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**I. Report Card Background**

House Bill 555 (HB 555) addresses the revision of Ohio’s academic accountability system and was passed into law by the Ohio General Assembly (OGA) in December of 2012. Much of the methodology to support the report card components of the bill was delegated to the State Board of Education (State Board), including the development of most of the methodology, standards, and indicators within the system. The information below is an update on the work the State Board of Education, via their Accountability Committee, that has done to implement the requirements in HB 555. The following components will be included in the new report card and are outlined in further detail throughout this document.

* Safe Harbor
* Report Card Components
	+ Achievement Component
	+ Graduation Rate
		- 4 year cohort
		- 5 year cohort
	+ Gap Closing
	+ Progress
		- Value-added
		- Overall
		- Gifted
		- Lowest 20%
		- Students with disabilities
	+ K-3 Literacy
	+ Prepared for Success
		- College admission test
		- Dual enrollment credits
		- Industry credentials
		- Honors diploma
		- Advanced placement
		- International Baccalaureate
	+ Dropout and Recovery Schools
		- Graduation Rates
		- High school assessment passage rates
		- Gap Closing

**II. Safe Harbor (this is the only component of HB 555 finalized by the State Board).**

HB 555 required that the State Board of Education submit recommendations to the general assembly to create a one-year safe harbor for districts and schools for the first year that assessments developed by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers PARCC are administered. At their March12, 2013 meeting, the State Board voted to submit a Safe Harbor Resolution to the General Assembly. The following is a summary of the recommendation:

* Ohio Department of Education (ODE) has developed a statistical methodology, which will be used in order to determine if a school building, or school district has met the safe harbor conditions.
* Draft Methodology: A district or school can meet safe harbor by either maintaining relative PI Score OR above expected growth in value-added.
	+ **Maintaining Relative PI Score**: There will likely be a drop in assessments score in the first year the PARCC assessments are administered. If a district or school can maintain their position in the distribution of PI across all districts or schools, they will meet safe harbor. The statistical method for measuring the position is the mean of the PI distribution, the PI score of the district or school, and a +/- two Standard Deviation range of Safe Harbor.
		- *Z-Score (2014-15).* A standardized Z-score for the district or school’s PI score relative to all schools and districts is generated to represent the relative place in distribution on new assessment regime.
		- *Z-Score (2013-14).* A standardized Z-score is also generated for 2013-14 to represents relative place in the distribution on previous assessment regime.
		- If Z-Score (2014-15) - Z-Score (2013-14) is greater than -2, then Safe Harbor is met.
		- That is, if the difference in standardized Z-scores is within the +/- two Standard Deviation range, then the school or district gets credit for maintaining its PI achievement in relation to others.
	+ **Above Expected Growth in Value-Added**: A Composite Value-Added rating of Above Expected Growth translates into at least maintaining position for a district or school, statistically, in statewide distribution. The method for measuring the position is as follows: Above Expected Growth is defined as growth that is at least two standards errors above the mean.
		- If Value-Added (2014-15) = Above Expected Growth, then Safe Harbor is met.
		- Would generally apply to buildings with tested grades, math and reading 4-8.
		- Some schools, such as K-3 buildings, would not have a Value-Added score and would not be eligible for this option.
* Methodology Rationale:
	+ Both of the methods to reach safe harbor demonstrate that the school is doing roughly at least as well as the previous school year (2013-2014). This indicates that the decrease in performance is primarily caused by the changes in state testing, not the efforts of the school. This is why these recommendations use the previous year’s Performance Index Grade to determine sanctions. Schools that received an “F” on the Performance Index Grade on their 2013-2014 report card are not eligible for safe harbor.
* If the school or district meets safe harbor, safe harbor grades will be calculated using the Performance Index Grade from the previous school year (2013-2014)
* The actual grades earned by the school or district at the end of the 2014-2015 school year will appear on their report card so they are held accountable to the public.
* Any sanctions placed on the school or district during the 2015-2016 school year will be based on the safe harbor grades.
* If a school or district meets safe harbor, sanctions will be in effect for the 2015-2016 school year only and will be based upon the Achievement Component Grade, the adjusted Performance Index, and the Overall Grade.
* Meeting safe harbor does not automatically exempt schools from sanctions. Instead, the sanctions are based on the safe harbor grades. These safe harbor grades may also create a new starting point for determinations that are based on ratings for multiple years. These adjusted grades will be used to determine if a school qualifies for the sanctions identified in HB 555.

**III. Report Card Components Delegated to ODE**

Below you will find a list of report card components that have not yet been approved by the full State Board. As of the date of this memo, the Accountability Committee has made recommendations around these components of the new report card structure to the State Board but no vote has been taken. Additionally, a member of ODE’s staff presented an abbreviated version of this information to the House Committee on Education on March 20, 2013. We expect the Accountability Committee will be meeting four more times prior to June 1, 2013 in order to finalize their recommendations around these components to be presented for approval to the State Board.

1. ***Achievement Component******(this component has not been voted on by the full State Board)***
* 2012-2013 State Indicators (75% proficiency standard)
	+ The State Board had the ability to set the rages for “C and D” scores, the others were statutorily required.
	+ In order for a school building or district to “meet” an indicator, 75% of students must be proficient. In order for a school building or district to receive an “A” on the achievement component they must have met at least 90% of the indicators.

|  |
| --- |
| Achievement Component Grading |
|   | **% Indicators Met** |
| A | At least 90% |
| B | 80 - 89.9% |
| C | 70 - 79.9% |
| D | 50 - 69.9 |
| F | > 50% |

* 2013-2014 State Indicators (80% proficiency standard)
	+ In the 2013-2014 school year the achievement component will be graded at 80% proficiency, a 5% increase. The grading scale remains the same as above.
	+ In order for a school building or district to “meet” an indicator, 80% of students must be proficient. In order for a school building or district to receive an “A” on the achievement component they must have met at least 90% of the indicators.
1. ***Graduation Rate*** ***(this component has not been voted on by the full State Board)***
* The 4 year and 5 year graduation rate component is based on the percentage of students that enter 9th grade for the first time and leave in either their 4th or 5th year with a diploma.
* 4 year (93-100% A; 89-92.9% B; 84-88.9% C; 79-83.9%; <79% F)
* 5 year (95-100% A; 90-94.9% B; 85-89.9%)
1. ***Gap Closing- Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) (this component has not been voted on by the full State Board)***
* Although we are confirming this with ODE, the AMO seems to measure academic components of specific students measured against the academic performance of all students in Ohio.
1. ***Progress******(this component has not been voted on by the full State Board)***
* Progress includes, value-added for the following categories: overall; gifted; lowest 20%; students with disabilities
* Progress will be measured at the school building level, school district level, and at the statewide level.
* In order to get an A in value-added, schools and districts must have 2 years or more of student growth
* Over a three year period (rolling average)
* Value-added will be a factor in teacher evaluation
1. ***K-3 Literacy (this component has not been voted on by the full State Board)***
* The State Board must determine test score criteria by December 2013
* The measure will be reported in the 2013-2014 school year and graded in the 2014-2015 school year.
* The State Board will begin working to define the measurements around this component this spring.
1. ***Prepared for Success******(this component has not been voted on by the full State Board)***
* 2013-2014- the prepared for success measures will be reported only.
* 2014-2015- the prepared for success measures will be graded. Grades will first be released on the August 2015 report card. According to the Accountability Committee’s presentation, the State Board does not have to determine how this is graded until that time.)
* The measure includes the following components:
	+ College admission test (participation rate and percent receiving non-remediation scores),
	+ Dual enrollment credits (percent earning at least 3 credits),
	+ Industry credentials (percent of students with a credential),
	+ Honors (percent of students with an honors diploma),
	+ Advanced placement (participation rate and the percent scoring 3 or above),
	+ International Baccalaureate (participation rate and percent scoring 4 or above.
* The State Board can also choose to include the results College and Career Readiness Assessment in the component grade- can give additional weight for student who demonstrate college and career readiness in multiple ways.
* The State Board will begin working to define the measurements around this component this spring.
1. ***Dropout and Recovery Schools******(this component has not been voted on by the full State Board)***
* 2013- Benchmarks for 7 report card indicators. No Indicator ratings in 2013.
	+ Graduation rates (4, 5, 6, 7, 8 year grad rates)
	+ High School Assessment Passage
		- Exceeds Standards = 59-100%; meets standards = 18-58.9%;
	+ AMOs
		- Exceeds Standards = 33-100%; meets standards = 5-32.9%
* 2014- Addition of 1 additional indicator.
* 2015- Overall rating designation
* No other states have consequences for failing to reach benchmarks and their indicators are also different (Ohio uses federal calculations, other states combine several indicators into one element)
* Statement of Intent- Based on an analysis of 2013 and 2014 dropout prevention and recovery data performance levels the State Board may amend benchmarks if warranted.
* Dropout and Recovery Next Steps:
	+ March- Intent to Adopt
	+ April- Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review (JCARR)
	+ May- Public Hearings
	+ June- Adoption

**IV. General Timeline on HB 555 Items**

* March: Presentation to the House Education Committee
* April- State Board meets the week of April 8th with its exact agenda to be determined, but it is expected that they will vote upon all report card components
* May- Public hearings on report card components & submission of those decisions submitted in rule via the Joint Committee on Agency Rules Review.
* June- Final adoption by State Board

**V. Report Card Implementation Timeline**

* As this point in time, the State Board plans to suggest that the following accountability measures be phased in, in the following increments:
	+ 2012-2013: 9 Measures
		- No component grade and no overall grade reported
	+ 2013-2014: Up to 16 Measures
		- Addition of K-3 literacy component
		- No component grade and no overall grade
	+ 2014-2015: Up to 17 Measures
		- Addition of college and career readiness component
		- Component grades and overall grade reported
	+ 2015-2016: Up to 18 Measures
		- Addition of value-added component and high school graduation rate