

1 **A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) – Subpart 4**
2

3 v. **Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))**

- 4 a. **Describe the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools**
5 **in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA,**
6 **including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State’s**
7 **accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that**
8 **each state must comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect**
9 **to accountability for charter schools.**

10
11 Ohio’s approach to annual meaningful differentiation is based on the state’s accountability
12 system components described earlier in this section, which apply to all public schools and
13 districts — including community (charter) schools. This aligned system uses multiple
14 measures to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement. *(Note: If Ohio law is*
15 *adjusted to alter the accountability system, a commensurate change would be made to the*
16 *state’s system for meaningful differentiation.)*

17 In Ohio, schools and districts receive up to 10 *measure* grades, which are combined into six
18 *component* grades — Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation, Gap Closing, K-3
19 Literacy and Prepared for Success. The six components then are aggregated to produce one
20 *overall summative letter grade* ranging from A to F. Appendix F includes detailed
21 technical documents showing how each measure grade is calculated and the grade scale that
22 provides meaningful differentiation between schools that earn the top grades of A versus
23 those with other levels of performance. Another technical document in the appendix
24 explains how the measures are combined to get the component grades and how the
25 components are combined to produce the summative grade.

- 26 b. **Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State’s system of annual meaningful**
27 **differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic,**
28 **Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight**
29 **individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or**
30 **Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.**

31
32 Each measure and component discussed above (and in the Appendix) is included in the
33 summative rating. Some measures and components are weighted more heavily and thus
34 contribute more to the summative rating calculation.

- 35
36 • **Achievement Component – 20 percent:** The Achievement component is made up of
37 two measures — Indicators Met and the Performance Index. The Performance Index
38 measure makes up 75 percent of the Achievement component and includes the
39 participation requirement used to comply with the federal accountability performance
40 requirements. The Indicators Met measure accounts for 25 percent of the Achievement
41 component. The additional measure of school quality and student success will be
42 included in the Indicators Met measure.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

- Academic Progress Component – 20 percent: State regulations require the Achievement component grade and the Progress component grade to be weighted equally in the amount they contribute to the overall summative grade.
- Graduation Rate Component – 15 percent: Within the Graduation Rate component, the four-year cohort rate is weighted at 60 percent and the five-year cohort rate weighted at 40 percent.
- Gap Closing, K-3 Literacy Improvement and Prepared for Success Components – 15 percent each.

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate and Progress in Achievement of English Language Proficiency through the measure grades and component grades contribute more than half of the weight toward the overall summative rating. The Performance Index measure makes up 75 percent of the Achievement component and includes the participation requirement used to comply with the federal accountability performance requirements. The additional measure of school quality and student success will be included in the Indicators Met measure, which accounts for 25 percent of the Achievement component. The overall or ‘all students’ Value-Added measure contributes 55 percent toward the Progress component.

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

In cases where a school or district has all six components, the Achievement and Progress components are weighted to contribute 20 percent each to the summative grade with the other four components: Graduation, Gap Closing, K-3 Literacy and Prepared for Success weighted at 15 percent each. In cases where a school or district has fewer than six components, (e.g., an elementary school that has no Graduation and no Prepared for Success components), the remaining components are weighted so that they contribute to the summative grade in the same proportion as when all six exist.

66
67

The table below (and in the Appendix) summarizes the graded components and their relative contribution to the summative grade:

| Graded Component | Summative Weighting |
|--|----------------------------|
| Achievement (Performance Index and Indicators Met) | 20% |
| Academic Progress | 20% |
| Graduation Rate (four-year and five-year) | 15% |
| Gap Closing | 15% |
| K-3 Literacy Improvement | 15% |
| Prepared for Success | 15% |

68
69

70
71
72
73
74

- c. **If the States uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a. above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (e.g., P-2 schools), describe the different methodology, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.**

75 Ohio designed its comprehensive accountability system specifically to ensure that no school will
76 have a report card without a final summative letter grade. Ohio has five variations from the
77 meaningful differentiation approach described in 4.v.a. above.

- 78
79 1. *Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the state's academic assessment system (e.g.,*
80 *preK-2 schools), although the state is not required to administer a standardized assessment to*
81 *meet this requirement;*

82
83 Some schools have no grade levels assessed under the state's academic assessment system. These
84 schools are included in the accountability system. Schools that serve at least two grades between
85 kindergarten and second grade (e.g., K-1, K-2 or 1-2) will receive a K-3 Literacy Component
86 grade, which will be used as one piece in the summative rating. Schools with a single grade
87 served (e.g., a single grade kindergarten building or a school that serves only first grade students)
88 can be rated on the gifted indicator (within the Indicators Met measure), as that measure includes
89 gifted identification and service data. Single-grade schools also will have the new chronic
90 absenteeism indicator (as part of the Indicators Met measure), as that element is calculated using
91 any students with a grade of K-12.

- 92 2. *Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., preK-12 schools);*

93
94 Some schools have variant grade configurations. Schools with a single grade served (e.g., a
95 single-grade kindergarten building or a school that serves only first grade students) can be rated
96 on the gifted indicator (within the Indicators Met measure), as that measure includes gifted
97 identification and service data. Single-grade schools also will have the new chronic absenteeism
98 indicator (as part of the Indicators Met measure) as that element is calculated using any students
99 with a grade of kindergarten-12. Schools that serve more than one grade may have multiple
100 measures based on the grades they serve.

- 101 3. *Small schools in which the total number of students who can be included in any indicator under*
102 *34 C.F.R. § 200.14 is less than the minimum number of students established by the state under 34*
103 *C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1), consistent with a state's uniform procedures for averaging data under 34*
104 *C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable;*

105
106 Given the size and configuration of districts in the state, Ohio almost never has a situation where
107 so few students are attending a school that no grades are calculated for any measure or
108 component. The state has several policies and laws that work together to ensure that schools are
109 large enough to earn at least one letter grade and thus would have a final summative rating.

110 For most measures or components (including Indicators Met, Performance Index, Four-year and
111 Five-year Graduation Rate and Prepared for Success), a grade is calculated if a school has at least
112 10 accountable students with data reported. Ohio's new chronic absenteeism measure also will be
113 calculated for all schools with at least 10 accountable students in any grade(s) with data.

114 Ohio is proposing in this state plan to reduce the "N size" for subgroups to be evaluated for the
115 Gap Closing component specifically to ensure that more schools have evaluated groups. In total,

116 using a small “N size” works to ensure that there are almost no cases where a school is open with
117 so few students that it does not have any graded measures or components.

118 The Ohio Department of Education’s legal counsel reviews all requests by traditional school
119 districts to open a new “school.” In the course of this review, it considers whether the school truly
120 is operating as a school versus being a “program” and examines the new entity’s proposed
121 enrollment numbers to ensure that the school is large enough to be counted in the accountability
122 system.

123 For community (charter) schools, [Ohio Revised Code Section 3314.03\(A\)\(11\)\(a\)](#) (see Appendix)
124 requires all community school contracts to include a provision stating that the school will provide
125 learning opportunities to a minimum of 25 students. This is well over the 10 students needed to
126 receive letter grades on the report card. Community school sponsors are responsible for ensuring
127 that all schools meet the minimum enrollment required to operate and if a school does not have at
128 least 25 students enrolled, they must close the school.

- 129 4. *Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative*
130 *programming in alternative educational settings – including students enrolled in dropout*
131 *recovery schools; students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children,*
132 *including juvenile justice facilities; students enrolled in State public schools for the deaf or blind;*
133 *and recently arrived English learners enrolled in public schools for newcomer students);*
134

135 Ohio has accountability rules to ensure that students who attend specialized schools are included
136 in the state’s accountability system and are treated the same as any other public school student.

137 **Special Student Populations:** For accountability purposes, Ohio does not differentiate between
138 public schools that serve special populations of students and those that serve traditional children.
139 For example, some districts place newly arrived English learners in a separate building to make it
140 easier to provide comprehensive English learner services, but those schools are treated just like
141 any other building operated by the district when it comes to the accountability system.

142 Some community (charter) schools have charters to serve students with significant disabilities, for
143 example a school whose charter indicates it will serve children with the most severe forms of
144 autism. These schools are treated just like any other public school and receive a report card with
145 the same measures, components and summative grade as any other school.

146 **Students Served Outside a District:** Ohio also ensures accountability for all students by
147 requiring the resident district to maintain accountability for each student in situations where he or
148 she is attending school elsewhere because of a contract or cooperative agreement. For example,
149 many districts participate in cooperative programs where they partner with their local county
150 board of developmental disabilities to provide comprehensive services to their students with the
151 most significant cognitive disabilities. In those cases, each sending district is responsible for the
152 achievement and progress of its students and they are included in their resident district’s report
153 card calculations.

154 **State Agency Schools:** At the state level, the Ohio State School for the Blind and the Ohio
155 School for the Deaf report the same student-level data that all other public districts report.
156 Similarly, Ohio’s Department of Youth Services operates schools for Ohio’s incarcerated youth
157 and reports data about the students it serves.

158 **Dropout Prevention and Recovery Community (Charter) Schools:** There is one place where
159 accountability is different. Community schools that serve a majority of their students through
160 dropout prevention and recovery programs receive Ohio’s Dropout Prevention and Recovery
161 (DOPR) Report Card. These report cards, approved as part of Ohio’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver
162 application, include four graded components: Graduation, Academic Achievement, Gap Closing
163 and Progress. Additionally, Student Postsecondary Outcomes is a reported category on the report
164 card.

- 165 • The *Graduation* component separately measures the percentage of students who
166 graduate within four, five, six, seven or eight years of entering the ninth grade in five
167 measure ratings. The numerators and denominators from each of the five rates are be
168 combined to create the graduation component rating.
- 169 • The *Academic Achievement* component measures the percentage of students who pass
170 all five Ohio graduation tests by the time they reach the 12th grade or by the time they
171 are within three months of turning age 22.
- 172 • The *Gap Closing* component measures how well a school is narrowing gaps in
173 reading, math and graduation rates among students identified in up to 10 federally
174 identified student groups. This component uses the same calculation used for
175 traditional schools and districts, but the scale for each rating is different. English
176 learners’ progress toward achieving English language proficiency will be included in
177 the Gap Closing component.
- 178 • The *Academic Progress* component measures the average annual gain made by the
179 students in reading and math using the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress
180 (MAP) assessment.
- 181 • The *Student Postsecondary Outcomes* component is a report-only measure that
182 provides additional outcome data relevant to the college and career readiness of
183 students enrolled in dropout recovery schools.

184 Rather than A-F letter grades, Dropout Prevention and Recovery schools have meaningful
185 differentiation by receiving one of the following ratings: Exceeds Standards, Meets Standards or
186 Does Not Meet Standards. Each component is assigned points based upon the extent to which the
187 standards and benchmarks are met or not met. A final overall rating is assigned based on the
188 percentage of points earned. The Graduation component and the overall rating will be used to
189 identify schools for comprehensive support.

- 190 5. *Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a state’s uniform*
191 *procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable, for at least one*
192 *indicator (e.g., a newly opened high school that has not yet graduated its first cohort for*
193 *students).*

194 Ohio’s accountability system includes multiple measures that are calculated using one year of
195 academic data. Newly opened schools with a single year of data will still receive report cards that
196 include applicable academic measures — the Academic Achievement indicator (Performance
197 Index and Indicators Met) and Chronic Absenteeism.

198
199 **vi. Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))**

200 Stakeholders urged use of accountability measures on Ohio’s School Report Card (such as the
201 Value-Added measure) as gauges for continuous improvement — not as punitive labels. Ohio
202 celebrates success by awarding several categories of rewards. Also, Ohio identifies various types
203 of schools as Priority, Focus and Watch as follows:

- 204 • Priority schools (equivalent to federal Comprehensive Support and Improvement
205 schools): The lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I served schools.
- 206 • Focus schools (equivalent to federal Targeted Support and Improvement schools):
207 Schools that struggle with large achievement gaps in student performance and
208 graduation rates, as required by ESEA.
- 209 • Watch schools (an Ohio-specific designation): Schools that struggle with student
210 subgroups and demonstrate low achievement.

211 The state also establishes an Academic Distress Commission under certain conditions to support
212 school districts that have a three-year history of low performance on Ohio’s School Report Cards.

213 Going forward, and leveraging ESSA, Ohio will ensure that the criteria for identifying
214 Priority, Focus and Watch schools fully aligns with Ohio’s School Report Card
215 measures. These measures are clearly identified and aligned to the entrance and exit
216 criteria so that schools can develop plans to specifically address the performance
217 metrics to exit the identification status. The Decision Framework will be aligned to the
218 report card so that the needs assessment that informs the improvement plan is based on
219 the metrics that establish the entrance and exit criteria.

220 The Department will ensure identification criteria aligned to report card measures and state
221 requirements for identifying struggling districts and schools (e.g., Academic Distress
222 Commissions and state Watch districts and schools with subgroup gaps). Entrance and exit
223 criteria will be understandable and clearly linked to improvement planning requirements.

- 224 a. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State’s methodology**
225 **for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving**
226 **Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement.**
227

228 Ohio will refer to comprehensive support and improvement schools as “Priority Schools” in
229 order to maintain continuity with prior period designations. Ohio will base criteria for
230 identifying not less than the lowest-performing 5 percent of all schools receiving Title I,
231 Part A funds using the report card’s overall grade methodology (See Section XX above).
232 Schools will be identified every three years.
233

- 234 b. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe the State’s methodology
235 for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or
236 more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement.

237
238 Ohio will identify high schools with graduation rates of 67 percent or less using the state’s
239 four-year graduation rate calculation.

- 240
241 c. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe the methodology by
242 which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds
243 that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)
244 (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own,
245 would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s
246 methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the
247 statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years.

248
249 Beginning with the update that will take place after the 2020-2021 school year, Ohio will
250 identify schools that previously were identified for targeted support because one or more
251 student subgroups was performing at a level similar to the lowest 5 percent of schools
252 (based on individual subgroup performance), and the subgroup did not show improvement
253 by the end of the third year after being identified for targeted support.

- 254
255 d. **Year of Identification.** Provide, for each type of schools identified for comprehensive
256 support and improvement, the year in which the State will first identify such schools
257 and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note
258 that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

259 During the transition to ESSA (from ESEA), Ohio will maintain its current Priority school
260 list through the 2017-2018 school year and generate a new Priority list based on ESSA
261 accountability measures at the end of the 2017-2018 school year. The list will be updated
262 every three years (starting with the end of the 2020-2021 school year.) Schools meeting exit
263 criteria will be removed from lists annually. Beginning with the update that will take place
264 at the end of the 2020-2021 school year, Ohio will identify schools for comprehensive
265 support if they originally were identified for targeted support because one or more student
266 subgroups was performing at a level similar to the lowest 5 percent of schools and the
267 subgroup’s performance did not improve in the three years allotted.

- 268
269 e. **Targeted Support and Improvement.** Describe the State’s methodology for annually
270 identifying any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of
271 students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful
272 differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent
273 underperformance. (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii)*)

274 Ohio will refer to targeted support and improvement schools as “Focus” schools in order to
275 maintain continuity with prior period designations. As was described above, each of the 10

276 federally required subgroups will have a Performance Index score calculated and points
277 will be earned in the Gap Closing component based on how that subgroup performs in
278 English language arts and math. The state will calculate the average performance for each
279 subgroup using just the data from the schools identified as Priority (comprehensive)
280 schools to obtain a standard against which all other schools' subgroups will be compared.
281 Other schools with subgroups that fall below that average for two or more years will be
282 identified as Focus schools at the end of the 2017-2018 school year. For example, the
283 calculation will average the English language arts and math performance of the economic
284 disadvantages subgroup using just the economic disadvantages data from all Priority
285 schools. That average (e.g., 35.2 percent) will be used as the standard against which the
286 economic disadvantaged subgroup from all other schools will be compared. If a school has
287 an economic disadvantaged subgroup with two consecutive years where its performance is
288 below 35.2 percent, it will be deemed to have a "consistently underperforming" subgroup
289 and will enter Focus status. The Department also will identify Focus schools (targeted
290 support) based on other criteria applied to various report card measures, which will be
291 reviewed annually:

- 292 • Schools that earn grades of D's or F's for the Gap Closing report card component
293 for two consecutive years;
- 294 • Schools that have one or more student subgroups that fail to meet specific locally
295 determined improvement goals for three consecutive years;
- 296 • Schools that do not meet multiple student subgroup performance benchmarks; and
297 • Schools identified for the first time as having one or more student subgroups
298 performing at a level similar to the lowest 5 percent of schools (based on individual
299 subgroup performance).

300
301 **f. Additional Targeted Support. Describe the State's methodology for identifying**
302 **schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification**
303 **under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA**
304 **section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such**
305 **schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools.**
306 **(ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))**

307 During the transition to ESSA, Ohio will maintain its current Focus school list through the
308 2017-2018 school year and generate a new Focus list based on ESSA accountability
309 measures at the end of the 2017-2018 school year. The list will be updated every three
310 years (at the end of the 2020-2021 school year). Schools meeting exit criteria will be
311 removed from lists annually. For the list created at the end of the 2017-2018 school year, a
312 school will be identified for targeted support (Focus school) if it has one or more student
313 subgroups performing at a level similar to the lowest 5 percent of schools (based on
314 individual subgroup performance). If a school continues to have one or more student
315 subgroups performing at a level similar to the lowest 5 percent of schools at the time the list
316 is updated after the 2020-2021 school year, it will have its level of support escalated and
317 will be identified for comprehensive support as is explained above.

318
319 **g. Additional Statewide Categories of Schools. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to**
320 **include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.**
321

322 Ohio includes one additional statewide category of schools.

323 **Watch Schools:** Watch schools are those schools that struggle to meet the needs of one or
324 more student subgroups as outlined in state law. Watch schools are identified using the
325 provisions enacted in section 3317.40 of the Ohio Revised Code. These are Title I or non-
326 Title I schools that receive state funding designated to service one of four specific
327 subgroups (students with disabilities, English learners, gifted and economically
328 disadvantaged) and one or more of those funded subgroups did not show satisfactory
329 progress and achievement. This list is updated annually and the two most recent years of
330 data are used to identify schools as Watch schools.

331 To identify schools as Watch schools, each subgroup is evaluated separately for
332 achievement and progress. For a school to be identified, a funded subgroup in the school
333 must be failing to make satisfactory achievement AND failing to make satisfactory
334 progress. If the subgroup makes either satisfactory achievement OR satisfactory progress
335 toward improving, the school is not identified as a Watch school. Watch school criteria are
336 based on Ohio law and may be updated by the State Board of Education through the
337 administrative rule-making process.
338

339 **vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)): Describe how the**
340 **State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide**
341 **mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability**
342 **system.**

343 Ohio incorporates student participation requirements into multiple measures in its
344 accountability system.

- 345 • The Performance Index score is calculated based on the number of tests that should have
346 been taken versus using just the tests that had actual scores reported. Per state law, a
347 school or district earns zero points for every test not taken. Untested students lower the
348 Performance Index score compared to what it would otherwise be with 100 percent
349 participation. Since the letter grade is assigned based on the percent of possible points
350 earned, a school or district with untested students can see its grade drop by one or even
351 two levels if not enough students participate.
- 352 • The state's Gap Closing measure includes a participation rate calculation that factors into
353 the final letter grade issued for each school and district. This calculation is done
354 separately for English language arts and math for each of the 10 graded subgroups
355 identified in Section B of this state plan. If even one subgroup fails to meet the 95 percent
356 participation rate, the final AMO grade is reduced by one level. Even in cases where the
357 initial grade is an F, points are deducted and the school or district falls deeper into the F
358 range.

359
360
361
362
363
364

365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379

380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401

viii. **Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement** (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))

h. **Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

The exit criteria for the Priority schools (comprehensive support) will be based on the revised report card measures, including the revised Gap Closing measure, which includes achievement, progress and graduation rate data for all required subgroups. The maximum time frame for the improvement requirements is four years. The exit criteria include:

- School performance is higher than the lowest 5 percent of schools as determined by the overall report card grade for two consecutive years;
- The school earns a four-year graduation rate of better than 67 percent for two consecutive school years; and
- No student subgroups are performing at a level similar to the lowest 5 percent of schools (based on individual subgroup performance).

i. **Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support.** Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

The exit criteria for the Focus schools (targeted support) will be based on the revised report card measures, including the revised Gap Closing measure, which includes achievement, progress and graduation rate data of all required subgroups. The maximum time frame for the improvement requirements is four years. The exit criteria include:

- The school or district earns an overall grade of C or better as determined by the report card grade, and earns a C or better for Gap Closing; and
- The school meets subgroup performance goals per state requirements.

j. **More Rigorous Interventions.** Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

For those districts that have been identified as needing more rigorous interventions because they fail to meet the state’s exit criteria within four years, the state will provide more direct support.

Regional Service Provider Supports: Direct support may come from the educational service center in the form of targeted curriculum alignment, instructional strategy supports, assistance with the use of formative assessment or professional development for teachers and leaders. The state support team also may be required to provide support around early childhood, special education, improvement processes and collaborative support structures.

402 Additional directed support may come from the information technology centers in the form
403 of help developing protocols to ensure data quality at the local level. Support from these
404 three entities (ESCs, SSTs and ITCs) will be coordinated to provide the best service to
405 struggling districts. Reporting requirements at this level also would include quarterly
406 expenditure reporting to ensure spending is on target with the identified plan and strategies.
407

408 **Peer-to-Peer Networks:** District leadership and school leadership teams will be
409 purposefully connected to a peer-to-peer network to build opportunities to learn from other
410 districts that have moved through particular struggles and can provide guidance about
411 various approaches to impact implementation around particular identified areas of need.
412

413 **Comprehensive District Review:** These districts also will participate in a comprehensive
414 district review. This deeper analysis of system functions within the district and buildings,
415 together with the State Diagnostic Review (SIDR), is designed to help schools and districts
416 improve student performance by analyzing current practices against effective evidence- and
417 research-based practices. There is a focus on identifying areas of strength and areas needing
418 improvement, as well as aligning evidence and research-based practices. The SIDR is
419 grounded in what is known about high-performing schools, with an emphasis on what has
420 been learned from Ohio's Schools of Promise.
421

422 **Other Interventions:** Ohio's accountability system has other more rigorous interventions
423 built into state law. Districts that have multiple years of poor performance may be subject
424 to an Academic Distress Commission. Community schools may be subject to school
425 closure requirements.
426

427 Schools failing to exit Priority and Focus status within four years may be subject to
428 additional Department oversight on federal expenditures.

429 Schools that do not make significant progress may be subject to more rigorous
430 interventions such as required "onsite review," in-depth resource allocation reviews, more
431 rigorous requirements on tiers of approved evidence-based strategies and required direct
432 student services.
433

- 434 **k. Resource Allocation Review. Describe how the State will periodically review resource**
435 **allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a**
436 **significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted**
437 **support and improvement.**
438

439 At the state level, Ohio will conduct periodic resource reviews. These reviews will be
440 focused on the districts that are most in need of support based on the district continuum of
441 supports. Ohio has been collecting and reporting school-level expenditure data for many
442 years. This information can be found on each district's and school's report card including a
443 specific chart that examines spending and performance. Ohio will develop a review process
444 for resource allocation, analyze data to determine ranges of acceptable allocations and use

445 this information to inform needs assessments, improvement planning, funding allocations
446 and models of funding, and expenditure patterns.

447 The state funding formula directs additional funds to districts for students with disabilities,
448 limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, gifted students,
449 and K-3 students.

450
451 Annually, the state reviews expenditure data from LEAs by fund, function and object of
452 expense. This data can inform school improvement activities and identify areas within an
453 LEA to focus resources.

454
455 **1. Technical Assistance. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each**
456 **LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for**
457 **comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.**

458 Ohio has a differentiated system of technical assistance based on the district continuum of
459 supports. This system forms the foundation for the technical assistance the state will
460 provide to each district serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified as
461 Priority or Focus schools.

462 **An Evidence-Based School Improvement System**

463 Stakeholders had a lot to say about Ohio’s school improvement system. They want
464 more local control in decision-making as it relates to school improvement planning
465 and see significant opportunity for alignment of initiatives, especially relating to
466 support coming from the state. Stakeholders emphasized the need for a more coherent
467 focus on addressing the needs of students, families and communities in struggling
468 schools. More integrated student supports are needed to help students succeed.

469 Community groups, such as those representing vulnerable student populations, want
470 more of a voice in developing local plans and can serve as a resource in
471 implementation.

472
473 Implementation of an aligned, evidence-based system of continuous improvement requires
474 a suite of tools and resources easily accessed by schools and districts. Plans for additional
475 tools and resources include:

- 476 • Redesigned online planning tool/consolidated grants application, known
477 as the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP);
- 478 • District and school reviews, including training for peer reviewers;
- 479 • Data analysis tools;
- 480 • Resource allocation tool;
- 481 • Equity Index (state Equity Plan);
- 482 • Performance database to support peer-to-peer improvement network.

483
484 Ohio will develop a local engagement toolkit to assist schools and districts in
485 collaborating with their communities to determine priorities for Title I and Title IV funds
486 and set goals for continuous improvement. The toolkit will include strategies in the

487 following areas:

- 488 • How to create a welcoming, inclusive environment for all families;
- 489 • Effective communication;
- 490 • Collaborating to support student success.

491
492 **Regional Support Structures:** Ohio has a robust system of school improvement
493 supports based on a regional system including the state’s educational service
494 centers, state support teams, information technology centers and direct support from
495 the Department and other partners.

496 Ohio’s regional partners and community organizations have close relationships with
497 schools and districts and can build on that expertise and local knowledge when it comes to
498 school improvement. Community organizations are doing significant work in this area and
499 can be valuable partners as the work moves forward. Ohio has pressing concerns that are
500 impacting students and families such as the opioid crisis, homelessness and the needs of
501 students in the juvenile justice system.

502 Schools and districts will be identified for improvement based on federal and state
503 requirements that focus on overall performance and the performance of all subgroups of
504 students.

505 **Ohio Improvement Process:** Ohio will continue to utilize the **Ohio Improvement**
506 **Process (OIP)** as a framework to establish systemic collaborative structures within
507 schools and districts designed to support development and implementation of a
508 strategic improvement plan and focused goals. An updated and expanded Decision
509 Framework will continue to be utilized as the primary data-based needs assessment.

510 Additional information about the OIP can be found at resources #1 at this link.

511 [http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/School-Improvement/Ohio-Improvement-](http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/School-Improvement/Ohio-Improvement-Process/Ohio-Improvement-Process-OIP-Resources-2012)
512 [Process/Ohio-Improvement-Process-OIP-Resources-2012](http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/School-Improvement/Ohio-Improvement-Process/Ohio-Improvement-Process-OIP-Resources-2012). This website will continue
513 to be updated as Ohio’s state plan is implemented.

514
515 Stakeholders consistently identified nonacademic factors as key needs in struggling schools
516 and districts. To assist schools and districts in educating the whole child, especially Ohio’s
517 most vulnerable students, the Department will develop and share information regarding
518 implementation of community learning center models; reducing chronic absenteeism;
519 integrating trauma sensitive approaches in schools; and reducing non-academic barriers
520 through integrated student supports.

521 In order to support a more comprehensive assessment of school needs, the scope of
522 tools, such as the Decision Framework, will expand to add additional focus on
523 nonacademic student supports. To address the integration and coordination of
524 student supports, a site coordinator will be crucial to serve as a nexus for
525 community partners to address integrated student supports. These supports include
526 mental health services, especially in light of the emphasis on chronic absenteeism.
527

528 **Online Evidence-Based Clearinghouse:** To support school and district planning,
529 Ohio will create an **online evidence-based clearinghouse**, leveraging partnerships
530 with the Ohio Education Research Center (OERC) and selected regional and local
531 education agencies. The clearinghouse will provide schools and districts with a broad
532 menu of proven strategies and programs to support local planning, decision-making
533 and implementation. It is the intention to provide a clearinghouse of evidence-based
534 strategies and develop a framework for approval of strategies. This approach,
535 however, would not preclude schools and districts that are capable of independently
536 producing their own evidence of effective interventions (within the guidelines of the
537 ESSA) to do so. Districts and schools may seek and identify or adopt practices or
538 strategies from other sources as long as they meet the requirement of the evidence-
539 based framework. As such, if the district has ongoing practices it would like to
540 continue to apply as evidence-based practices, then the district would need to show
541 that the practices meet the evidence-based criteria. Local partners are important to
542 developing innovative practices and populating the clearinghouse based on the
543 framework.

544 Moving forward, Ohio will build on the strengths of this regional system by
545 developing and implementing an **evidence-based system** of improvement that
546 provides tools and support for schools and districts by leveraging numerous
547 partnerships, including partnerships with educational service centers, state support
548 teams and information technology centers.

549 According to ESSA, evidence-based means an activity, strategy or intervention that
550 demonstrates a statistically significant effect on student outcomes. ESSA defines four tiers
551 of evidence, as follows:

- 552 • Level I – strong evidence from an experimental study;
- 553 • Level II – moderate evidence from a quasi-experiment;
- 554 • Level III – promising evidence from a correlational study with control for
555 selection bias;
- 556 • Level IV – activities, strategies or interventions that demonstrate quality
557 through research or program evaluation; including ongoing efforts to
558 evaluate the study.

560 **SEA Research Capacity:** To further support schools and districts with implementing
561 evidence-based strategies, the Department will build its research capacity both
562 internally and with partners to emphasize performance monitoring (rather than just
563 compliance monitoring) and rigorous research to meet the evidence-based
564 requirements. Local action research will be supported by the Department through a
565 variety of partnerships, including working with Proving Ground, a research
566 partnership with the Center for Education Policy Research. This partnership is
567 designed to help schools and districts implement quick turnaround evaluation (Level
568 II: Quasi-Experimental and Level III: Promising) to provide evidence that strategies
569 are meeting evidence-based requirements. This work builds on peer-to-peer networks
570 of schools with similar priority strategies (including addressing Chronic

571 Absenteeism), and is designed to help build long-term capacity for research and
572 evaluation.

573
574 **Peer-to-Peer Improvement Network:** Ohio will create the **Peer-to-Peer**
575 **Improvement Network** encouraging partnerships and opportunities for educators to
576 collaborate across district boundaries, and across subjects that support a well-rounded
577 education, to fashion solutions to common challenges. Peer-to-peer networks can
578 occur in multiple formats: natural or unstructured connections between educators,
579 guided peer-to-peer discussions facilitated (face-to-face and web-based), as well as
580 structured, facilitated peer-to-peer networks.

581 **District Continuum of Support**

582 As part of the overall school improvement system, the state is responsible for approving
583 district improvement plans and plans for Priority schools identified for comprehensive
584 support. Districts have the responsibility of approving plans for Focus schools identified for
585 targeted support.
586

587 Stakeholders recommended the process be less focused on compliance and more focused on
588 quality, evidence-based practices. Partners such as the educational service centers, state
589 support teams and information technology centers have reiterated their willingness and
590 ability to support districts in this work.

591 Ohio has developed a continuum of supports based on federal and state laws and regulations. This
592 continuum ranges from “Independent” support districts that have no specific state-mandated
593 improvement requirements to districts under the oversight of an “Academic Distress
594 Commission,” which is the most intensive school improvement strategy. Districts also may fall
595 into moderate or intensive supports on that continuum.

596 This “differentiated accountability” system contains a range of support levels that are
597 based on a district’s report card grades and the presence in a district of Priority, Focus or
598 Watch schools. These support levels feature specific interventions, supports and
599 monitoring. They recognize districts that are making progress, raising student
600 achievement and closing performance gaps between student subgroups.

601 **Districts under an Academic Distress Commission**

602 Per Ohio law, districts that meet certain performance criteria over an extended period of time are
603 placed under the oversight of an Academic Distress Commission. This commission, which is
604 appointed by the state superintendent of public instruction, in conjunction with the local board of
605 education and local mayor, is tasked with hiring a chief executive officer. The CEO will have
606 operational control over the district and be tasked with working with the local community to
607 develop and implement a district improvement plan.
608

609 **Intensive Support Districts**

610 The Department applies a tiered system of support to Intensive Support districts, with districts at
611 risk of being placed under an academic distress commission receiving the most in-depth supports
612 and assistance. These districts may receive a district review in addition to the supports and

613 assistance provided to all Intensive Support districts. Intensive Support districts receive technical
614 assistance and coaching support delivered through the state’s regional system with a focus on
615 implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process. Intensive Support districts also may be
616 assigned an improvement liaison.

617
618 **Moderate Support Districts**

619 A Moderate Support district with a C or better on its Gap Closing on the previous year’s report
620 card has the flexibility and responsibility to determine its own district improvement plan and its
621 process for improving performance in all buildings except Focus schools. Districts with Focus
622 schools must implement the OIP in those schools. Districts that do not have a C or better on the
623 Gap Closing measure in the previous year will receive supports to implement additional
624 interventions and requirements.

625
626 **Independent Districts**

627 Independent Districts are defined as having no Priority, Focus or Watch schools, and they have
628 no substantial gaps in performance of any student subgroup compared to the same subgroup
629 statewide. The Department grants Independent Districts the highest level of freedom and a
630 minimum amount of oversight.

631
632 Ohio will continue to utilize a continuum of support based on new ESSA requirements and
633 ongoing state law. This continuum will be aligned to Ohio’s School Report Card measures
634 and be used by the regional support system to prioritize supports.

635
636 Several tools and resources are included on this continuum including district reviews, which
637 are district-level on-site performance reviews by third party experts; School Improvement
638 Diagnostic Reviews (SIDRs), which are school-level performance reviews; and
639 improvement liaisons, which are positions designed to provide focus school improvement
640 supports to districts in or at risk of moving in to academic distress.

641
642 The proposed continuum of district supports is as follows:

| Academic Distress Commission | Intensive Support Status | Moderate Support Status | Independent Support Status |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| Districts that are under the Supervision of an Academic Distress Commission | Overall "F" on district Report Card or At least two Priority Schools or A four year graduation rate of less than 67% or An "F" on Gap Closing for two consecutive years | Overall "D" on district Report Card or "D" or "F" on Gap Closing for the two most recent years or At least one Priority, Focus or Watch School | All other districts |

| |
|--|
| Access to OIP Quick Start |
| Option to implement the Career-Pathways model |
| Create a district improvement plan |
| Access to Ohio Leadership Advisory Council resources |
| Access to Technical Assistance |
| Letter outlining support status and implications |
| Implement OIP in Focus and Priority schools and districts* |
| Decision Framework in buildings and districts |
| School Improvement Diagnostic Review |
| Peer to Peer network |
| Target funding based on incentives in competitive process |
| Improvement Liaison** |
| District Review** |

*if Applicable

**Selected by the SEA

643
644
645

646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653

- m. **Additional Optional Action.** If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

Not applicable.

DRAFT