ALLIANCE FOR HIGH QUALITY EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE

March 11, 2020 11:00 A.M.

MEETING SUMMARY

In attendance on phone conference: Andrea Celico, Kathy Powers, Keith Kelly, Norm Potter, Robert Scott, Jessica Voltolini, and Tony Podojil.

Tony Podojil convened the meeting by phone conference at 11:04 a.m. The primary focus of the meeting was to update the committee on the status of the State Report Card Revision process.

I. State Report Card Revision Process- Labeling System/Scales per Report Card component

Tony and Jessica presented an update on the current status related to the state report card reform process. They indicated that they are continuing to work with BASA, OASBO, OSBA and ODE in meetings coordinated by the State Superintendent. In addition, they have continued to meet with representatives from Ohio Excels, the Ohio 8, Fordham, Columbus City and the Gifted Student Association discussing and attempting to formulate a consensus around potential state report card reform.

For the purpose of today's call, the committee gave feedback on the following label revision proposal:

State Report Card - Labeling Revision Proposal

Rationale: Structure the report card reporting requirements and the labeling system to correspond and meet the Federal Requirements pertaining to ESSA.

Labeling Recommendation

Structure the labeling criteria around the three tier ESSA system that requires an approach that provides for a meaningful differentiation to occur amongst district buildings and the identification of the bottom 5% of school buildings. The following is a proposal that utilizes the federal requirements and terminology and meets the ESSA standard.

Tier 1 Independent Buildings

Can be separated into three categories: Exceeds Expectations

Meets Expectations

Approaching Expectations

(could be separated into two categories: Improving or Limited progress)

Tier 2 Focused Support Buildings (Targeted)

Districts that are not making adequate progress in specific sub/group categories in multiple areas.

State provides some support to districts to assist them with addressing subgroup issues in order to improve achievement levels for those subgroups.

Tier 3 Priority Support Buildings

Lowest 5% of districts statewide

Multiple academic needs both in overall measures and subgroup scores

Intensive State Support in terms of resources, personnel and funding. Focus is on improvement strategies and offering support for those districts who have the greatest challenges in terms of socio-economic and diversity characteristics. (This category of districts could replace the current Academic Distress Commission identification process. Title could be changed to Academic Priority Districts.)

The above approach could still provide a five-category system of differentiation and would meet the ESSA requirements for meaningful differentiation. Would allow for an intense focus on the Priority and Target districts in terms of ODE support and assistance without simply labeling these districts failures.

Tony shared that the consensus from both groups is that components should be divided up into at least 4 or 5 sections. Labeling, whichever design is eventually chosen, should make sense and the categories that it's describing must fit the component.

- II. <u>K-3 Literacy Proficient vs Proficiency</u>
- III. Gap Closing Achievement/Progress as a 50/50 measure

IV. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be April 8, 2020 at 11:00 a.m. by phone conference.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.