade is calculated by using the results of each of the six components (Achievement, Progress, Gap Closing, Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers, Graduation Rate, and Prepared for Success). When a district or school has letter grades for each component, the overall grade is weighted according to the framework provided in Figure 1 below. A district that does not have a grade for one or more of its components will receive its rating based on the graded components available, with the weights of the remaining components proportionately adjusted per guidance issued by the State Board of Education.²

Figure 1: Report Card Overall Grade Weighting by Component

Component	Weight
Achievement	20%
Progress	20%
Gap Closing	15%
Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers	15%
Graduation Rate	15%
Prepared for Success	15%

Alignment with Federal Requirements

As part of the Every Student Succeeds Act, the federal government requires each state to have a system of “meaningful differentiation” that allows states to apply a methodology that identifies low performing schools for purposes of school improvement. That system must identify a statewide category of schools for comprehensive support and improvement, including identifying the lowest-performing 5% of schools statewide.³ A state’s methodology must include all indicators in the state’s accountability system, and its combination of academic performance measures that outweigh an additional measure of school quality and student success.

¹Ohio Legislative Service Commission, Am. Sub. HB 555 Final Analysis, 129th General Assembly, <https://www.lsc.ohio.gov/documents/gaDocuments/analyses129/12-hb555-129.pdf>, p. 10-12.

² Ohio Department of Education, “2018-2019 Overall Grade Technical Document,” 20 February 2019, <http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Report-Card-Resources/Sections/Report-Card-Components/Overall-Grade-Technical-Documentation.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>, p. 3.

³ Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA ACT), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, Sec. 1111(c)(4)(C), <https://legcounsel.house.gov/Comps/Elementary%20And%20Secondary%20Education%20Act%20Of%201965.pdf>, p. 32.

Ohio uses the report card to identify low-performing schools. Ohio's Priority schools, or Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools, include the lowest-performing 5% of schools. Ohio also identifies Focus schools and Warning schools as part of this improvement measure.

According to the Education Commission of the States (ECS), Ohio is one of 13 states that meet the ESSA's differential measurement requirement by use of A-F ratings. The ECS reports that 12 other states utilize an index rating, 11 states use descriptive ratings, 6 states use support labels, and 4 states (and the District of Columbia) use a 1-5 star rating.⁴

Overview of Ohio's School Report Card

The following contains a short overview of each of the six graded components of Ohio's school report cards, as well as a brief description of additional, non-graded information provided on the report card. Except where otherwise noted, descriptions are provided based on ODE's Guide to the 2019 Ohio School Report Cards.

A. Achievement Component

Federal law requires states to measure student achievement based on the performance of all students, and for each student subgroup, on all required English language arts, mathematics, and science tests.⁵ Ohio's measure of student achievement is the Achievement component, representing the number of students who passed the state assessments and how well students performed on those tests. The Achievement component includes two measures of academic performance, the Performance Index and the Indicators Met measures.

Performance Index

Counting for 75% of the grade for the Achievement component, the Performance Index (PI) is a measure of student achievement on state assessments. The PI provides districts and schools points for every student's level of achievement, with higher levels of achievement by a student resulting in a higher weight for that student. The index is based on a 120 point scale. Students can score in one of seven levels on the index, which are (from highest to lowest) advanced plus, advanced, accelerated, proficient, basic, limited, and untested. Point levels vary by achievement level, ranging from 1.3 points for Advanced Plus to .3 points for Limited, or 0 points for an untested student.

Indicators Met

The Indicators Met measure, which accounts for 25% of the Achievement component grade, represents student performance on state tests by measuring the percent of students who score proficient or higher in a grade and subject. It is based on a series of up to 23 state tests taken between grades 3-12. Unlike the performance index, indicators have a passage rate of 80% for each test indicator and 25% for each end of course improvement indicator. A school receives a rating of "Met" or "Not Met" based on whether they reached the passage rate for that indicator. Districts and schools also are evaluated on the Chronic Absenteeism Improvement Indicator*, End-of-Course Improvement Indicator and Gifted Indicator (which is itself derived from three components), that are non-test indicators. These give districts and schools up to 26 possible indicators.

Chronic Absenteeism*

⁴ Education Commission of the States, "50-State Comparison: States' School Accountability Systems," 31 May 2018, <https://www.ecs.org/50-state-comparison-states-school-accountability-systems/>.

⁵ ESEA Act, Sec. 1111(c)(4)(B), p. 31.

Under ESSA, federal law requires states to include at least one valid, reliable, statewide indicator of school quality or student success.⁶ Ohio uses its Chronic Absenteeism Improvement Indicator within the Indicators Met measure to meet this federal requirement. A district or school meets this indicator if it meets the established threshold or shows improvement from the previous year.

NOTE: According to ODE, on the 2019 report card, 44 schools, typically K-1-2 buildings, only received a letter grade based off their chronic absenteeism measure.

B. Progress Component

Under ESSA, each state must include an “other academic indicator” that annually measures the performance for all students and each separate student subgroup. This measure can be a measure of academic growth, or if not a measure of academic growth, one which the state can demonstrate is a valid, reliable, statewide academic indicator allowing for meaningful differentiation.⁷ Ohio meets this requirement by use of the Progress component.

The Progress component is a measurement of student growth made by students in grades 3-12 based on their past performance. The component measures growth for all students in a school, as well as the progress of gifted students, students with disabilities, and students whose academic performance is in the lowest 20% of students statewide. Growth is determined using the results of all state tests offered in grades 4-8, and English language arts and mathematics tests in high school. Figure 2 provides the breakdown of the grade for the progress component, broken down by each student group.

Figure 2: Progress Component Weighting

Component	Weighting
Overall Value-Added Measure (All Students)	55%
Gifted Value-Added Measure	15%
Students with Disabilities Value-Added Measure	15%
Students Whose Academic Performance is in the Lowest 20% Statewide Measure	15%

Value-Added Progress Score

The Value-Added Progress Score uses three years’ worth of assessment data from state tests to determine if a school district or building is producing academic progress in its students. ODE assigns a letter grade for each of the four groups measured in the progress component based on the performance of those students related to a statewide student achievement distribution. A student group that has made more than expected growth earns the school or district a grade of A or B. Expected growth produces a grade of C. Less than expected growth results in a grade of D or F. These letter grades are determined by using a gain index that converts points on the value-added score to an assigned grade.

House Bill 166 modified the value-added score’s gain index, setting the value for a school or district that is meeting growth expectations from a “C” to a “B” by adjusting the point values that convert to letter grades.

⁶ ESEA Act, Sec. 1111(c)(4)(B), p. 31-32.

⁷ Ibid., p. 31.

These changes will apply to the report cards issued for the 2019-2020 school year and beyond. Figure 3 provides a more detailed comparison below.

Figure 3: Grading Scale Used to Determine Value-Added Ratings:

Letter Grade	Prior Grading Scale	Grading Scale as Adjusted by HB 166
A	+2 and above	+1 and above
B	+1 to +2	-1 to +1
C	-1 to +1	-1 to -2
D	-1 to -2	-2 to -3
F	-2 and below	-3 and below

Under prior law, a school or district could not receive an overall “A” on its Progress component if one or more of its sub-groups’ value-added rating was below a “B.” HB 166 modified this deduction requirement based off a sub-group’s value-added ranking from a “B” to a “C.”⁸ This change will also become effective with the 2019-2020 report cards.

C. Gap Closing Component

Federal law requires states to address educational equity by measuring and reporting academic performance at the sub-group level, with sub-group size being determined by the state to disaggregate sub-group performance (this minimum number is frequently called the “n-size.”)⁹ States must also measure the progress that English learners are making toward English proficiency, which must contribute to the assigned rating or grade.¹⁰ They must furthermore address participation by all students, including students in established sub-groups, in the state’s assessments within its accountability system.

Ohio’s measurement of how well schools are meeting performance expectations for vulnerable students in English language arts, math, and graduation, as well as measuring whether English learners are making progress toward English proficiency, is included in its Gap Closing component. This component uses the Performance Index to measure whether schools and districts are closing achievement gaps for each student sub-group. This is done by utilizing Annual Measurable Objectives that compare the performance of students in up to ten sub-groups against that sub-group’s statewide performance goal. A school or district’s preliminary grade is calculated as an average of the four sub-component grades listed above; a school or district receives a demotion in its grade for low test participation if fewer than 95% of one or more of its sub-groups participate in state English and math assessments.¹¹ A sub-group is not graded if fewer than 15 such students are being served in that school.

Groups of students include:

⁸ Ohio Revised Code Sec. 3302.03(C)(1)(e), <http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/3302.03>.

⁹ ESEA Act, Sec. 1111(c)(4)(B), p. 31.

¹⁰ ESEA Act, Sec. 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), p. 31.

¹¹ “Revised State Template for the Consolidated State Plan,” U.S. Department of Education, Ohio Submission, 16 January 2018, http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Every-Student-Succeeds-Act-ESSA/OH_ESSA_SUBMISSION.pdf.aspx p. 36.

- All Students;
- American Indian/Alaskan Native;
- Asian/Pacific Islander;
- Black, Non-Hispanic;
- Hispanic;
- Multiracial;
- White, Non-Hispanic;
- Economically Disadvantaged;
- Students with Disabilities; and
- English Learners.

NOTE: The n-size for sub-group scores was set at 25 students for the 2017-18 school year, 20 students in the 2018-19 school year, and 15 students in the 2019-20 school year and beyond.¹² Ohio’s ESSA Plan similarly set its n-size at 15 students.¹³

D. Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers Component

The Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers component reports how successful a school or district is at improving at-risk K-3rd grade readers. The component relates to Ohio’s Third Grade Reading Guarantee and uses results from two assessments to provide a grade. The first is a reading diagnostic given to students in Kindergarten through grade three at the beginning of each school year. The second is the state’s third grade English language arts test, which is given to third grade students twice during that school year.

It should be noted that this component does not measure the literacy performance of all K-3 students in a school; it is rather a measure of the efficacy of a school’s efforts to improve literacy for struggling readers, which may be only a small segment of the school’s overall student population.

Ohio’s ESSA Plan included this measure as part of the state’s accountability system and methodology for establishing meaningful differentiation of schools. However, the Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers component is not federally required.

NOTE: According to ODE, on the 2019 report card 93 schools only received grades on the chronic absenteeism indicator (under the Achievement component) and under the Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers component.

E. Graduation Rate Component

States are required to annually report the graduation rate for all students and each student sub-group, based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. States are authorized to report extended-year cohort graduation rates. ESSA requires that students who do not meet that state’s graduation requirements are not to be counted as on-time graduates in the cohort graduation rate.¹⁴ Ohio’s Graduation Rate component provides this measurement.

The Graduation Rate component highlights the percent of students who are successfully finishing their high school education with a diploma in four or five years. The four-year graduation rate counts for 60% of a school or district’s Graduation Rate component; the five-year graduation rate accounts for the remaining 40%. For purposes of federal accountability, Ohio calculates a “federal graduation rate” that does not include students who earn their diploma using exemptions in an Individualized Education Plan (IEP).

F. Prepared for Success Component

¹² Ohio Revised Code Sec. 3302.03(C)(1)(a), <http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/3302.03>.

¹³ “Revised State Template for the Consolidated State Plan,” U.S. Department of Education, Ohio Submission, p. 14.

¹⁴ ESEA Act, Sec. 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb), p. 30.

The Prepared for Success component identifies how well prepared students are for college and career success after high school. The component uses multiple measures for college and career readiness. Though it was included in Ohio’s ESSA Plan, this information is not federally required.

A school or district earns 1 point for every student who earns a remediation free score on their ACT or SAT, earns an honors diploma, or earned an industry-recognized credential. Every student who earns 1 point from any of these achievements can also earn .3 bonus points for a student earning a 3 or higher on at least one Advanced Placement (AP) exam, earning a 4 or higher on at least one International Baccalaureate (IB) exam, or earning at least three college credits prior to leaving high school. Each student thus can earn a maximum of 1.3 points. A school or district’s score is computed by measuring the points earned with the total number of students in the class. Additional measures are added to the component as non-graded measures that do not factor into a school or district’s Prepared for Success rating.

G. Additional Non-Graded Report Card Information

Ohio’s school report cards include a number of additional documents and information that is of great value to parents, educators and students about the school or district in question.

- School or District Details—this section includes additional information concerning student enrollment, attendance, and mobility data, teacher experience, types, and licensure, teacher and principal evaluation information, student services, and school choice options for students residing in the district
- Financial Data—this includes information concerning classroom and administrative spending for that school or district, spending per pupil, and sources of revenue, alongside data from comparable districts and statewide averages.

H. Index of Statutory and Regulatory Prescriptions

The index below provides a reference point to relevant sections of the Ohio Revised Code and Ohio Administrative Code listing any requirements related to each of the six report card components, as well as the overall grade.

Component	Revised Code	Prescribes	Administrative Code	Prescribes
Overall Rating	3302.03	Overall academic performance rating, using the letter grade system; Achievement and Progress shall be equally weighted	3301-28-10	Methodology for assigning overall grade and weights for each component
Achievement	Performance Index: 3302.03(C)(1)(b)	Weighting the five levels and the additional weight for formally accelerated students; specifies “A”, “C”, and “F” ranges	3301-28-03	“B” & “D” ranges not specified in code
	Indicators Met: 3302.03(C)(1)(c)	Specifies “A” range must be ninety percent or higher	3301-28-04	“B”-“F” ranges not specified in code; indicator met if 80% of students score proficient or higher

	Additional Requirements: 3302.01(A); 3302.02	Inclusion of science & social studies; indicator of gifted students & achievement; ranking of schools & districts using Performance Index		
Progress	3302.03(C)(1)(e)	Model and measure details; overall value-added progress and value-added progress score of subgroups: gifted, students with disabilities, students with scores that place them in the lowest quintile for achievement on a statewide basis	3301-28-06	Weights of each of the measures that are combined into the component
Gap Closing	3302.03(C)(1)(a)	Use annual measureable objectives; n-size (currently 15)	3301-28-02	"A"- "F" ranges
Graduation Rate	3302.03(A)(1)(d)	Four-year cohort- rate of 93% or higher is an "A". Five-year cohort- rate of 95% or higher is an "A".	3301-28-05	"B"- "F" ranges not specified in code for both cohorts
Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers	3302.03(C)(1)(g)	Improving literacy measure to assess progress in K-3; "C" grade value must not be lower than the statewide average value for the measure	3301-28-07	Methodology for measuring and grading the reduction in total percentage of students scoring below grade level or below proficient
Prepared for Success	3302.03(C)(3)(f)	Using all students in four and five year adjusted graduation cohorts	3301-28-08	Structure of a component and the weighting methodology
	3302.03(C)(2)(a)-(f)	Measures to be included that contribute to the grade		

IV. Recommendations

The Study Committee received the following recommendations from stakeholders during testimony on changes to Ohio’s school report cards.

Achievement Component

Buckeye Association of School Administrators	Ohio State Board of Education	Ohio Education Association	Alliance for High Quality Education	Ohio Excels	Ohio Federation of Teachers	Thomas B. Fordham Institute of Ohio	Ohio Association of Gifted Students	Urban Network Report Card Work Group
Eliminate Indicators Met as a graded measure; set top of PI at 3-yr average of highest score in the state; add 7 th “approaching” level to the PI between “basic” and “proficient;” modify current “untested” category to students without documented approval for test exemption; use equivalency crosswalk for students taking approved science or social studies test; add 3-year trend arrow	Eliminate Indicators Met as a graded measure; provide information on the number of students above the proficiency rate; give comparative data	Include additional, non-test based measures of achievement	Eliminate Indicators Met measure; add a new cut score (at .8) to the PI range; include comparative data; report test scores by sub-group		Include development of social-emotional competence, learning and innovation skills, information technology skill, life/career skills; and access to student enrichment activities; identify supply & development of teachers and school leaders	Eliminate Indicators Met but continue to report; maintain current PI weighting	Maintain Indicators Met, particularly Gifted Indicator; alternatively, move Gifted Indicator to Gap Closing/Equity component if Indicators Met eliminated; rename PI level to “accelerated”	Measure percent of students scoring proficient or better and percent of growth targets met to show efforts to raise achievement; replace Indicators Met with ELA, math & end of course scores on 4-pt scale; modify PI scale & calculate growth

Progress Component

Buckeye Association of School Administrators	Ohio State Board of Education/ Ohio Dept. of Education	Ohio Education Association	Alliance for High Quality Education	Ohio Excels	Ohio Federation of Teachers	Thomas B. Fordham Institute of Ohio	Ohio Association of Gifted Students	Urban Network Report Card Work Group
Base value-added score off one year of data; report but do not grade the 2- and 3-year scores; use 3-year trend arrow; remove the sub-group demotion requirement and move gifted and students with disabilities scoring to Gap Closing; provide comparative data	Use 1 year of data for value-added score (but continue to report multi-year value-add); eliminate sub-group demotion and ranking requirements		Report 1-year & 3-year average value-added data & permit a school/district to determine which valuation to use on its report card; utilize a 2-standard error deviation metric instead of 1-standard error; eliminate sub-group demotion requirement		Make the formula for calculating value-added scores more transparent	Use a weighted average score; focus on actual gain or loss by average student instead of index scores; remove sub-group value-added measures; transfer gifted & students with disabilities to Gap Closing	Maintain current sub-group demotion requirement for value-added score	Utilize a 4-point scale connected to the gain index

Gap Closing Component

<p>Buckeye Association of School Administrators</p>	<p>Ohio State Board of Education/ Ohio Dept. of Education</p>	<p>Ohio Education Association</p>	<p>Alliance for High Quality Education</p>	<p>Ohio Excels</p>	<p>Ohio Federation of Teachers</p>	<p>Thomas B. Fordham Institute of Ohio</p>	<p>Ohio Association of Gifted Students</p>	<p>Urban Network Report Card Work Group</p>
<p>Use 3-tiered measure for sub-group scores; add growth scores for gifted students & students with disabilities as new sub-groups; provide comparative data; freeze n-size at 20 (rather than 15)</p>	<p>No recommended changes provided.</p>		<p>Reform to an “Equity” component focused on measuring subgroup performance on achievement and growth targets; report test scores by sub-group with comparisons; eliminate letter grade demotion</p>			<p>Change from “Gap Closing to Equity;” measure subgroup performance on achievement and growth targets</p>	<p>If Indicators Met were to be eliminated, include Gifted Indicator within this component; maintain n-size at 15</p>	<p>Modify targets and assign points on a 4-point scale to the percentage of targets attained; remove graduation</p>

Graduation Rate Component

Buckeye Association of School Administrators	Ohio State Board of Education/ Ohio Dept. of Education	Ohio Education Association	Alliance for High Quality Education	Ohio Excels	Ohio Federation of Teachers	Thomas B. Fordham Institute of Ohio	Ohio Association of Gifted Students	Urban Network Report Card Work Group
Provide additional data for students in each cohort who did not graduate but are receiving services, as well as percentage who dropped out; provide mobility rate for the district; add comparative data	No recommended changes provided	Include additional, non-test based measures of achievement	Report 4 and 5-year graduation cohort rates; report number of students with disabilities who did not graduate in 4-yr cohort but receiving services via IEP; include student mobility impact in graduation rate calculation		Include development of social-emotional competence, learning and innovation skills, information technology skill, life/career skills; and access to student enrichment activities; identify supply & development of teachers and school leaders	Award a single graduation rate combining the 4 and 5-year graduation rates; include method to account for students who transferred schools		Provide 4 and 5-year graduation rate; include graduation rate and growth, 9 th grade course passage, post-school outcomes, and advanced coursework participation; assign points on a 4-point scale

Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers Component

Buckeye Association of School Administrators	Ohio State Board of Education/ Ohio Dept. of Education	Ohio Education Association	Alliance for High Quality Education	Ohio Excels	Ohio Federation of Teachers	Thomas B. Fordham Institute of Ohio	Ohio Association of Gifted Students	Urban Network Report Card Work Group
Rename as "Third Grade Reading Guarantee," reporting percent of students who are promoted to 4 th grade based on the Ohio test and district-selected alternative test; provide additional data and comparison	Eliminate, or utilize the promotion rate to 4 th grade if an early literacy measure is desired; give comparative data		Report 4 and 5-year graduation cohort rates; report number of students with disabilities who did not graduate in 4-yr cohort but receiving services via IEP; include student mobility impact in graduation rate calculation	Use a graded measure to demonstrate how many students reach proficiency by the end of elementary school; show growth with Kindergarten baseline	Prioritize early learning; identify strategies advancing high-quality early childhood educational opportunities	Eliminate as a graded component, use as rating for K-2 schools only, or explore ways to significantly strengthen the measure		Measure in a similar fashion to achievement; use criteria & growth targets and assign points on 4-point scale

Prepared for Success Component

Buckeye Association of School Administrators	Ohio State Board of Education/ Ohio Dept. of Education	Ohio Education Association	Alliance for High Quality Education	Ohio Excels	Ohio Federation of Teachers	Thomas B. Fordham Institute of Ohio	Ohio Association of Gifted Students	Urban Network Report Card Work Group
Eliminate this component	Refine measure to include additional measures of college, career and life preparedness; restructure dual tiers into single tier providing similar credit for all measures	Include additional, non-test based measures of achievement	Eliminate component; suggest that the district or school report high school graduation seal data as part of proposed ESSA-compliant dashboard	Harmonize current measure with new career-tech report card version of the measure with focus on college and career readiness	Modify current component to allow wider range of opportunities, including career licenses and military enlistment	Incorporate military readiness and enlistment; modify grading scale to account for increased differentiation; incorporate improvement dimension	Maintain this component	

Recommendations Concerning Sec. 265.510 (D):

1. Years of Data for Progress Component & Method of Assigning Grades

Division (D)(1) of Sec. 265.510 required the committee to consider how many years of data should be included in, and how grades are assigned to, the progress component.

- BASA recommended basing the progress component on the current year of data, rather than three years, and reporting the two- and three-year scores for informational purposes only. They also recommended that the “Exceed” rating be an index score of 1.0 or greater, placing the “Met” standard between scores less than 1.0 but greater than -2, and assigning a rating of “Not Met” to scores below -2. BASA further recommended eliminating the demotion requirement, relocating the reporting of progress for gifted students and students with disabilities to the Gap Closing measure, and eliminating the reporting of progress for students in the lowest 20% in achievement, as it is also already reporting in other sub-group measures.
- The SBOE recommended that the state use one year of value-added data for accountability purposes, while reporting multiple years of value-added data for the additional benefit of viewing larger trends. The Board also recommended eliminating the sub-group demotion requirement and value-added rankings required in Sec. 3302.21(A)(2) of the Revised Code.¹⁵
- The AHQE recommended reporting the 1-year and 3-year average value-added data for federal accountability purposes, but authorizing the school or district to select which valuation to use for state report card purposes. Alternatively, the Alliance recommended using a weighted 3-year average. The Alliance further recommended using a two standard of error deviation for setting value-added scores, rather than using one standard of error deviation, and eliminating the subgroup demotion.
- The OFT recommended that the formula for computing a value-added progress score should become more transparent.
- The Fordham Institute recommended creating a weighted average score, placing a weight of 50% on a school or district’s value-added score for the current year, and 25% weight on each of the prior two years. The Fordham Institute also recommended shifting away from index scores and instead focusing on the actual gain made by the average student in each school. Further recommendations include removing the sub-group value-added measures, transferring the Gifted and Students with Disabilities measures to the Gap Closing component.
- The OAGC recommended maintaining the sub-group demotion requirement within the Progress component if not all of a school or district’s sub-groups received a “C” or higher on their value-added score.
- The Urban Network recommended using a scale of 0-4 points connected to a gain index.

2. How to Structure the Prepared for Success Component

Division (D)(2) required the committee to consider the structure of the prepared for success component prescribed under division (C)(3)(f) of section 3302.03 of the Revised Code, including considering additional ways to earn points;

- BASA and the AHQE recommended the Prepared for Success component be eliminated.
- The SBOE recommended that the Prepared for Success component be modified to include additional measures of college, career and life preparedness, including military enlistment, ASVAB, CLEP, CTAG, career prep program credentials, an Ohio Means Jobs Readiness seal, and others. Additionally, the current dual structure of the component should be consolidated into a single tier providing similar credit for all measures.

¹⁵ Ohio Revised Code Sec. 3302.21(A)(2), <http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/3302.21>.

- Ohio Excels recommended that the current Prepared for Success component be modified to reflect changes made to the career and post-secondary readiness grade for career-tech schools, with a focus on including indicators most likely to lead to college and career readiness.
- The OFT also recommended expanding the amount of career opportunities that are included in the Prepared for Success component to include earning career licenses or enlisting in the military.
- The Fordham Institute recommended including military readiness and enlistment as an indicator of success, as well as revising the grading scale to create more differentiation between schools, and incorporating an improvement dimension that provides additional opportunities for schools to demonstrate success and incentivize readiness.
- The OAGC recommended maintaining the Prepared for Success component.

3. How the Gap Closing Component Meets Requirements under Federal Law

Division (D)(3) required the committee to consider how the gap closing component prescribed under division (C)(3)(a) of section 3302.03 of the Revised Code meets requirements established under federal law and applies to all schools.

The Gap Closing component measures how well schools are meeting the achievement and growth expectations for Ohio’s most vulnerable populations of students in English language arts, mathematics, and graduation, as well as how schools are doing in helping English language learners become English-proficient.

- BASA recommended measuring a composite of subgroup performance in English language arts, mathematics, graduation rate, and English learner progress, and reporting a composite of subgroup performance in these categories as a percentage. “Exceed” would be set at 90% or greater, “Met” between 70% to 89.9%, and “Not Met” set below 70%. BASA further recommended moving the sub-group scores for gifted students and students with disabilities from the Progress component to the Gap Closing component and eliminating the demotion requirement within the measure. Furthermore, BASA recommended freezing the student n-size at 20 students for data reporting purposes.
- The AHQE and Fordham Institute recommended changing the name of this component to “Equity” and measuring sub-group performance on meeting achievement and growth targets. The AFQE also recommended reporting raw test scores by sub-group and eliminating the letter grade demotion as it relates to federal assessment participation requirements.
- The OAGC recommended maintaining the current n-size at 15 students.
- The Urban Network recommended modifying the sub-group targets to include meeting Annual Measureable Objectives, value-added score growth, and targeting an increase in performance by 10% or more. The Urban Network recommended against awarding partial points, and further recommended that the Gap Closing measure not consider performance expectations for graduation.

4. How the Graduation Component Includes Students with Disabilities and Mobile Students

Division (D)(4) required the committee to consider how the graduation component prescribed under division (C)(3)(d) of section 3302.03 of the Revised Code includes students with disabilities and mobile students.

- BASA recommended continuing to report 4-year and 5-year graduation rates. Their recommendation set the standards for the 4-year graduation rate at 93% or greater for “Exceed,” 84%-92.9% for “Met,” and “Not Met” scores below 84%. Their recommendations for the 5-year graduation rate set standards for “Exceed” at 95% or greater, a “Met” standard between 85%-94.9%, and “Not Met” for any score below 85%. Both would be complemented by a 3-year trend arrow noting if performance is increasing, decreasing has remained flat. BASA

also recommended adjusting the Graduation Rate calculation to denote the percentage of students who did not graduate in their cohort but are still receiving services from the school district, and the percentage of students in that cohort who dropped out of school, and adding a student mobility rate.

- The AHQE also recommended reporting the number of students with disabilities who did not graduate in their four-year cohort, but are continuing to receive educational services through an IEP, and including student mobility as part of the calculation of the graduation rate.
- The Fordham Institute recommended awarding a single Graduation Rate that combines the four and five-year graduation rate of each cohort, as well as calculating the graduation rate to account for students who transfer schools.
- The Urban Network recommended including graduation rate growth within the measurement of the Graduation Rate component, including growth by student groups and consideration of whether the school meets targets set for that building.

5. Whether Overall Grades should be a Letter Grade or Other Rating System

Division (D)(5) required the committee to consider whether the overall grades should be a letter grade or some other rating system that clearly communicate the performance of school districts and other public schools to families and communities.

- BASA recommended eliminating A-F letter grades and creating a three-tiered grading structure for each component (five components, per BASA's recommendations) of "Exceed," "Met," or "Not Met," with an overall grade determined by the number of points earned on the five weighted components.
- The SBOE recommended generating numeric values for each report card metric, and designing a structure through which report card components would produce a numeric value that allows for federally-required meaningful differentiation of low-performing schools.
- The AHQE recommended eliminating A-F letter grades and an overall summative rating, and moving to an ESSA-compliant dashboard.
- Ohio Excels recommended maintaining an overall grade of A-F.
- The OEA recommended the state not include a "failing" label, and that report cards should focus on encouraging reforms that do not rely on a potentially punitive letter grade. The OEA instead recommended moving to a system of shared responsibility among students, educators, parents and the community.
- The Fordham Institute recommended maintaining Ohio's overall rating through an A-F letter grade.
- The OAGC recommended maintaining a rating scale for each report card component, but did not recommend maintaining a summative grade.
- The Urban Network Report Card Work Group recommended eliminating A-F letter grades and implementing a continuum of targets and supports: "meeting targets;" "substantial progress toward targets;" "partial progress toward targets;" "limited progress toward targets/targeted supports;" and "very limited progress towards targets/comprehensive support." The Urban Network recommended including reported and rated measures on the report card. Rated measures would be determined using two number-based rating scales, on a scale of 0-4, for rated measures. One measure would provide a criteria-based score, and a second would serve as a norm-based growth measure. Each would count at 50% of the overall score for that measure.

Recommendations Concerning Sec. 265.510 (E):

1. Calculating each graded measure included in the state report card.

- BASA recommended creating five report card components scored on a three-measure scale of Exceed, Met, or Not Met; points would be assessed for each component, and Achievement and Progress would receive a 1.5 component weight, on a 24-point scale that would award a rating of “Exceed” for schools or a district that score 20-24 points, “Met” for 9-19 points, and “Not Met” for 0-8 points.
- The SBOE recommended eliminating A-F letter grades and adopting an ESSA-compliant dashboard model, utilizing an approach that generates numeric values for each report card metric and allows for meaningful differentiation of low-performing schools.
 - As part of its overall recommendations on the Progress component, the Board referenced a 2018 report by the Value-Added Technical Advisory Group that was convened by ODE, upon which its recommendations were based.¹⁶
- The AHQE also recommended eliminating A-F report card grades and moving to an ESSA-compliant dashboard, which would reflect only federally-required accountability components aligned with minimum ESSA requirements.
- The OFT also recommended ending A-F letter grading in favor of a dashboard.
- The Fordham Institute recommended maintaining the current A-F letter grades for report cards, including an overall summative grade. Ohio Excels recommended the report card include a small number of graded measures for accountability purposes and utilize additional non-graded measures for informational purposes, with letter grades assigned to each graded measure and an overall rating for that school or district.
- The Urban Network recommended rating both scores and growth, using a number-based scale of 0-4 for each. Each rating would account for 50% of the overall measure. Scores would be criteria-based and determine the quintile for growth in the following year. The growth measure would be based on a norm group and be compared against districts or schools in its quintile.

2. How to assign a grade to each graded measure, including ranges of scores.

- The AHQE recommended that the State Board of Education should be required to review, analyze, and evaluate cut scores for all report card components at least every three years.
- The OEA recommended that all measurement methodologies be recommended by either the State Board of Education or ODE and approved by the General Assembly.
- The OFT recommended against utilizing cut scores that change annually.
- The Urban Network recommended using a 0-4 point scale to score measures within up to four strategies of the ten strategies it recommended be adopted within the report card. Additional strategies would be reported but not rated. The Urban Network did not have a recommendation on the percent that each rated measure should count toward the final ratings.

3. How to weight the graded measures for school buildings that do not have all measures.

- As part of its recommendations on the Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers component, the AHQE recommended including a K-3 literacy report card measurement for only those school buildings that serve students in grades K-1-2.

¹⁶ State Board of Education of Ohio, Accountability & Continuous Improvement Committee (Expanded), “Recommendations for Reforms to Ohio’s District and School Report Cards,” Appendix B “Value-Added Advisory—Recommendations—10.10.18,” 15 November 2018, https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/State-Board/Expanded-Committee-Recommendations_RC.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US, p. 9-14

- The Fordham Institute also recommended maintaining a K-3 literacy grade for buildings that solely serve students in grades K-2.

4. Which state report card calculations should be prescribed in statute and which should be prescribed in administrative rule.

- The OEA recommended that the methodologies for all report card measurements be recommended by the State Board/ODE and approved by the General Assembly. Depending on the approval mechanism, this may require legislative approval by the General Assembly.
- The AHQE recommended that the State Board should be required to review, analyze, and evaluate cut scores for all report card components at least every three years. Initiating such a requirement could be done by statute or administrative rule.

5. What additional, non-graded information families and communities want to see on the state report card.

- Multiple entities recommended that comparative data be provided on district and school report cards to offer readers an opportunity to compare that school's performance against the performance of a similar school.
- BASA proposed that each report card component include a trend arrow indicating positive, negative, or flat performance made by that school or district over the last three years.
- The OFT recommended that the report card highlight engagement with supportive services offered by the school, including nurses, counselors, social workers, art and music programs, physical education programs, and wraparound services. Multiple recommendations were made concerning identification of teacher supply and development, emphasizing collective stakeholder impact, identifying student enrichment opportunities provided beyond traditional K-12 school experience, and including measures of how a school or district is accommodating all students' learning and growth needs and aspirations.
- The OEA recommended including non-test measures such as advanced coursework completion, the percentage of educators teaching within their field, and access to full-day kindergarten. The OEA also recommended including information on access to health and wellness programs, counseling and mental health services, and interventions necessary to overcome non-academic barriers.

6. What additional items can be used for bonus points in the prepared for success component.

- No specific recommendations were made to the committee on what additional items could be used as bonus points in the Prepared for Success component. Several entities recommended expanding the number of achievements tied to college, career and life readiness within the Prepared for Success component.

Other Recommendations:

In addition to the recommendations provided above, the Study Committee received several recommendations that are provided below.

- BASA recommended making several modifications to the Achievement component, including eliminating Indicators Met as a graded measure, modifying the cut scores within the Performance Index to set a new "approaching" category between "basic" and "proficient" with a .8 point multiplier, capping the high end of the PI scale at the three-year average of the highest PI score in the state (112, based off the most recent data), and providing exceptions to including students who have an exemption from state testing or are participating in another approved assessment from being counted in the PI score.

- The SBOE and AHQE both also recommended eliminating Indicators Met as a graded measure. The AHQE also recommended adding a new category in the PI between “basic” and “proficient” with a .8 point multiplier.
- The OFT recommended that any redesign of the report card include in-depth stakeholder input with parents, teachers, and the local community, and that reporting based on state assessments take equity measures into account.
- The OAGC recommended renaming the “accelerated” level within the current Performance Index as “accomplished,” to better convey the meaning of that level. OAGC also recommended modifying provisions within the Gifted Indicator to increase emphasis on any under-identification and service to minority, English learner, and K-3 student populations.
- The Urban Network Report Card Work Group proposed remodeling the state report cards around the Ohio Strategic Plan for Education, using 10 strategies that focus on a holistic representation of how districts and schools educate the whole child, measuring and reflecting the progress and opportunities in each district and school. This report card, as proposed, would represent state, district, and school progress toward the core principles and strategies in Ohio’s Strategic Plan. The work group stated that inspiration was taken from the Massachusetts report card in its recommendations.