


Preliminary Analysis of 2012-13 District Report Card

State Distribution of Selected Report Card Measures

	A	B	C	D	F	NR
Performance Index	27	436	128	19	0	--
Value-Added Overall	281	52	84	52	141	--
Value-Added Gifted	62	77	269	99	52	54
Value-Added Bottom 20%	87	97	296	76	39	5
AMO	28	183	112	96	191	--

Distribution of Grades on Selected report Card Measures



Preliminary Analysis of 2012-13 District Report Card

IND MET by District Type

	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	38	42	22	16	6	--	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	50	29	15	12	1	--	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	87	13	11	0	0	--	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	29	18	25	10	7	--	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	63	8	3	1	2	--	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	46	0	0	0	0	--	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	6	5	4	10	24	--	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	0	0	0	0	6	--	6

- 71% of all districts earned an A or B for IND MET
- 65% of Type 1 districts earned an A or B for IND MET
- 74% of Type 2 districts earned an A or B for IND MET
- 90% of Type 3 districts earned an A or B for IND MET
- 53% of Type 4 districts earned an A or B for IND MET
- 92% of Type 5 districts earned an a or B for IND MET
- 100% of Type 6 districts earned an A or B for IND MET
- 22% of Type 7 districts earned an A or B for IND MET
- No Type 8 districts earned and A or B for IND MET

Performance Index by District Type

	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	0	90	34	0	0	--	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	5	77	25	0	6	--	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	1	105	6	0	0	--	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	0	56	32	1	0	--	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	3	70	3	1	0	--	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	18	28	0	0	0	--	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	0	10	26	13	0	--	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	0	0	2	4	0	--	6

- 76% of all districts earned an A or B for Performance Index
- 73% of Type 1 districts earned an A or B for Performance Index
- 77% of Type 2 districts earned an A or B for Performance Index
- 95% of Type 3 districts earned an A or B for Performance Index
- 63% of Type 4 districts earned an A or B for Performance Index
- 95% of Type 5 districts earned an a or B for Performance Index
- 100% of Type 6 districts earned an A or B for Performance Index
- 20% of Type 7 districts earned an A or B for Performance Index
- No Type 8 districts earned and A or B for Performance Index

Preliminary Analysis of 2012-13 District Report Card

Overall Value-Added by District Type

	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	46	9	21	11	37	--	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	34	13	23	9	28	--	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	54	10	15	11	21	--	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	37	9	14	9	20	--	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	50	5	6	6	10	--	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	41	3	0	1	1	--	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	19	2	4	4	20	--	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	0	0	1	1	4	--	6

- 55% of all districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- 44% of Type 1 districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- 44% of Type 2 districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- 58% of Type 3 districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- 52% of Type 4 districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- 71% of Type 5 districts earned an a or B for overall value-added
- 96% of Type 6 districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- 43% of Type 7 districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- No Type 8 districts earned and A or B for overall value-added

Value-Added Gifted Students by District Type

	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	5	12	53	21	10	23	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	7	14	53	13	7	13	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	9	12	54	21	10	5	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	7	10	44	14	8	6	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	13	11	34	14	4	1	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	18	11	11	5	1	--	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	3	6	18	10	10	2	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	0	1	2	1	2	--	6

- 25% of all districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added (54 districts did not receive a rating)
- 14% of Type 1 districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- 20% of Type 2 districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- 20% of Type 3 districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- 19% of Type 4 districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- 31% of Type 5 districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- 63% of Type 6 districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- 18% of Type 7 districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- 17% of Type 8 districts (1) earned an A or B for gifted value-added

Preliminary Analysis of 2012-13 District Report Card

VA SWD by District Type

	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	18	15	53	14	21	3	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	12	17	47	9	13	9	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	16	21	51	12	10	1	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	12	17	37	11	11	1	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	20	16	29	4	8	--	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	14	13	15	3	1	--	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	4	6	22	5	12	--	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	1	0	1	1	3	--	6

- 33% of all districts earned an A or B for value-added SWD
- 27% of Type 1 districts earned an A or B for value-added SWD
- 27% of Type 2 districts earned an A or B for value-added SWD
- 33% of Type 3 districts earned an A or B for value-added SWD
- 33% of Type 4 districts earned an A or B for value-added SWD
- 47% of Type 5 districts earned an a or B for value-added SWD
- 59% of Type 6 districts earned an A or B for value-added SWD
- 20% of Type 7 districts earned an A or B for value-added SWD
- 17% of Type 8 districts earned and A or B for value-added SWD

VA Bottom 20% by District Type

	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	12	19	60	18	13	2	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	8	18	49	18	4	10	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	11	18	61	16	5	--	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	17	12	47	7	6	--	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	19	12	37	4	5	--	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	8	11	22	2	1	2	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	11	7	17	9	5	--	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	1	0	3	2	0	--	6

Value-Added Bottom 20% by District Type

- 79% of all districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added
- 73% of Type 1 districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added
- 70% of Type 2 districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added
- 81% of Type 3 districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added
- 85% of Type 4 districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added
- 88% of Type 5 districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added
- 89% of Type 6 districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added
- 76% of Type 7 districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added
- 67% of Type 8 districts earned a C or better for Bottom 20% Value-Added

AMO by District Type

	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	3	37	25	19	40	--	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	12	27	25	13	30	--	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	3	45	21	27	15	--	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	1	15	15	15	43	--	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	1	32	15	14	15	--	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	7	25	9	4	1	--	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	0	2	2	4	41	--	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	0	0	0	0	6	--	6

- 35% of all districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- 32% of Type 1 districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- 27% of Type 2 districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- 43% of Type 3 districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- 18% of Type 4 districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- 43% of Type 5 districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- 70% of Type 6 districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- 4% of Type 7 districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- 0 Type 8 districts earned an A or B for AMOs

Preliminary Analysis of 2012-13 District Report Card

4th YR GR

	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	48	37	29	10	0	--	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	63	32	9	3	0	--	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	75	24	10	2	0	--	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	23	29	24	9	4	--	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	41	25	8	2	1	--	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	40	5	0	1	0	--	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	3	6	12	12	16	--	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	0	0	0	1	5	--	6

- 74% of all districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR
- 69% of Type 1 districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR
- 89% of Type 2 districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR
- 89% of Type 3 districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR
- 58% of Type 4 districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR
- 86% of Type 5 districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR
- 98% of Type 6 districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR
- 18% of Type 7 districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR
- No Type 8 districts earned an A or B for 4th YR GR

Preliminary Analysis of 2012-13 District Report Card

5th YR GR

5th Yr Gr	A	B	C	D	F	NR	Total Districts
Type 1 – Rural High Poverty	28	66	22	7	1	--	124
Type 2 – Rural Average Poverty	46	45	11	3	2	--	107
Type 3 – Small Town Low Poverty	52	44	12	3	0	--	111
Type 4 – Small Town High Poverty	11	38	30	6	4	--	89
Type 5 – Suburban Low Poverty	38	30	6	3	0	--	77
Type 6 – Suburban Very Low Poverty	38	7	1	0	0	--	46
Type 7 – Urban High Poverty	2	7	16	11	13	--	49
Type 8 – Very High Poverty	0	0	0	2	4	--	6

- 74% of all districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR
- 77% of Type 1 districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR
- 85% of Type 2 districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR
- 86% of Type 3 districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR
- 55% of Type 4 districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR
- 88% of Type 5 districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR
- 98% of Type 6 districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR
- 18% of Type 7 districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR
- No Type 8 districts earned an A or B for 5th YR GR

Selected District Information

Northeast Ohio

- Strongsville (Type 5) – Fs in Value-added, gifted value-added and AMOs; 71% of similar districts earned an A or B in overall value-added; 31% of similar districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added; 43% of similar districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- Solon (Type 6) – C in value-added gifted; 63% of similar districts earned an A or B for value-added gifted
- Westlake (Type 6) – D for overall value-added, gifted value-added and bottom 20% value-added; 96% of similar districts earned an A or B for overall value-added, 63% of similar districts earned an A or B for value-added gifted, 89% of similar districts earned a C or better for bottom 20% value-added
- Highland (Medina, Type 6) – F for value-added gifted; 63% of similar districts earned an A or B for value-added gifted
- Kirtland (Type 5) – D in overall value-added; 71% of similar districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- Kenston (Geauga, Type 6) – Only Type 6 district earning an F for value-added for SWD

Dayton

- Northridge (Type 4) – watermarked for data scrubbing; earned F for AMO, D for gifted value-added – This district benefitted from less rigorous standards in the past.
- Oakwood (Type 6) – earned C in value-added for SWD; 24% of similar districts earned an A or B for SWD value-added

Central Ohio

- New Albany (Type 6) – earned D in value-added for SWD; 59% of similar districts earned an A or B in value-added for SWD
- Hilliard (Type 6) – earned a D in gifted value-added, 63% of similar districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added (Upper Arlington and Worthington both earned As in gifted value-added)

Preliminary Analysis of 2012-13 District Report Card

- Circleville (Type 4) – earned Ds for overall and bottom 20% value-added and Fs for gifted value-added and AMOs; 19% similar districts earned and A or B for gifted value-added, 52% of similar districts earned an A or B for overall value-added, 18% of similar districts earned and A or B for AMOs and 85% of similar districts earned a C or better for bottom 20% value-added
- Lakewood (Licking County, Type 4) – earned Fs for overall value-added and AMOs; 52% of similar districts earned an A or B for overall value-added, 18% of similar districts earned and A or B for AMOs

Cincinnati

- Sycamore (Type 6) – earned F in bottom 20% value-added and D in SWD value-added; 89% of similar districts earned a C or better for bottom 20% value-added 59% of similar districts earned an A or B in value-added for SWD
- Springboro (Type 6) – earned D in gifted value-added; 63% of similar districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- Princeton (Type 5) – earned Fs in gifted value-added and AMOs; 31% of similar districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added and 43% of similar districts earned an A or B for AMOs

Canton


- Alliance (Type 7) – earned Fs for overall value-added and AMOs; 43% of similar districts earned an A or B for overall value-added and 4% of similar districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- Canton City (Type 7) - earned Fs for gifted value-added, AMOs and both graduation rate; graduation rates are both below state average and well below state benchmarks, 4% of similar districts earned an A or B for AMOs, and 18% of similar districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added
- Jackson Local (Type 5) – earned Cs for gifted, SWD and bottom 20% value-added; 31% of Type 5 districts earned an A or B for gifted value-added, 18% of similar districts earned an A or B for SWD value-added, and 40% of similar districts earned an A or B in bottom 20% value-added

Preliminary Analysis of 2012-13 District Report Card


Youngstown/Warren

- Poland (Type 5) – earned an F for SWD value-added and D for overall value-added; 18% of similar districts earned an A or B for SWD value-added and 71% of similar districts earned an A or B for overall value-added
- Liberty (Trumbull, Type 4) – earned Fs for AMOs; 18% of similar districts earned an A or B for AMOs
- Austintown (Type 7) – earned F for overall value-added, gifted value-added and AMOs and a D for SWD and bottom 20% value-added; 43% of similar districts earned an A or B for overall value-added, 55% of similar districts earned a C or better for gifted value-added, 8% of similar districts earned a C or better for AMOs, 65% of similar districts earned a C or better for SWD value-added and 76% of similar districts earned a C or better for bottom 20% value-added

School District Value-Added For Gifted Students Report Card Grades by District Type



School District AMO Report Card Grades by District Type



School District Value-Added For Lowest Quintile Students Report Card Grades by District Type

