

Statement of Work

Overview

2013 Local Report Card

The Local Report Card creation, production and PDF publication is a very complicated process, requiring the coordination of extensive data elements, analytical calculations and statistical simulations and evaluations. ODE coordinates the internal EMIS data, which it provides to our vendor, SAS, for the Value-Added calculations, and to Battelle for Kids for the Roster Verification data used for teacher-level Value-Added calculations. While we have coordinated this process for on-time delivery for 7 years, the central key to our success is planning and identifying the requirements and needed changes as close to August and September of the year preceding the publication of the report card. Adhering to this schedule allows us to request data, program and data-check changes to be completed in time for the LRC production. For example any new reporting requirements should be submitted to EMIS nearly a year in advance.

Greatly impacting the Summer 2013 Report Cards are the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver Request and House Bill 555 (HB 555). The ESEA Flexibility Request permits State Educational Agencies (SEAs) flexibility with moving forward with state and local educational reform efforts designed to improve academic achievement and the quality of instruction for all students beyond what was outlined under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. To utilize this flexibility, Ohio submitted and received Conditional Approval for its ESEA Flexibility Request. Necessary to receive Final Approval, the Ohio General Assembly would need to implement changes to its state laws governing the accountability system. Hence, in December, 2012, HB 555 was enacted. In addition to providing the framework for developing phased-in A-F report cards, the bill contains contained provisions evolve the accountability system over the next few years to incorporate new state assessments, include early childhood measures, and develop a separate report card for community schools classified as dropout recovery schools.

New Local Report Card (LRC) Components

HB 555 As Enrolled

<u>Components</u>	<u>Aug 2013</u>	<u>Aug 2014</u>	<u>Component</u>	<u>Aug 2015</u>	<u>Aug 2016 +</u>
Overall Grade	-	-		Calculated	Calculated
Component Grade	-	-		Calculated	Calculated
AMOs	Graded	Graded	Gap Closing	Graded	Graded
Performance Index	Graded	Graded	Achievement	Graded	Graded
Performance Indicators*	Graded	Graded		Graded	Graded
Graduation Rate (4- and 5-year)	Graded	Graded	Grad Rate	Graded	Graded
Value-Added (Overall)	Graded	Graded	Progress	Graded+	Graded+
Value-Added: Gifted	Graded	Graded		Graded	Graded
Value-Added: SWD	Graded	Graded		Graded	Graded
Value-Added: Lowest Quintile	Graded	Graded		Graded	Graded
High School Progress	-	-		-	Graded§
Third Grade Guarantee Progress	-	Graded	K-3 Literacy	Graded	Graded
College Admission Test (Participation rate and non-remediation score)	-	RO	Prep for Success	RO	RO
Dual Enrollment Credits	-	RO		RO	RO
Industry Credentials	-	RO		RO	RO
Honors Diplomas Awarded	-	RO		RO	RO
AP Participation & Score	-	RO		RO	RO
IB Participation & Score	-	RO		RO	RO
College & Career Ready Assess.	-	-	Prep for Success ‡	RO	RO

RO = Report Only

- = Not Included at All

The following is an outline of the LRC process and Roles and Responsibilities.

1. Major Project Tasks

(see Appendix A on pg. 9 for the HB 555 Assignment Table)

Major Activities	Staff Responsibility
Approval of business rules by Senior Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jon Peterson Scholarship • Equivalency rules (for Excellent and Effective) • Letter grading system for A-F components • ESEA gap measures (reading, mathematics and graduation) • JVS/Career Tech Accountability Measures • Dropout Recovery Measures • Data Integrity Policy 	ODE Cabinet
Adoption of Resolution for business rules by State Board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equivalency rules (for Excellent and Effective) • Letter grading system for A-F components • ESEA gap measures (reading, mathematics and graduation) • JVS/Career Tech Accountability Measures • Dropout Recovery Measures 	Board Relations
Public Presentation to House and Senate of new Accountability System	ODE Senior Leaders/Legal Counsel
Chapter 119 hearing of Rules <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equivalency rules (for Excellent and Effective) • Letter grading system for A-F components • ESEA gap measures (reading, mathematics and graduation) • JVS/Career Tech Accountability Measures • Dropout Recovery Measures 	Legal Counsel/Accountability
Approval of administrative rules by the General Assembly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equivalency rules (for Excellent and Effective) • Letter grading system for A-F components • ESEA gap measures (reading, mathematics and graduation) • JVS/Career Tech Accountability Measures • Dropout Recovery Measures 	Legal Counsel/Accountability
Coordination of activities with external vendors	Offices of Policy and Research/Communications/Accountability
Approval of new Accountability System from the U.S. Department of Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESEA gap measures 	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (USDOE)
Special Education Profile Report, and Exceptional Children Supplemental Reporting Processing (required by the U.S. Department of Education)	Offices of Exceptional Children/ Elementary and Secondary Education (USDOE)
Public Meetings for Public Input <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications regarding the new system 	Offices of Accountability/Communications
HB 525 (Cleveland Plan) Monitoring	Offices of Legal/Policy and Research/Legal/Accountability

2. Project Organization

Role	Description	Staff Assigned
Project Sponsor (member of Senior Leadership)	Has ultimate authority over and responsibility for the project, its scope and deliverables	Tina Thomas-Manning (Jeanine Molock)
Project Manager	Develops and maintains the project plan and project schedules, executes project reviews, tracks and disposes of issues and change requests, manages the budget and is responsible for overall quality of the deliverables.	Toni Marshall (on behalf of Marsha Ward)
Project Team	Are responsible for performing the activities necessary for implementation of the project.	Staff in the Offices of: Communications, ITO/Enterprise Application, Data Quality and Governance, Accountability, Policy and Research, Assessment, Exceptional Children, Community Schools, Career Technical Education
Key Stakeholders	Provide expert understanding of state and federal laws and represent the Ohio Department of Education and the Office of Accountability.	State Board of Education, Governor’s Office, Ohio General Assembly, BASA Report Card Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Offices of Community Schools, Exceptional Children, Assessment



3. Project Dependencies

Dependency
Finalization Report Card Template Designs
Final Approval of ESEA Flexibility Request Contingent upon successful submission of ESEA Flexibility Accountability Addendum
Successful Procurement by the Office of Communications of a Designer for Local Report Card (electronic) System
Successful Procurement by the Office of Communications of a Variable Data Publisher (loading actual data on PDF)
State Board Adoption of Rules
Legislative Adoption of Concurrent Resolution for ESEA Flexibility Request Gap Measure
Successful completion by EMIS to update the data structures to include new data elements and provide final report card data
Successful delivery of Value-Added Vendor for the Existing and New Data Elements
Approval of Data Managers to be available to support the quality assurance checks for the components of the local report card.

4. Project Assumptions

Assumption
Results of the final Auditor of the State's Enrollment and Attendance Report will have a very minimal impact on the 2012 and 2013 processing schedule
EMIS Processing Windows (Graduate, October, Special Education Federal Follow-up, and Year-end) will not encounter major issues that result in the periods being delayed
Procurement of external vendors/staff augmentation occur in a timely fashion
Adequate staff are assigned to the critical tasks necessary for report card production
Support and timely feedback pertaining to the finalization of business rules from the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Senior Leadership -Support of State Board of Education -Support of the General Assembly -Support of the U.S. Department of Education -Support of the Governor's Office

5. Project Risks

Potential Risk	Description of Risk	Mitigation
Final Report from the Auditor of the State's Office	Impact on 2011 Report Card Impact on 2012 Report Card Impact on 2013 Report Card	Use the findings and recommendations to guide process for 2013 report cards and beyond. This is supported by the Title I monitoring process completed by the US Department of Education.
Supplemental Reporting Processes	Impact on processing schedule if we fail to adhere to established reporting deadlines	Respond to data reporting issues based on the degree of misreporting. Utilize watermarks on PDF (minimal) and EMIS Corrective Action Plans with progressive sanctions (major)
Staff Constraints	<p>Accountability staff will be developing the business rules, running simulations, developing quality assurance checks and proofing the PDF design and data layout for the 2013 report card while working on the proofing and production of the 2012 report cards (with its associated data checks).</p> <p>IT will be developing new business rules, reporting requirements, and quality assurance checks at the same time the EMIS reporting windows is expected to open.</p> <p>Additionally, IT will need to develop new reports for the display of the new components.</p> <p>Redesign of iLRC (interactive)</p>	<p>Expedite the hiring process for the two open positions</p> <p>Redeploy staff from Policy and Research to support the implementation of the new accountability system</p> <p>Additional staff augmentation, as needed</p> <p>Delayed opening of the Year-End reporting window.</p> <p>Additional staff augmentation, as needed</p> <p>Delayed opening of the Year-End reporting window.</p> <p>Additional staff augmentation, as needed</p>
Development and Finalization of the PDF Template	<p>Will be utilizing an external vendor to design the new PDF template.</p> <p>Will be utilizing an external vendor to handle the variable data publishing of the PDF templates</p>	<p>Senior Leadership (and possible State Board) Approval</p> <p>Redeploy staff from Policy and Accountability to assist with proofing the PDFs</p>
EVAAS' ability to meet current delivery schedule	Impact of new value-added reporting requirements on EVAAS' ability to deliver data on the current 10 day delivery timetable	Extend the delivery of projection data

6. Forward Thinking

Graduation Rate

- As outlined through HB 555, there will be two graduation rate indicators (the four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate, and the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate). However, neither rate fulfills the expectation under the ESEA for SEAs to close gaps in student achievement (reading and mathematics) and graduation rates for the ten federally-approved student groups. Additionally, for the federal graduation rate gap determination, Ohio was approved to meet the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) through either the four- or five- year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

Proposed Solution: Have the state graduation rate measure met by either the four- or five- year graduation rate. Replace the two graduation rate measures with the graduation rate gap measure (as proposed in Ohio's ESEA Flexibility Request).

- As outlined in HB 555 [3301.0711(O)(3)], students may be reassigned to a cohort. This is expressly prohibited by the non-regulatory guidance for the high school graduation rate.

Proposed Solution: Request a revision to the language, possibly through the Budget Bill.

Current language: "If a student who was a dropout in any previous year returns to the same school district, that student shall be entered into the calculation as if the student has entered ninth grade four years before the graduation year of the graduating class the student joins."

New language: "If a student who was a dropout in any previous year returns to an Ohio local educational agency, that student shall be entered into the calculation based on the cohort to which the student originally was assigned."

- As outlined in HB 555 [3302.021(B)(1)(d) and 3302.021(C)(1)(d)] there are references to the four- and five year adjusted cohort graduation rates. Depending on the decision to address the first bullet, we may need to revised the language to permit the graduation rate indicator to be met with the four- **or** five- year adjusted cohort graduation rates.

Proposed Solution: Request a revision to the language, possibly through the Budget Bill.

Current language: "The four- and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates."

New language: "The four- or five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates."

Value-Added

- As outlined in HB 555 [3302.03(A)(1)(e)], there is a reference to three years of data that could be interpreted different ways.

Proposed Solution: Request a revision to the language, possibly through the Budget Bill.

Current language: "...department shall use up to three years of value-added data..."

New language: "...the department shall use up to three consecutive years of value-added data".

- As outlined in HB 555 [3302.03(B)(1)(f) and 3302.03(C)(1)(f)], it calls for a value-added progress dimension score to be disaggregated by three subgroups. However, technically the vendor cannot compute a value-added score at the subgroup level. Instead, it produces a gain-score.

Proposed solution: For technical accuracy, request a revision to the language, possibly through the Budget Bill

Current language: "The value-added progress dimension score..."

New language: "The value-added gain score..."

Dropout Recovery Schools

- Prescribe and adopt rules for community schools identified as dropout recovery

Joint Vocational School (JVS)/Career Tech Report Cards

- Prescribe and adopt rules for community schools identified as JVS/Career Tech

Joint Vocational School (JVS)/Career Tech Report Cards

- Prescribe and adopt rules for community schools identified JVS/Career Tech

Monitoring Obligations of HB 525 (Cleveland Plan)

- Develop monitoring process and requirements

2013-14 Local Report Card and Beyond

- Submission of EMIS Change requests for new measures
- Adoption of business rules to establish letter grades for the measures
- Incorporation of Gifted Indicator /Report Card
- Develop and adopt Literacy Measure
- Incorporation of “Report Only” Indicators (AP, dual enrollment, etc.)
- Adoption of criteria for acceptable industry credentials
- Procure a vendor to develop the next generation of the Interactive Local Report Card
- Begin development of the “prepared for success” measure

DRAFT

Appendix A

**HB 555 Responsibilities - Enacted
DRAFT As of December 19, 2012**

	Requirement	Deadline - 12-13 LRC	Section	Ohio Revised Code Assigned	ODE Staff Assigned	LRC Component
1	Must determine what is the "equivalent to excellent or effective rating" under the new report card so than it can be determined which districts have the flexibility to use different diagnostics that those prescribed by the State Board.	Must be determined for the August 2013 report card	3301.0715 (C)	ODE	Jeanine Molock, Matt Cohen, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning	LRC "Effective or Excellent" Equivalent Rating
2	The Department shall assign additional weights to students who have been permitted to pass over a subject (student acceleration policy) for performance index purposes. The State Board shall approve the additional proportional weight for accelerated students who score advanced. That additional weight shall be assigned to the student on a subject by subject basis	Must do for the August 2013 report card	3302.01 (A)	State Board and ODE	Jim Herrholtz, Sasheen Phillips, Tina Thomas-Manning, Sue Zake	Performance Index
	There shall not be an overall letter grade for a school district or building for the 2012-2013 school year.	2012-13 LRC	3302.03 (A) (3);			Overall letter grade

5	Not later than the 15th of September or the preceding Friday when that day falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the Department shall assign a letter grade for overall academic performance and for each separate performance measure	Annually starting with the report released in 2013 -	3302.03	ODE	Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning	Release of LRC
6	Adopt rules to establish performance criteria for each letter grade and prescribe a method by which the department assigns each letter grade. For a school building to which any of the performance measures do not apply, due to grade levels served by the building, the state board shall designate the performance measures that are applicable to the building and that must be calculated separately and used to calculate the building's overall grade	Not specified, but needed for 12-13	3302.03	State Board	Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning	LRC subcomponent letter grades

7	Not later than April 30, 2013 the state board shall adopt a resolution describing the performance measures, benchmarks, and grading system for the 12-13 school year and, not later than June 30, 2013, shall adopt rules that prescribe the method by which the performance measures shall be assessed and assigned a letter grade, including performance benchmarks for each letter grade.	4/30/2013 and 6/30/2013	3302.03 (A)(2)	State Board	Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning	LRC subcomponent letter grades
8	At least 45 days prior to the state board's adoption of rules to prescribe the methods for calculating the overall grade for the report card for the 2012-2013 school year, for the 2013-14 school year and the 2014-15 school year, ODE shall conduct a public presentation before the House and Senate education committees describing the format for the report card, weights that will be assigned to the components of the overall grade, and the method for calculating the overall grade.	Must report for the 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 report cards	3302.03 (A) (2); 3302.03 (B) (3); 3302.03 (C) (3) (f)	State Board and ODE	Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning	LRC subcomponent letter grades

17	If the Department does not report student data for a group because it contains less than ten students, the Department shall indicate on the report card that is why the data was not reported	Beginning with the 2012-13 report card	3302.03 (F)	ODE	Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning	LRC masking
19	The department shall endeavor to include schools and buildings that receive report card grades that it considers to be low performing.	For the 2012-13 school year and thereafter	3302.04 (A) (2)	ODE	Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning, Cindy Lemmerman, Jeanne Paliotto, Melissa Thompson	Low performing schools
20	The department may initiate a site evaluation of a building or school district that meets the conditions for a site evaluation prescribed by the ESEA Flexibility waiver.	For the 2012-13 school year and thereafter	3302.04 (D) (2)	ODE	Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning, Cindy Lemmerman, Jeanne Paliotto, Melissa Thompson	Low performing schools
21	The State Board shall adopt rules to free school districts from specified state mandates if high grades are obtained as specified in the bill for the new grading system	Rules would have to be modified for use after the report is released in 2013	3302.05	State Board	Jim Herrholtz, Tina Thomas-Manning, John Richard, Jeanine Molock, Sharon Jennings	

23	Changes are made to the conditions upon which required restructuring must occur for buildings in traditional school districts.	New criteria will have to be applied for traditional school district buildings after the release of the report card in 2013	3302.12	ODE	Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning, Cindy Lemmerman, Jeanne Paliotto, Melissa Thompson	Restructuring requirements
36	The State Board shall prescribe rules regarding an academic performance rating and report card system that satisfies the requirements for dropout prevention and recovery community schools (<u>to be used in lieu of the system for other schools</u>) beginning with the 2012-13 school year. Each such school shall comply with the testing and reporting requirements of the system as prescribed by the state board.	06/30/2013 for 2012-13 report card	3314.017 (A)	State Board	Chris Castle, Joni Hoffman, Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning, Kathy Shibley	Dropout recovery LRC
38	Adopt rules prescribing the performance indicators for the dropout prevention and recovery report cards including performance levels and benchmarks for graduation rate, high school assessment percentage, and AMOs	6/30/13	3314.017 (D) (2) (a)	State Board	Chris Castle, Joni Hoffman, Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning, Kathy Shibley	Dropout recovery LRC

42	Issue a dropout prevention and recovery report card. For 2012-13, the Department shall issue a report card including certain performance measures but without any performance ratings.	August of 2013	3314.017 (E) (1), (2) and (3)	ODE	Joni Hoffman, Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning, Kathy Shibley	Dropout recovery LRC
43	In developing the rating and report card system required during 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years, the Department shall gather and analyze data from each dropout prevention and recovery school and consult with stakeholders	For 2012-13 and 2013-14 report cards	3314.017 (F)	ODE	Joni Hoffman, Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning, Kathy Shibley, Sarah Dove	Dropout recovery LRC
44	ODE shall also identify one or more states that have established or are in the process of establishing similar academic performance rating systems for dropout prevention and recovery programs and consult with the departments of education of those states in developing the system required by this section.	Not specified but assumed to also occur while developing report cards for 2012-13 and 2013-14	3314.017 (F)	ODE	Joni Hoffman, Jeanine Molock, John Richard, Tina Thomas-Manning, Kathy Shibley	Dropout recovery LRC