

State Accountability System Profiles: Ohio

Overview of State Accountability System

This summary provides an overview of the Ohio accountability system using the components of the *Roadmap for Next-Generation Accountability Systems* (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011) as a framework.¹

Crosswalk of Roadmap Components and State Accountability System

Roadmap Component	Description of State Approach
1. Performance Objectives of College and Career Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Core State Standards in English language arts and mathematics adopted June 2010, effective 2014–15 (Ohio Department of Education, 2011i). • Revised academic content standards in science and social studies adopted June 2010 (Ohio Department of Education, 2011j, 2011k). • With input from teams of Ohio teachers working collaboratively in summer and fall 2010, Ohio Department of Education developed a model curriculum, aligned to the Common Core and revised state standards, which is available as a public Web-based resource. The state board of education adopted the model curriculum on March 15, 2011 (Ohio Department of Education, 2011i).

¹ This profile was prepared collaboratively by Regional Educational Laboratory Midwest and Great Lakes West Comprehensive Center under Institute of Education Sciences (IES) contract ED-06-CO-0019 and U.S. Department of Education cooperative agreement S283B060001, respectively. The content does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. government. This document is not verified as meeting IES standards and is not intended for public distribution.

Roadmap Component	Description of State Approach
<p>2. Measures of Student Performance Outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ohio is part of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, assessments to be in place in 2014–15 (State of Washington, n.d.; Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, 2011). • The Ohio Performance Assessment Pilot Project, developed through a partnership with The School Redesign Network at Stanford University, is piloting a new generation of assessments that uses a multiple-measures approach (Route 21, n.d.) <p><u>Students:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) requires all children in public schools entering kindergarten for the first time to be assessed on the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment – Literacy (KRA-L), an assessment that measures early reading skills (Ohio Department of Education, 2010). • Grades 3–8 are administered the Ohio Achievement Assessment in Reading and Mathematics. Grades 5 and 8 are administered a Science and Social Studies Assessment and Grades 4 and 7 are administered a Writing Assessment (Ohio Department of Education, 2011h). • Ohio Graduation Tests are given in Grades 10 and 11 in five subjects: reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies. Students must demonstrate proficiency in all tests prior to graduation. <p><u>Schools and Districts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ohio uses a combination of four measures as the basis for assigning one of six performance designations (see below) to schools and districts. The four measures used to assign performance designations are state indicators, a performance index calculation, adequate yearly progress, and a value-added measure (Ohio Department of Education, 2011g).
<p>3. Determinations</p>	<p><u>Students:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The achievement levels (cut scores) for Ohio Achievement Assessments and Ohio Graduation Tests are as follows: limited, basic, proficient, accelerated, and advanced. Ohio provides definitions of these achievement levels by subject area (Ohio Department of Education, 2011c). Definitions for each subject area can be found under “Performance Level Descriptors” for Ohio Graduation Tests and “Grade 3–8: Performance Level Descriptors” for the Ohio Achievement Assessments (Ohio Department of Education, 2006a, 2006b).

Roadmap Component	Description of State Approach
3. Determinations (continued)	<p><u>Schools and Districts:</u> Ohio uses a combination of four sets of criteria as the basis for assigning one of six performance designations to districts. The following four measures are used for determinations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>State Indicators</u> – Schools and districts are measured against up to 26 indicators that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Performance on Ohio Achievement Assessments in reading and math for Grades 3–8 (75% state requirement) ○ Performance on Ohio Graduation Tests in reading, math, and science for Grades 10 and 11 (75% for Grade 10 and 85% for Grade 11) ○ Attendance rate (93%) and graduation rate (90%) • <u>Performance Index Calculation</u> – Out of a possible 120 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Description from ODE: “The Performance Index reflects the achievement of every student enrolled for the full academic year. The Performance Index is a weighted average that includes all tested subjects and grades and untested students. The greatest weight is given to advanced scores (accelerated or advanced on state assessments); the weights decrease for each performance level and a weight of zero is given to untested students. This results in a scale from 0 to 120 points. The performance index can be compared across years to show district achievement trends” (Ohio Department of Education, 2011g, p. 3). • <u>Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)</u> – Federal definition • <u>Value-Added Measure</u> – Districts can be designated as Above Expected Growth (greater than one year of progress achieved), Met Expected Growth (one year of progress has been achieved), or Below Expected Growth (less than one year of growth achieved) (Ohio Department of Education, 2011g).
4. Transparent Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE provides an online repository of all accountability information at the district and school level as a part of its interactive local report card database. The database lets users download large amounts of information and build custom reports (Ohio Department of Education, 2011b). • ODE releases district- and school-level PDF dashboards that provide information on the school or district’s preliminary and final determination, including performance on 26 state indicators, Performance Index rating, three years of graphed student achievement data by grade level and subject, AYP status by subject and subgroup, value-added measure, and other demographic information (Ohio Department of Education, 2011e).

Roadmap Component	Description of State Approach
<p>5. Diagnostic Reviews and Classifications</p>	<p><u>Schools and Districts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary designations are based on performance on state indicators, performance index, and AYP. The possible school and district classifications are (Ohio Department of Education, 2011g, p. 7): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excellent or Effective – Met 94%–100% of indicators or scored 100–120 on performance index, and met or not met AYP designation ○ Effective or Continuous Improvement – Met 75%–93.9% of indicators or scored 90–99.9 on performance index, and met or not met AYP designation ○ Continuous Improvement – Met 0%–74.9% of indicators or scored 0–89.9 on performance index, and met AYP designation OR met 50%–74.9% of indicators or scored 80–89.9 on performance index, and not met AYP designation ○ Academic Watch – Met 31%–49.9% of indicators or scored 70–79.9 on performance index, and not met AYP designation ○ Academic Emergency – Met 0%–30.9% of indicators and scored 0–69.9 on performance index, and not met AYP designation • Final designations are based on preliminary designations and value-added measure. The possible school and district classifications are (Ohio Department of Education, 2011g, p. 7): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excellent with Distinction – Preliminary designation of Excellent and above-expected growth for at least two consecutive years ○ Effective – Preliminary designation of Excellent and below-expected growth for at least three consecutive years OR preliminary designation of Continuous Improvement and above-expected growth for at least two consecutive years ○ Excellent – Preliminary designation of Effective and above-expected growth for at least two consecutive years ○ Continuous Improvement – Preliminary designation of Effective and below-expected growth for at least three consecutive years OR preliminary designation of Academic Watch and above-expected growth for at least two consecutive years ○ Academic Watch – Preliminary designation of Continuous Improvement and below-expected growth for at least three consecutive years OR preliminary designation of Academic Emergency and above-expected growth for at least two consecutive years ○ Academic Emergency – Preliminary designation of Academic Watch or Academic Emergency and below-expected growth for at least three consecutive years

Roadmap Component	Description of State Approach
5. Diagnostic Reviews and Classifications (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ohio School Improvement Diagnostic Review teams conduct on-site reviews, issue diagnostic review reports to schools, and work with schools and districts to provide follow-up support as a part of the larger Ohio Improvement Process (see below). • Schools’ practices are compared with practices of high-performing Ohio schools: Alignment of Standards, Instructional Practice, Environment and Climate, System of Leadership, Professional Development, and Data-Driven Decisions (Ohio Department of Education, 2011f). • In June 2011, the Ohio legislature, as a part of the state budget bill, enacted new consequences for low performance. Schools will be ranked according their Performance Index, and the bottom 5% for three consecutive years will be targeted for intervention, including closure, layoff and replacement of whole staff, conversion to charters, or operations management relinquished to another entity (Bloom, 2011).
6. Supports and Interventions	<p><u>Schools and Districts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and districts that fail to make AYP for two consecutive years are required to create school and district improvement plans that at a minimum (Ohio Department of Education, 2011a): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Incorporate scientifically based research strategies ○ Identify actions for improving the academic achievement of participating children ○ Address the professional development needs of the instructional staff and committing not less than 10% of the district’s Title I allocation for professional development for each fiscal year. ○ Specify measurable achievement goals for each of the subgroups identified in disaggregated data ○ Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools and the specific academic problems of low achieving students ○ Incorporate, as appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during an extension of the school year ○ Specify the responsibilities of the district and the state, including technical assistance to be provided ○ Identify strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school

Roadmap Component	Description of State Approach
<p>6. Supports and Interventions (continued)</p>	<p><u>Schools and Districts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2008, Ohio’s Differentiated Accountability Plan was approved by the U.S. Department of Education, which targets varied supports and interventions to schools and districts based on more nuanced accountability determinations (U.S. Department of Education, 2008): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Low support</u> means the district (if in district improvement) and all the buildings in improvement status were identified in less than 20% of the AYP measures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Requirements:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public school choice required for all identified Title I-funded buildings ▪ Supplemental Educational Services required for all Title I-funded buildings identified and failing to make AYP for three or more years ▪ State to notify parents that the district is identified as a low-support district ▪ Must use the state’s Decision Framework to create district and building needs assessments ▪ Must develop district- and building-focused improvement plans using state’s planning guidance ▪ Ten percent of Title I funds directed to Professional Development—at the building and/or district level, as appropriate ▪ Annual measurable objectives for each affected disaggregated group ▪ Additionally, a district and building may choose to develop and implement a District Leadership Team (DLT) and Building Leadership Teams (BLTs) that conduct business in accordance with the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council framework ○ <u>Medium support</u> means the district (if in district improvement) and all buildings in improvement status were identified in 20%–29% of the AYP measures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Requirements:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All low-support requirements, plus... ▪ Must develop a DLT and BLTs that conduct business in accordance with the OLAC framework ▪ Annual measurable objectives for each affected disaggregated group ○ <u>High support</u> means the district (if in district improvement) and all buildings in improvement status were identified in more than 30% of the AYP measures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Requirements:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All low- and medium-support requirements, plus... ▪ On-site review and follow-up by the State Diagnostic Team as selected by the state ○ Additional support and intervention items are available for medium- and high-support districts and schools

Roadmap Component	Description of State Approach
7. Continuous Improvement	<p><u>Schools and Districts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) outlines a four-step process through which continuous improvement of schools and districts should occur. OIP steps, as described by ODE, consist of the following: “(1) use data to identify areas of greatest need; (2) develop a focused plan with a limited number of goals and strategies targeted at instructional practice and student performance; (3) implement and monitor; and (4) evaluate the effectiveness of the improvement process in changing instructional practice and student performance” (Ohio Department of Education, 2011d). <p><u>Overall System:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No information was found on state-level efforts to continually evaluate and improve the overall accountability system.

State Snapshot

Wisconsin and Ohio public school enrollment in 2009–10.

	Enrollment					
	US + DC Public Schools, 2009–10		Wisconsin Public Schools, 2009–10		Ohio Public Schools, 2009–10	
Total Number of Operational Schools	98,817		2,242		3,796	
Total Number of Students	49,373,307		872,436		1,764,297	
Student Enrollment by Gender	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students
Male	25,058,982	51.4	449,894	51.6	870,039	51.4
Female	23,712,836	48.6	422,542	48.4	821,783	48.6
Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students
American Indian/Alaska Native students	588,507	1.2	13,045	1.5	2,485	0.1
Asian/Pacific Islanders	2,465,167	5.1	32,151	3.7	29,430	1.7

Black students	8,197,317	16.8	91,069	10.4	287,747	17.0
Hispanic students	10,796,257	22.1	73,472	8.4	50,753	3.0
White students	26,393,240	54.1	662,699	76.0	1,321,407	78.1
Students claiming two of more races	335,350	0.7				0.0
Students in Special Programs	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students
Eligible for free or reduced-price lunch	22,423,407	45.4	323,634	37.1	710,381	40.3
Limited English proficiency (English language learner)	4,723,926	9.6	45,168	5.2	37,478	2.1
Individualized education program	6,450,858	13.1	125,503	14.4	263,394	14.9
Student Enrollment by Geographic Locale	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students
City	14,431,591	29.4	239,745	27.5	352,878	20.0
Rural	11,933,156	24.3	243,543	27.9	467,440	26.5
Suburb	16,870,809	34.3	208,010	23.8	696,013	39.5
Town	5,900,330	12.0	181,023	20.8	245,984	14.0
Number of Schools by Geographic Locale	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools
City	26,101	26.2	546	24.3	865	22.6
Rural	32,273	32.4	873	38.8	1,118	29.3
Suburb	27,195	27.3	401	17.8	1,276	33.4
Town	14,158	14.2	430	19.1	560	14.7

Source: National Center for Education Statistics (n.d.).

Additional Resources

- Achieve. (2010). *On the road to implementation* [Web page]. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from http://www.achieve.org/achievingcommoncore_implementation
- Klau, K., Auty, W., & Roschewski, P. (2010). *Key elements for educational accountability models in transition: A guide for policymakers*. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2010/Key_Elements_for_Accountability_2010.pdf
- Perie, M., Park, J., & Klau, K. (2007). *Key elements for educational accountability models*. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2007/Key_elements_for_educational_2007.pdf
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2009). *The next generation of school accountability: A blueprint for raising high school achievement and graduation rates in SREB states*. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from http://publications.sreb.org/2009/09V17_Blueprint_Highschools.pdf
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2008). *America's dynamic workforce*. Retrieved September 20, 2011, from <http://www.dol.gov/asp/archive/reports/Workforce2008/ADW2008.pdf>

References

- Bloom, M. (2011, August 4) *For the first time, Ohio public schools face closure for poor performance*. State Impact at NPR.org. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://stateimpact.npr.org/ohio/2011/08/04/for-the-first-time-ohio-public-schools-face-closure-for-poor-performance/>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011). *Roadmap for next-generation state accountability systems*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.ccsso.org/documents/Roadmap.pdf>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2006a). *Ohio achievement tests grade 3 – 8: Performance level descriptors*. Retrieved November 1, 2011 from <http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=222&ContentID=19484&Content=108244>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2006b). *Ohio graduation tests: Performance level descriptors*. Retrieved November 1, 2011 from <http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=216&ContentID=4347&Content=108225>

- Ohio Department of Education. (2010). *Testing: Kindergarten Reading Assessment – Literacy (KRA–L)*. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=1366&ContentID=3930&Content=88588>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011a). *Accountability: Accountability and local report card frequently asked questions (FAQ)*. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=1&ContentID=46854&Content=110534>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011b). *Accountability: State/local report card* [Web page]. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEPrimary.aspx?Page=2&TopicID=1868&TopicRelationID=115>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011c). *Ohio achievement assessments grade 3–8: Family report interpretive guide*. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=222&ContentID=17597&Content=108240>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011d). *Ohio improvement process: Online Ohio improvement process resource*. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://staging.learningpt.org/greatlakeseast/OIP/index2.php>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011e). *Ohio report cards*. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.reportcard.ohio.gov>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011f). *School Improvement Diagnostic Review*. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=586>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011g). *State/local report card; district example*. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/reportcardfiles/2010-2011/DIST/045245.pdf>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011h). *Testing: Ohio achievement assessment results*. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://www.education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=222&ContentID=15606&Content=108759>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011i). *Teaching: Revised academic content standards and model curriculum development* [Web page]. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=1696&ContentID=83819&Content=105524>

- Ohio Department of Education. (2011j). *Teaching: Science* (Content standards). Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEPrimary.aspx?Page=2&TopicID=1706&TopicRelationID=1705>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011k). *Teaching: Social studies* (Content standards). Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEPrimary.aspx?Page=2&TopicID=1704&TopicRelationID=1706>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Common core of data: Public elementary/secondary school universe survey data* [Web page]. Washington; DC. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/pubschuniv.asp>
- Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers. (2011). *PARCC States* [Web page]. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://www.parcconline.org/parcc-states>
- Route 21. (n.d.). *Ohio assessment*. Retrieved November 1, 2011 from http://route21.p21.org/?option=com_content&view=article&id=221&Itemid=295
- State of Washington. (n.d.). Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://www.k12.wa.us/smarter/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2008). Ohio: Differentiated Accountability Plan, June 26, 2008. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/differentiatedaccountability/dapstates.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Approved state accountability plans: Ohio*. Retrieved September 21, 2011, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/ohcsa.pdf>