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Philanthropy Ohio’s Commitment to Education

In 2012, Ohio Grantmakers Forum expanded its mission to represent and serve Ohio’s entire philanthropic sector – not just grantmaking foundations. To fully reflect this updated mission and focus, the organization officially changed its name to Philanthropy Ohio in January 2013. While this report is the first to come under the name Philanthropy Ohio, it represents a continuation of the previous education policy and advocacy work pursued by Ohio Grantmakers Forum. For clarity and consistency, this report uses Philanthropy Ohio in place of Ohio Grantmakers Forum.

The mission of Philanthropy Ohio – an association of foundations, corporate giving programs and other individuals and organizations actively involved in philanthropy – is to provide leadership for Ohio’s philanthropic sector and to enhance the ability of its members to fulfill their charitable goals. Philanthropy Ohio is comprised of approximately 200 member organizations, whose assets total nearly $16 billion and who contribute more than $600 million annually – including $300 million dedicated to funding education programs and initiatives. Ohio philanthropy “puts its money where its mouth is” by investing in initiatives that support individuals, local communities and the state. It also invests in cutting-edge initiatives that are promising and, in some cases, unproven. This research and development (R&D) component is crucial to the discovery and identification of practices that could one day transform the field and substantially improve student achievement.

Ohio’s foundations have prioritized statewide education policy since 2005, when Philanthropy Ohio’s Board of Trustees formed an Education Advisory Committee to consider how philanthropy might better understand and address education reform in Ohio. The work of the Education Advisory Committee targets three audiences: 1) Ohio’s philanthropic community; 2) statewide elected officials and education policymakers; and 3) the general public. Education for Ohio’s Future, a groundbreaking education report issued in 2006, was Philanthropy Ohio’s first major milestone in statewide education policy. The report reviewed the state of education and identified 14 policy and practice recommendations across the areas of systems and structures, standards and accountability, teaching and leadership quality, innovation and school choice and funding.

In 2009, following the release of the report, Philanthropy Ohio engaged more than 1,200 Ohioans in regional conversations that set the stage for the development and release of Beyond Tinkering: Creating Real Opportunities for Today’s Learners and for Generations of Ohioans to Come. Philanthropy Ohio’s second important milestone in education policy, Beyond Tinkering targeted three specific areas, including accelerating the pace of innovation, improving academic standards and assessments and ensuring effective teaching and school leadership. A diverse group of Ohioans worked for six months to identify its 11 recommendations – about 80 percent of which were adopted in legislation, primarily through House Bill 1, Ohio’s 2010-11 biennial budget (128th General Assembly).
In 2010, Philanthropy Ohio assisted the Ohio Department of Education in creating the state’s winning $400 million federal Race to the Top (RTT) proposal. Philanthropy Ohio’s members critiqued and reviewed the grant application and funded a national consulting firm to help the state orchestrate its successful application. Subsequently, Philanthropy Ohio offered significant leadership on education-related initiatives contained in House Bill 153, Ohio’s 2012-13 biennial budget (129th General Assembly). This included the development of a standards-based framework for evaluating teachers and principals and the creation of Innovation Schools and Innovation School Zones.

Today, Ohio’s philanthropists continue to be leaders and neutral conveners in important matters of public interest. They view education not only as an economic imperative, but as a moral imperative to improve the lives of Ohio’s citizens, especially its youngest and most vulnerable. Education is Ohio’s great equalizer and philanthropists remain committed to actively improving it across the state.

Forging ahead, Ohio’s foundation community will remain sharply focused on transforming the state’s education system to prepare students for success in life.

This report identifies the top education priorities of Ohio’s philanthropic community.
Ohio’s Challenge

Preparing Students for Success in Life
Introduction

In 2006, Philanthropy Ohio (formerly known as Ohio Grantmakers Forum) released its groundbreaking report, entitled *Education for Ohio’s Future*, which declared:

“The global economic shift is upon us. We face unprecedented global competition, not just for low-skill, low-wage jobs but also for well-paid professional positions.”

Six years later, too many Ohioans have felt the chilling effects of the global and national economic shift. For instance, in 2006 the state’s unemployment rate was 5.4 percent. Today, it is 7 percent.¹ Six years ago, the state was home to 783,000 manufacturing jobs. Today, the number is 657,000, representing a loss of 126,000 jobs.² In 2006, Ohio’s per capita income was $34,008, about 9 percent lower than the national average, which was $37,725. This year, the state’s per capita income increased to $37,836, but the national average increased to $41,560, still leaving Ohio 9 percent behind.³

At the same time, historic advances have occurred in innovation and technology. The iPhone,⁴ for example, did not exist in 2006 when *Education for Ohio’s Future* was released. It was unveiled one year later and has forever changed the mobile phone platform and how students and families communicate and receive information. In 2010, the iPad⁵ was launched and transformed the Tablet PC and the types of tools available for teaching and learning. More broadly, since 2006, technology has accelerated the world’s rate of information, which has doubled every two years. This is momentous change.

The question is: Has Ohio’s student, school and system performance changed fast enough and deep enough to help Ohio thrive as the global economic shifts continue? Based on policy and data analyses, most in Ohio’s philanthropic community – who invest $300 million annually in education programs and initiatives – would reply “No.”

To be fair, Ohio has taken important steps to improve student achievement. These include:

- Winning a federal $400 million Race to the Top (RTT) award to enact significant teaching and learning reforms aimed at increasing high school graduation rates, reducing academic achievement gaps and doubling the numbers of students enrolling in postsecondary education;
- Securing a $70 million Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant to improve the quality of programs that serve high-needs children from birth to five years of age;
- Adopting Ohio’s new learning standards – consisting of the college- and career-ready Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and revisions for social studies and science – and aligned assessments through Ohio’s next generation of assessments, which include the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC);

The question is: Has Ohio’s student, school and system performance changed fast enough and deep enough to help Ohio thrive as the global economic shifts continue?

Most in Ohio’s philanthropic community would reply “No.”
• Implementing new teacher and principal evaluation systems;
• Increasing expectations for teachers to earn tenure: seven years of experience is now required, instead of three years;
• Improving the quality of Ohio’s charter schools; and
• Enacting a performance funding system to promote completion at Ohio’s public colleges and universities.

Student performance on the Ohio Achievement Assessments for grades 3, 4, 8 and 10 and the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP) for grades 4 and 8 has increased minimally over the last six years, as described further in Ohio’s Education Landscape section.

The hard truth is that the needle for measuring student achievement has not moved far enough or fast enough. Consider how U.S. and Ohio students fare against their international peers. On the 2009 NAEP, Ohio eighth graders ranked 19th nationally in mathematics – toward the middle of the pack – and 10th in reading. That same year, U.S. 15 year olds ranked 14th in reading, 17th in science and 25th in mathematics out of 34 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries participating in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). U.S. performance was well behind Singapore, Finland, Germany and India – and about even with Slovenia. This is alarming.

Plus, Ohio has lost ground on key areas where it once led, and failed to achieve sustainable progress in other areas where change has never gained broad stakeholder support and long-term traction. Consider the following:

• In House Bill 1, Ohio’s 2010-11 biennial budget, the state eliminated the Early Learning Initiative (ELI), which funded full- and part-day services for approximately 12,000 three- and four-year old children; cut $11 million from the public preschool program; and reduced funding by 20 percent for Help Me Grow, the state’s birth-to-three program that provides home visiting and parent education services to at-risk children and their families.
• The state’s achievement gap – the difference in performance between minority students and their peers – has not diminished over the last six years.
Ohio’s postsecondary remediation rate for traditional college freshmen, which cost taxpayers more than $130 million a year, remains high, while postsecondary completion rates are low.

Ohio’s P-20 education system is fragmented and disconnected. Over the last six years, the state systematically jettisoned its formal state-level P-20 structure.

Overall, Ohio’s P-20 educational progress from 2006 to 2012 can be summarized, at best, as tinkering at the margins.

A Clear and Compelling Vision for the Future of Learning

To move beyond tinkering, Ohio’s philanthropic community embraces a vision where every learner...

- Has equal access to all levels of learning across the state’s educational continuum, with strong starts in early childhood education and seamless transitions to K-12 and postsecondary education.
- Engages in a rigorous curriculum based on challenging expectations and receives commensurate support to ensure success.
- Benefits from individual, personalized and unique learning opportunities and models.
- Is deeply exposed to information technology that supports immediate and virtual communication and learning.
- Experiences opportunities that are not confined to the traditional classroom, normal school day or calendar year.
- Has an opportunity to participate in real-world learning through internships, co-ops or mentorships.
- Is taught by highly-effective, skilled teachers who understand the learning process and are masters in their content areas.
- Has an opportunity to earn college credit while in high school and continue education beyond high school, thanks to a tightly aligned education continuum that is not limited by artificial barriers.
- Is fully prepared for success in the competitive 21st century economy and in life.

Foundation leaders know this vision cannot be achieved overnight. They understand the importance of implementation and the care, persistence and long-term commitment necessary to turn this vision into a reality.

Reflected throughout this report, Philanthropy Ohio believes that clear and tight expectations must be articulated at the state-level, with room for local flexibility that honors the differences that exist across regions and provides school districts the leeway necessary to accommodate unique needs and situations.
A P-20 Education Continuum that Prepares Students for Success in Life

The purpose of Preparing Students for Success in Life is threefold: It is designed to inform and maximize Ohio’s philanthropic investments in education initiatives across the state. It also is intended to provide Ohio’s top elected officials and policymakers with recommendations that will dramatically accelerate the state’s rate of progress in student outcomes and education improvement. Finally, the report serves to inform the general public. It is data-based, comprehensive and aimed at providing learners with a connected and interlocked P-20 education experience from early childhood to college and career – ultimately preparing them for success in life.

The report begins by examining important updates over the last six years, including a comparison of student demographic and performance metrics. Figure 1, the organizer for the report’s 16 recommendations, identifies the components that must work seamlessly across the system to maximize the learning experience for all students. This includes the cross-cutting, high-impact elements of innovation and technology and educator human capital. The report then individually addresses the structural components of the system, including early childhood, K-12 and postsecondary education.

Ultimately, the recommendations in this report drive toward the creation of a more aligned P-20 education system where all students benefit from a strong start, high expectations, effective supports and excellent educators – and the structure is adequately funded and operates productively in service of student success. Most notably, because the system is seamless and fully integrated, no students fall through the cracks.

The recommendations are intentionally bold and will require Ohio’s elected officials and policymakers to be courageous and dedicated to identifying priorities to ensure long-term success. This work will begin in earnest with the development of the state’s operating budget for fiscal years 2014-15, and will likely require increasing investments in priority education areas, making smarter spending decisions at the local level, eliminating ineffective programs and maximizing efficiencies in the system. While the 2014-15 biennial budget is sure to be challenging, given the current economic climate of the state and nation, Philanthropy Ohio and its members believe that education is the one investment worth increasing. It can propel the state’s struggling economy by producing the talent necessary to envision, invent, create and fill high-paying 21st century jobs that will support Ohioans and their families.
Ohio’s Education Landscape

Enrollment Trends:

Number of Children Birth to 5 Served in Ohio Today: Table 1 points out the low numbers of infants and toddlers served in Ohio’s licensed early childhood settings. Only 33 percent of Ohio’s children benefit from early learning in one of Ohio’s licensed environments.

Table 1: Ohio’s Early Childhood Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Infants and Toddlers Birth to Age 2</th>
<th>Preschool Ages 3 to 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Education (ODE) Licensed Sites</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>59,352</td>
<td>61,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) Licensed Sites</td>
<td>79,516</td>
<td>148,255</td>
<td>227,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Children in Licensed Settings in Ohio Birth to Age 5</td>
<td>81,222</td>
<td>207,607</td>
<td>288,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Children Birth to Age 5 in Ohio</td>
<td>425,980</td>
<td>441,016</td>
<td>866,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Children in Ohio in Licensed Settings</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of High-Needs Children Served in Early Learning and Development Programs: Table 2 denotes the total number of children with high needs participating in each type of early learning and development program from 2007 to 2011. Note that of the nine programs listed, all have increased the number of high-needs children served except for the Home Visiting Program and the Early Learning Initiative, which was completely cut in House Bill 1. A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple programs.

Table 2: Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Early Learning Program</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>07-08 change</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>08-09 change</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>09-10 change</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>10-11 change</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>10-11 change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded Preschool</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>-1,473</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start and Head Start</td>
<td>37,968</td>
<td>37,916</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>38,894</td>
<td>-1,022</td>
<td>39,469</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>39,383</td>
<td>-86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Disability Education Act Programs</td>
<td>35,015</td>
<td>36,132</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>38,176</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>37,672</td>
<td>-504</td>
<td>37,256</td>
<td>-416</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary &amp; Secondary Education Act Programs</td>
<td>15,147</td>
<td>17,150</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>19,447</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>21,658</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care &amp; Development Fund Programs</td>
<td>51,502</td>
<td>53,571</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>56,121</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>60,889</td>
<td>4,768</td>
<td>62,920</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visiting Program</td>
<td>18,240</td>
<td>18,037</td>
<td>-203</td>
<td>17,947</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>9,958</td>
<td>-7,989</td>
<td>7,881</td>
<td>-2,077</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation</td>
<td>22,207</td>
<td>20,886</td>
<td>-1,321</td>
<td>18,448</td>
<td>-2,438</td>
<td>26,583</td>
<td>8,135</td>
<td>27,803</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Treatment</td>
<td>9,433</td>
<td>11,048</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>11,599</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>12,624</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>12,370</td>
<td>-254</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Initiative</td>
<td>9,693</td>
<td>12,588</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>13,464</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>9,655</td>
<td>-3,809</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9,655</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Students Served in K-12 System: Ohio’s 614 school districts, 370 charter schools, 2 STEM schools and 49 JVSDs serve more than 1.7 million students.

Table 3: Ohio’s Schools and Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Schools</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School districts in Ohio</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional public schools</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>3,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (charter) schools</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standalone STEM schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Vocational School Districts</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Enrollment: Over the last six years, Ohio’s student enrollment has hovered around 1.7 million. Figure 2 depicts the state’s enrollment trends over that time. Figure 3 provides a closer look at the trends.

Figure 2: Student Enrollment Over Last Six Years

Charter School Enrollment: While the majority of Ohio’s K-12 students are educated in a traditional public school setting, Table 4 notes that Ohio’s charter school enrollment has increased by more than 50 percent over the last six years.

Table 4: Ohio Charter School and Public School Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Student Enrollment</td>
<td>1,772,930</td>
<td>1,749,395</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in charter schools</td>
<td>71,837</td>
<td>108,476</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in private schools</td>
<td>207,054</td>
<td>181,420</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Demographics: Ohio’s K-12 student body has significantly changed over the last six years. The number of Hispanic students has increased by nearly 50 percent. Students with Limited English Proficiency have increased by 11 percent and the number of students with disabilities has increased 3 percent. Of significant note, the number of students identified as economically disadvantaged has increased by 27 percent. This means almost half of Ohio’s students today are categorized as economically disadvantaged. These demographic shifts, represented in Table 5, are significant and impact how the state must prioritize its educational services.

Table 5: Student Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Student Enrollment</td>
<td>1,772,930</td>
<td>1,749,395</td>
<td>-23,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>296,861</td>
<td>287,974</td>
<td>-8,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>41,097</td>
<td>61,124</td>
<td>20,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>46,698</td>
<td>73,104</td>
<td>26,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,361,774</td>
<td>1,294,742</td>
<td>-67,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td>28,936</td>
<td>35,293</td>
<td>6,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>254,078</td>
<td>259,302</td>
<td>5,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged Students</td>
<td>622,698</td>
<td>785,084</td>
<td>162,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Performance: Tables 6 and 7 indicate that student performance over the last six years is trending in the right direction on both NAEP and the state’s achievement tests. But the gains are minimal.

Table 6: Ohio NAEP Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio NAEP</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th graders at or above proficient in math (NAEP)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th graders at or above proficient in reading (NAEP)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th graders at or above proficient in math (NAEP)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th graders at or above proficient in reading (NAEP)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Ohio Achievement Test and Graduation Test Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio Achievement Tests and Graduation Tests</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd graders at or above proficient in math</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd graders at or above proficient in reading</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th graders at or above proficient in math</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th graders at or above proficient in reading</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th graders at or above proficient in math</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th graders at or above proficient in reading</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th graders at or above proficient in math</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th graders at or above proficient in reading</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio’s Education Landscape

**Achievement Gaps:** Ohio still wrestles with a serious achievement gap that separates the performance of minority students from their peers. *Figure 7* compares the state’s 2006-07 achievement gaps to those present in 2010-11. While some progress is evident, significant and unacceptable gaps persist.

*Figure 7: Achievement Gaps based on Ohio Achievement Assessments: 2006-07 vs. 2010-11*

**Ohio Freshmen Remediation Rate by School District:** Forty-one percent of Ohio’s graduating class of 2009 were required to complete one or more remedial-level courses upon enrolling in an Ohio public college or university. *Figure 8* breaks down remediation percentages by school districts.

*Figure 8: Public College or University Freshmen Remediation Rate by School District*

*Districts in white lacked sufficient data for calculation.*
Priorities for Action

Preparing Students for Success in Life
Creating Seamless State and Regional P-20 Systems and Structures

Why It Matters
Ohio – the nation’s seventh most populous state with more than 11.5 million people – provides educational services to nearly a quarter of its population. More than 2.7 million citizens benefit, from early childhood, serving children birth to age 5, to K-12 and postsecondary education:

- **288,829** children in licensed early childhood sites in Ohio; 13
- **1,749,248** students in K-12 settings; 14 and
- **681,219** learners enrolled in postsecondary studies in the state’s public and private colleges and universities. 15

For fiscal year 2013, Ohio is on track to spend more than **$11 billion** to fund P-20 education programs and initiatives that cut across at least four state agencies: the Ohio Department of Health ($34 million), the Ohio Department of Education ($8.7 billion), the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services ($600 million) and the Ohio Board of Regents ($2.3 billion). 16

---

**Defining Early Childhood, K-12 and Postsecondary Education**

The term “Early Childhood” in this report refers to those programs that serve infants and children in early learning settings, including pre-natal care, home visiting services and preschool.

“K-12” means those learning settings that serve students in Kindergarten through 12th grade. This includes any public, charter, private, virtual, alternative and innovative model of schooling.

“Postsecondary” refers to any education or training beyond K-12 that results in a two-year or four-year degree, certificate or credential of economic value in the workplace.
Providing high-quality education experiences through a seamless P-20 education system is even more essential since education stands as the state’s most powerful tool for enabling individual and family prosperity. Such an integrated system features aligned academic expectations, multiple and accessible on-ramps and key supports that help students continue their learning through postsecondary completion – ultimately earning degrees, certificates or credentials of economic value in the marketplace.

**Six Years Ago, Philanthropy Ohio Reported That…**

“Ohio has a fragmented P-20 system, although efforts are underway to improve alignment.” Ohio had disconnected goals across the education continuum and desperately needed to improve the linkages across the state’s education sectors and across P-20 data systems. The report applauded the creation of Ohio’s new state-level P-20 education council known as the Partnership for Continued Learning.

**Where Does Ohio Stand Today?**

**Efforts to Align Its State-Level P-20 System**

The reality is that Ohio’s state-level education system is more fragmented and dysfunctional today than it was six years ago, resulting in unnecessary barriers to student success across the continuum.

In August 2005, Ohio launched the Partnership for Continued Learning, which, among other things, helped build coalitions to pass the Ohio Core college- and career-ready graduation requirements and paved the way for a series of investments in STEM education. In 2007, this state-level P-20 council became dormant and its authorizing statute was ultimately repealed in 2009 by House Bill 1.

Today, there is no official mechanism that connects the state’s early childhood, K-12 and postsecondary education policies and practices. Any collaborative efforts among the structures are dependent upon personalities and the relationships of the leaders. And, while the Board of Regents has plans to physically relocate to the building where the Ohio Department of Education is housed – at this point, the move is just that – relocation. Formal plans have not been developed to strategically and programmatically align and link programs, initiatives or funding streams to achieve maximum impact for Ohio’s learners.

Ohio must act to connect and strengthen its education continuum so that it is student-centered and enables high standards, strong accountability, effective teaching and leadership, personalized learning, high-quality school choices, longitudinal-data collection and analysis and funding that supports learners’ individual needs. This type of integrated education continuum, reflected in Figure 9, is necessary at the state level to enhance the work occurring at the regional and local levels.
Regional Success, Despite State-Level Setbacks

While ground has been lost at the state-level, many of Ohio’s regions are effectively advancing P-20 education councils to transform the learning experiences of their students. In total, 22 communities have developed P-20 education councils. The Stark Education Partnership is a celebrated regional P-20 education model in Ohio. Anchored in a “P-20 Compact for Stark County” that was established in 2002, the partnership works to identify solutions to “support and sustain” all Stark County students in realizing their academic potential and pursuing and succeeding in postsecondary education. The compact also promotes programs that are often hindered by a lack of state-level funding and artificial operating barriers – such as Early College High School and other dual enrollment opportunities.

The Strive Partnership in Cincinnati-Northern Kentucky is another honored regional P-20 education model gaining national traction. It was launched in 2006 to “target a problem of being program rich and system poor,” engage a broad spectrum of partners to work through “turf issues” among service providers and invest in educational strategies that have proven results.

Other promising P-20 education models include Learn to Earn Dayton, Clark County P-20 ASPIRE, Eastern Ohio P-16 Partnership for Education, Lake and Geauga County P-16 Council, Succeed and Prosper through Education: Ashland, Richland, Crawford (SPARC), Summit Education Initiative’s Cradle to Career Alliance and Learn4Life Columbus.

These P-20 approaches work. Stark Education Partnership, for instance, reports that 17 of 18 Stark County high schools outperformed the state average on academic achievement indicators. Stark County also outpaced Ohio and the nation in both associate and baccalaureate degree growth – a significant accomplishment for a county that ranked below state and national averages when this work started. Similarly, Strive reports that Greater Cincinnati is the beneficiary of a 9 percent increase in kindergarten readiness, an 11 percent increase in high school graduation and a 10 percent increase in college enrollment over the last six years.
Priority Recommendations: Ensuring a Seamless P-20 Education Continuum

1. The Governor’s Office, in partnership with the Ohio General Assembly and leaders of all state agencies that directly impact student learning, must collectively:
   a. Develop a shared vision, supported by clear and ambitious short- and long-term goals, for improving student learning outcomes across the entire P-20 education continuum.
   b. Design and implement a plan to merge state agencies and state-level efforts that impact early childhood, K-12 and postsecondary learning into a single and cohesive system. The plan should seek to:
      i. Break down structures and create the highest and best use of resources.
      ii. Thoroughly consider governance options and make a governance recommendation based on the needs of students.
      iii. Consolidate the current hodgepodge of governing boards to assure consistent focus on the P-20 system as a whole.
      iv. Honor the P-20 work occurring at the local and regional levels and encourage, support and expand such initiatives through the adoption of model criteria.
      v. Attract a leader who articulates a clear and aligned vision for the success of the entire P-20 system and the students it serves. This leader should build internal capacity and transform the culture of the system from compliance-based to customer-centered and encourage innovative and flexible implementation efforts that result in increased student learning.

Pursuing a merger of this magnitude will be complex and intensive. To ensure the best foot forward, Philanthropy Ohio recommends that a nationally-respected consulting firm with a successful track record of designing or redesigning multifaceted organizations be secured to help guide the effort.

P-20 governance consolidation efforts have occurred in Florida, Idaho, New York, Pennsylvania and, most recently, Oregon.

2. Ohio must fully implement and use a P-20 data system that can inform critical education policy decisions and provide educators with accessible, on-demand data for real-time analysis. This includes:
   a. Fulfilling the commitment in the state’s Race to the Top (RTT) grant and completing the linkage of its P-20 longitudinal data system by June 2013. This will require changes in state law that permit the tracking of each student’s academic progress and coordination with the data management system of higher education. Better use of longitudinal data can ensure greater accountability, more efficient budgeting strategies and smarter policies and practices throughout the system. In pursuing this recommendation, state agencies should recognize and build from existing data sources that are in use by regions and locales across the state, including the National Student Clearinghouse.
   b. Creating a dashboard of leading indicators for early childhood, K-8 and 9-12 to provide data and information to educators and parents about students who are off-track at critical education points (kindergarten readiness, third grade reading, credit attainment, etc.) and at risk of dropping out. Measures might include attendance rates, behavior, course grades and growth measures looking at the change in student achievement over time. In 2011, 18 other states had developed such systems to help increase the likelihood of student success by intervening before it is too late.
Using Innovation and Technology to Transform the System and Personalize Learning

Why it Matters

Innovations in teaching and learning – and the technology that supports those innovations – stand as two of the most important and underused tools for transforming the state’s P-20 educational continuum and the learning experience for Ohio’s students.

Together, innovation and technology have fueled improvements in nearly every sector of the world’s economy. Unfortunately, education systems have lagged behind this trend. Over the past six years, Ohio’s education delivery model has changed very little. Meanwhile, the world’s information doubles every two years as a result of technology – and too many students are struggling to succeed in an outdated classroom environment that requires them to “power down.”

At the state level, innovation, coupled with technology, can enhance the student learning experience by transforming and modernizing the state’s P-20 systems and structures; assisting with the implementation of standards, assessments and accountability; scaling state-of-the-art instructional models; creating new learning environments, including promising new schools; retooling the education human capital talent pool and maximizing funding across the system. Innovation and technology cut across every aspect of the education continuum.
At the district level, innovative models can result in significant changes that support student learning. Examples include reorganizing the structure of the school day and year; expanding the impact of the most effective educators; redesigning schedules that encourage professional collaboration and planning; and increasing postsecondary learning opportunities, internships, externships and mentorships for students.

**Six Years Ago, Philanthropy Ohio Reported That…**

“Many Ohio public school districts have not recognized the need for wide-scale innovation.” The state lacked a comprehensive strategy for implementing innovative school models, but promising programs like Post-Secondary Enrollment Options and College Tech Prep were in place.

“Ohio has only started to imagine what education might look like in the future.” Technology, such as the Internet and video games, was beginning to change how students learned and interacted outside of school, but had little impact in the average classroom.

**Where Does Ohio Stand Today?**

**Wide-Scale Innovation**

Ohio is just beginning to realize the power of a diverse portfolio of innovative school models, including:

- STEM and New Tech Network High Schools;
- Early College High Schools;
- School models that embrace longer school days and years;
- Schools that offer internships and mentorships;
- Single-sex school models;
- College-ready, career-tech high schools; and
- Schools and classrooms that maintain partnerships with zoos, science centers and other unique settings.

There are several reasons for the “neutral” rating. First, too few students have access to these opportunities. It also is unclear if the state has a thoughtful and comprehensive strategy for implementing innovative models. And, the state’s track record of harnessing, disseminating and scaling best practices and leading-edge innovations from these models is poor. Additionally, innovative programs that Philanthropy Ohio recognized six years ago as strong, such as Tech Prep, have declined precipitously due to state and federal funding cuts.

**Programmatic versus Platform Innovation**

Many of the innovative models referenced in this section are programmatic in nature, meaning that they have been initiated within the broader context of the education system to change or impact the system. Examples of programmatic innovations include:

- **STEM Schools and New Tech Network High Schools**: where students are immersed in multi-disciplinary and project-based approaches to teaching and learning;
- **Early College High Schools**: where students earn postsecondary credits while still in high school;
- **Flex Schools**: where core instruction is conducted online with on-site academic support and guidance, integration and application opportunities and extracurricular activities; and
- **Rotation Schools**: where students spend 20 to 50 percent of their time online but in a typically traditional school, such as Rocketship, KIPP, Empower and Carpe Diem.

Platform innovations are a complete change in how education is delivered, transforming the entire delivery system. Two prime examples of platform innovations in education include:

- **Massive Open On-Line Courses (MOOCS)**: A type of online, non-credit bearing, open-access course that is usually free and aimed at large-scale participation. Examples of MOOCS include Coursera, edX, Udacity, Class2Go and Academic Room.
- **The Flipped Classroom**: A reversed teaching model that delivers instruction at home through interactive, teacher-created videos and moves homework to the classroom. This setup enables teachers to spend more “1:1” time with each student. Examples include TED-Ed and Khan Academy.

These program and platform innovations should be considered by the Ohio Department of Education and Ohio Board of Regents as they work to capture and disseminate other more programmatic innovations through the state’s RTT application.
The closest Ohio comes to articulating a comprehensive strategy for implementing innovative school models is in its Race to the Top proposal, which created the Ohio Network for Education Transformation (ONET) to “facilitate student progress in low-performing and innovative schools.” Through Race to the Top and ONET, Ohio has invested nearly $30 million in innovative educational programs:

- **Asia Society**: Offering school districts tools and resources to develop globally competent, college-ready high school students.
- **Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)**: Providing educators with professional development training and students with an elective course focused on enhancing study skills, sharpening note taking abilities and engaging students in a tight-knit learning community.
- **Early College High Schools**: Giving students the opportunity to earn college credit while still in high school.
- **STEM and New Tech Network High Schools**: Exposing students to real-world, connected, interdisciplinary, rigorous and project-based learning experiences.
- **On-Line AP Courses and Programs**: Expanding virtual learning options to reach underserved student populations with on-line AP courses and strengthened AP programs.

It is important that ONET and ODE capture effective innovations from these models and promote them across the state for broader impact. Ohio, however, must not be limited to just these models. The state should be aware of other programmatic and platform innovations that have significant impact on teaching and learning – and it should do this within the context of a broader statewide strategy. A mishmash of innovations, no matter how well intended, will not improve student success. Nor will a one-size-fits-all approach. Local schools and districts must be encouraged and supported to pursue innovations that will best meet the needs of their students and communities. “Cleveland’s Plan for Transforming Schools” stands as a prime example. The innovative portfolio approach, aimed at transitioning the district’s education delivery method from a traditional, single-source to a mixed portfolio of district and charter schools, has gained support from a broad array of local- and state-level elected officials and stakeholders, including philanthropy, business, union – and perhaps most importantly – Cleveland’s parents, students and taxpayers.

Innovation does not always mean transforming the entire school model. There are simple, effective and efficient ways school districts can inject innovation into their classrooms, some at no additional cost. For instance, changes such as cooperative learning, student self-reporting grades, formative assessments, acceleration, creativity programs, problem solving, and mastery learning have significant positive effects on student learning. Numerous schools across the state are already engaged in such efforts.

Noteworthy are several tools the state has established for increasing school districts’ use of innovative methods, including credit flexibility. Ohio’s Credit Flexibility Plan is designed to allow students to earn high school credit based on a demonstration of subject area competency. Students can earn credits by completing coursework, testing out or demonstrating mastery of course content or by pursuing “educational options” such as internships, distance learning, educational travel and community service to name just a few.
Finally, House Bill 153, Ohio’s 2012-13 biennial budget, created “Innovation Schools” and “Innovation School Zones” to provide schools the option of using innovation plans to improve student performance. The bill allows any provisions of a collective bargaining agreement to be waived to implement an innovation plan, if at least 60 percent of the members of the bargaining unit in each participating school approve the waiver. While a step in the right direction, to date no school district in Ohio has taken advantage of the provision. There are likely two prohibiting forces at play. First, the innovation plan language is too cumbersome. Second, the provision has not been promoted locally, regionally and statewide as a viable tool for spreading innovation.

Technology in Education

Ohio has neither lost nor gained ground on using technology to advance and enhance education opportunities. That said, the state is not keeping pace with national and international competition and, most notably, student interests. The use of technology also is inconsistent across the state.

As a first step in promoting consistency and framing a certain level of quality, Ohio enacted Senate Bill 316, which took effect in September 2012, to codify a definition for “Blended Learning” and “Digital Learning.” Ohio’s approach to digital learning is among the most advanced in the nation; however, too few students benefit from it. It is important that all students have access to digital learning opportunities.

With regard to blended learning, schools and districts must recreate classrooms operationally and pedagogically to maximize its impact. Technology that is overlaid on an antiquated model of schooling only increases the costs of education and the challenges to improving student achievement. The model must be recreated so that every student has opportunities for individualized learning and every teacher has the time and resources, including data, to differentiate small group or one-to-one instruction.

Over the last six years, as noted in Figure 10, Ohio has increased its investment in educational technology from $395 million in 2006 to $489 million in 2011, resulting in enhancements and increased use in schools across the state. This investment includes data processing services, software, computer and technical equipment, information services, networking data communications and technology-based professional development.

Going forward, Ohio must fast-track its use of technology to deploy flexible and personalized learning opportunities to meet individual student needs, such as investing in its use beyond the school walls and the traditional school day. As technology tools become more affordable and widely available, classrooms should take advantage of these new learning modes, which engage and excite students in ways that traditional education has not.

Educators also must use technology more effectively, including using data to make real-time instructional decisions, identifying individual interventions for struggling students, accelerating the highest-performing students, engaging disenfranchised students, connecting students with real-world learning experiences and expanding the reach of the best educators to impact a greater number of students. This will require targeted investments in high-quality, job-embedded professional development and changes to Ohio’s educator preparation and licensure programs.

Finally, Ohio’s digital infrastructure must meet growing demands if it is to fully capitalize on the promise of technology. A recent analysis...
by eTech and the Ohio Department of Education points out that over 350 schools serving more than 100,000 students have connectivity levels below 10 Megabytes. eTech, Ohio’s state organization charged with advancing learning through technology, recommends that all schools have at least 100 Megabytes of connectivity. Currently there are almost 700 schools serving 300,000 students that do not meet these standards. This means that student access to the internet is limited, use is slow and some programs may not function properly – including Ohio’s next generation of assessments. The hardware in schools is often inadequate, existing only in outdated desktop PCs that limit access for students. To assist on this front, Ohio should create a technology fund that is tethered to a broader system of supports for identifying and fostering quality implementation and continuous improvement.

Priority Recommendations: Promoting Innovative School Models and Using Technology to Personalize Learning

3 With support from the Governor and Ohio General Assembly, the Ohio Department of Education, in conjunction with the Ohio Board of Regents, must:
   a. Capture, disseminate and scale best practices and innovations that emerge from:
      i. Innovative programs funded by the state’s RTT investments, including Asia Society, AVID, Early College High Schools, STEM and New Tech Network High Schools and On-Line AP Courses and Programs;
      ii. New and promising platform innovations, including Massive Open On-Line Courses, The Flipped Classroom, etc.;
      iii. Tried-and-true programmatic innovations, such as Early College High Schools and Post-Secondary Enrollment Options, and promising blended learning innovations, including Rotation and Flex models.
      iv. Other cutting-edge innovations underway in schools and learning communities across the state, nation and world.
   b. Provide concrete incentives for schools to do more with emerging technologies to personalize student learning, including blended learning, distance learning, open education resources and gaming to enhance differentiated instruction, accelerated learning, real-world problem solving and access to higher-level courses. Such incentives might be funding-based or accomplished by issuing waivers or easing regulations, while still ensuring quality and accessibility for all students. The state also should address the funding challenges and prohibitions that hinder student participation in blended learning and online courses.
   c. Consider the creation of a technology fund for the purposes of supplementing – not supplanting – technology resources (connectivity, capacity and hardware) for in-need schools across the state. A set of eligibility requirements should be established to guide the distribution of these funds.

4 The Governor and Ohio General Assembly, in conjunction with the Ohio Department of Education, should revise the current Ohio Revised Code language on Innovation Schools and Innovation School Zones (ORC § 3302.06 – 3302.068) to make it easier for districts and schools to take advantage of the provisions. The Ohio Department of Education also should promote the option to school districts across the state to increase awareness of its existence. Additionally, various statutory provisions that enable the issuance of waivers should be consolidated and the state superintendent should have greater authority to issue waivers to schools or districts that show promise for improved student achievement and school performance.
Building a Human Capital System to Support Teachers and Leaders

Why it Matters
Teachers are the single most important school-based factor in improving student achievement. In fact, a teacher’s influence on student achievement is 20 times greater than any other variable, including class size and poverty. At the elementary level, highly-effective teachers can substantially offset or even eliminate the disadvantage of a low socio-economic background. The research is convincing: Effective teachers are the state’s most important asset in preparing all students for college, career and life.

Ohio defines effective teachers as those who:
- Understand student learning and development, respect the diversity and background of the students they teach, and hold high expectations for all students to achieve and progress at high levels;
- Know and understand the content areas for which they have instructional responsibility;
- Plan and deliver effective instruction that advances the learning of individual students;
• Create a learning environment that promotes high levels of student learning and achievement for all students;
• Understand and use varied assessments to inform instruction, and evaluate and ensure student learning;
• Collaborate and communicate with students, parents, other teachers, administrators and the community to support student learning; and
• Assume responsibility for professional growth and performance as an individual and as a member of a learning community.30

This definition specifies that teachers take responsibility for their own growth by continuously inquiring into and improving their own teaching and professional growth. Constant inquiry and continuous individual and collective development are essential to professional success.31

Behind teachers, principals are the second-most important school-based factor in improving student achievement.32 Ohio defines effective principals as those who:
• Help create a shared vision and clear goals for their schools and ensure continuous progress towards achieving those goals;
• Support the implementation of high-quality, standards-based instruction that results in high levels of achievement for all students;
• Allocate resources and manage school operations in order to ensure a safe and productive learning environment;
• Establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote learning and achievement of all students; and
• Engage parents and community members in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support student learning, achievement and well-being. 33

To effectively do their jobs, research suggests that school leaders give principals “defined autonomy,” whereby the principal has clear and non-negotiable goals for learning and instruction, but is afforded the flexibility and authority for determining how best to meet those goals.34 The National Association of Elementary Principals takes the point further by acknowledging that principals “often feel they lack the autonomy to effectively lead their schools.”35 But to lead with this flexibility and autonomy, Ohio needs to rethink how principals are recruited, prepared, selected and evaluated.

Instructional leadership – carried out, in many cases, by a building principal – can be described as the work of setting direction and high expectations, motivating and supporting staff to achieve goals, assess progress, and drive continuous collaborative organizational improvement that results in strong classroom practice and student achievement. Depending on the school, instructional leaders are principals, assistant principals, teacher leaders, instructional coaches and central office staff who supervise and support school leaders and teachers.
Six Years Ago, Philanthropy Ohio Reported That…

“Ohio has taken promising steps to strengthen the education profession, but most changes have not yet impacted local districts.”

“Ohio does not have enough qualified teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff urban and rural schools and in high-need subject areas.”

“Most Ohio districts use traditional seniority and a credential-based system, rather than a performance-based system, to compensate teachers and principals and determine school staffing.”

Where Does Ohio Stand Today?

Strengthening Teaching and Leading

Over the past six years, the teacher effectiveness conversation has become a greater national priority, resulting in stronger research and a better understanding of the elements that lead to effective teaching and leading. This includes recognizing the necessity of a connected human capital continuum that represents an educator’s full career path, from preparation to recruitment, job retention, compensation, differentiated responsibilities and the overall culture of a school or system.

This long-term approach for developing human capital is illustrated in Figure 11. The interconnected continuum maximizes the development, circulation and reinvestment of professional capital. This is the long-term approach for developing and investing in educators.36

Figure 11: Aligned Educator Human Capital Continuum

Unfortunately, Ohio’s current state-level approach to educator human capital is disconnected. The same can be said for most of Ohio’s major school districts, which often struggle with bureaucratic hiring practices that hinder the recruitment of top-talent, offer little to no new teacher induction opportunities beyond those required by the state, have ineffective and disparate professional development policies, include weak retention incentives and have limited flexibility in compensation. The result is a misaligned, ineffective human capital continuum that diminishes educator effectiveness and severely impacts student learning.

Capital (adj): Relating to or being assets that add to the long-term net worth.

— Merriam-Webster Dictionary
Given Ohio’s generally disconnected approach to educator human capital, it is not too surprising that the 2011 State Teacher Policy Yearbook gave Ohio a C+ overall for its approach to teacher effectiveness, up from a D+ in 2009. The report rated the following factors:

- Delivering Well Prepared Teachers – D+
- Expanding the Teaching Pool – B-
- Identifying Effective Teachers – C+
- Retaining Effective Teachers – C-
- Exiting Ineffective Teachers – C-

There is somewhat of a silver lining to the report. Ohio is making “high” progress when compared to other states. The state ranks 11th nationally in achieving overall progress – thanks, in part, to “evidence of student learning in teacher evaluations, having flexibility for nontraditional candidates in alternate route programs and the broad usage and providers of alternate route programs.”

Ohio’s principal preparation programs also require significant improvements. Most fail to provide candidates with the skills and competencies leaders need to be successful. This subject has received increased attention over the last 10 years from respected organizations like the National Staff Development Council, the Rand Corporation, the Institute for Educational Leadership, the Wallace Foundation and the Woodrow Wilson Foundation that raise serious questions about the effectiveness of principal preparation programs. Arthur Levine, CEO of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, concluded that the majority of leadership preparation programs “range from inadequate to appalling, even at some leading universities.”

Ohio has been criticized for continuing to “offer curriculum that does little to prepare the type of leader needed for twenty-first century schools… the situation exacerbates in Ohio’s urban and rural public school systems.”

### Ensuring Effective Teachers

Ohio has made significant strides in enhancing its stream of effective teachers. House Bill 1, Ohio’s 2010-11 biennial budget, enacted important laws specific to teacher tenure and just cause for dismissal. The state’s new tenure law specifies that teachers can only earn tenure after seven years of teaching in the classroom. This is a dramatic departure from the previous three-year requirement. At the same time, the Ohio General Assembly amended state law to permit the dismissal of teachers for “good and just cause” – the same standard applied to other public employees.

While the state is working hard to ensure that teachers already in the classroom are effective, it has some work to do in forecasting the supply of effective teachers. Currently, there is no way to know if Ohio is on-track to supply enough qualified teachers to fill jobs in schools, subject-matter areas and grade levels that need them most. Until 2007, the Ohio Department of Education commissioned regular reports on the
“Condition of Teacher Supply and Demand in Ohio.” The comprehensive analysis considered a series of factors necessary to develop a 10-year supply and demand forecast. The last report is more than six years old and does not offer an accurate description of the current educator supply and demand situation in Ohio. According to the Ohio Department of Education, the Ohio Education Research Center (OERC) is currently pursuing an update to this report.

To ensure that Ohio’s teacher preparation programs are preparing effective candidates, the Board of Regents, in partnership with leaders of both public and private teacher preparation programs, is developing a performance report for evaluating programs. The report will feature both quantitative and qualitative data that will provide prospective students, parents, the public, K-12 and higher education leaders and elected officials with comparable information on the quality of Ohio’s teacher preparation programs. Ohio’s teacher preparation programs must work cooperatively with the Board of Regents through this performance reporting process. A counter-productive example includes one major Ohio university that has identified over 1900 reports that will be generated for various programs, degrees and licenses.

**Using a Performance-Based System to Identify, Develop, Reward and Compensate Teachers and Principals**

Ohio’s successful Race to the Top (RTT) proposal has catalyzed the state’s progress toward developing and implementing a standards-based teacher evaluation to identify effective teachers, inform individualized professional development needs and impact teacher compensation. With regard to compensation, H.B. 153, the state’s 2012-13 biennial budget, requires that each RTT school district adopt an annual performance-based salary schedule for teachers, if specified in the district’s scope of work. Non-RTT school districts can choose to follow suit as well.

Those schools that implement a performance-based salary schedule must measure a teacher’s performance by: 1) The level of educator license the teacher holds; 2) Whether the teacher is “highly qualified” under No Child Left Behind; and 3) The ratings received by the teacher on the state’s newly implemented Teacher Evaluation System.

Additionally, the state has adopted a comprehensive evaluation system for Ohio’s principals. The Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) model components include: 1) Goal-Setting and Professional Growth Plan; 2) Communication and Professionalism; 3) Skills and Knowledge; and 4) Measures of Student Academic Growth. Inherent in Ohio’s definition of principal effectiveness is the expectation that all students will demonstrate a minimum of one year of growth based on standard and reliable measures.41

*Figures* 12 and 13 reflect the evaluation frameworks adopted by the State Board of Education for teacher and principal evaluations. The evaluation frameworks specify that 50 percent of the evaluation must be
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comprised of multiple measures of student growth and 50 percent based on teacher performance – or, in the case of principals, performance on the standards.

Figure 12: Ohio’s Teacher Evaluation Framework

Evaluation Framework

Evaluation =

Accomplished  Proficient  Developing  Ineffective

Student Growth Measures 50%

Teacher Performance 50%
Student Learning Environment
Content Assessment
Collaboration/Communication Instruction
Professional Responsibility and Growth

Figure 13: Ohio’s Principal Evaluation Framework

Evaluation Framework

Evaluation =

Accomplished  Proficient  Developing  Ineffective

Performance on the Standards 50%
Continuous Improvement Instruction
School Operation, Resources and Learning Environment
Collaboration
Parent and Community Engagement

Priority Recommendations: Creating a Human Capital Continuum that Results in Educator Effectiveness and Student Achievement

Together, the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education must:

a. Work to support local school districts in achieving a fully aligned educator human capital continuum, which should be used as the lens to formulate coherent and connected policies for teachers and leaders. Ohio must embrace a systems approach to educator human capital and identify and implement policies that enable it at the local level. This includes tightly articulated expectations at the state-level and flexible implementation at the local level, recognizing that not all local school districts face the same issues when it comes to a human capital system.

The Board of Regents must also:

b. Ensure that all teacher and principal preparation programs rigorously prepare candidates to teach and lead in Ohio’s Pre-K-12 system. This means:

i. Teachers must be prepared to teach the new CCSS, understand the impact of the PARCC assessments, interpret and use student performance data, use technology to deliver personalized instruction, engage in continuous improvement practices and be content experts in the subject areas they teach.

ii. Preparation curriculum should include a descriptive review of state evaluation expectations.

iii. Teacher and principal programs should offer opportunities, early in the process, for high-quality field experiences with exemplary teachers and principals who are selected based on their effectiveness with students.

Continued on following page...
iv. Teacher and principal programs should emphasize what it means to educate students who have diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

c. Regularly review and approve teacher and principal preparation programs to ensure they meet these expectations and their graduates effectively impact student performance.

d. Proceed with full implementation of teacher and principal preparation performance reports that annually rate programs based on their graduates’ performance in Ohio classrooms and schools, including the impact that graduates have on student performance.

e. Use the teacher and principal preparation performance reports to evaluate and explore the expansion of quality alternative preparation programs, including Teach for America, Woodrow Wilson, TNTP, New Leaders, Rice Education Entrepreneurship Program and others. Additionally, the Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education should work together to clarify alternative paths to licensure.

More broadly, Ohio must attract and recruit a strong cadre of candidates into the teaching field by:

f. Raising the admission standards for colleges of education and only admitting students with strong academic records based on a minimum GPA and/or a minimum ACT composite score.

g. Building a talent pipeline of school leaders, including principals and superintendents. This takes on greater significance as recent reforms to Ohio’s pension system impact retirement rates.

Ohio must ensure its “Four-Tiered Licensure Structure” appropriately accounts for and reflects the effectiveness of teachers, including student performance measures, at every level. To achieve this, the Ohio Department of Education and the Board of Regents must:

a. Achieve full implementation of the “Teacher Performance Assessment” (TPA) so that new candidates licensed as Resident Educators or Alternative Resident Educators are fully prepared for the content and pedagogical challenges of the classroom.

b. Make certain that the five-year renewable Professional Educator, Senior Professional Educator and Lead Profession Educator Licenses fully reflect the latest research and best practices specific to effective teaching and student growth. This includes:

   i. Thoughtfully considering the requirement of a master’s degree for five-year renewable licenses (which research indicates does not contribute to increased student performance unless pursued in a content area) and

   ii. Requiring demonstrated success in improving student performance as one element of advancement in the licensure structure.
Supporting and developing educators must be Ohio’s top priority as the state implements the CCSS and transitions to the new assessments. Thus, the Governor, General Assembly, Ohio Department of Education and Board of Regents must:

a. Continue to invest in and offer high-quality, job-embedded professional development opportunities that will help teachers strengthen their craft and assure effective CCSS implementation. The state also must begin to evaluate and monitor the impact of professional development programs – particularly given the already large state and federal investment in programs which may or may not be having the desired impact on teacher effectiveness.

b. Ensure that the quality of vendor-provided professional development meets high standards and is aligned to the state’s expectations by establishing a clear rating system, rubric, report card and/or standardized evaluation that measures the value and effectiveness of professional development providers, especially in the area of the CCSS, and informs school district leaders of effective and aligned professional development offerings and services. A system that features user ratings, similar to Amazon or Angie’s List, might be a helpful tool.

The Governor and Ohio General Assembly should:

a. Continue to eliminate the “steps and lanes” salary schedule for teachers and principals and move toward a system that rewards performance, effectiveness, leadership, differentiated responsibilities, and other important hallmarks that exist in an educator’s career. Consideration should be given to models that front-end compensation and adopt modern workforce practices, especially for Ohio’s newest educators.

To accomplish this, the state should build from its RTT implementation progress. Additionally, House Bill 525, which became effective on October 1, 2012, contains model language specific to Cleveland’s Plan for Transforming Schools that could be used to shift policies across the state. Specifically, the bill addresses contracts, differentiated salary schedules, teacher assignments, standards-based teacher evaluations, continuing contracts, termination of contracts, reduction in the number of teachers and the evaluation of principals.

b. Modify ORC § 3319.11 to insist that all teachers, regardless of contract status, and principals are retained based on performance as determined by local teacher and principal evaluation systems. When reductions in force occur, seniority should be used only as a tie-breaker when evaluations are of comparable quality.

c. Mandate the dismissal of teachers who score in the bottom category on the teacher evaluation for more than two years in a row.

d. Amend statute to encourage school leaders to provide autonomy and flexibility to those principals who demonstrate a track record of effectiveness.
Increasing Access to, Readiness for and Expansion of Early Childhood

Why It Matters
Investments in early childhood development, particularly for disadvantaged children, have clear and tangible benefits, including:

• Preventing achievement gaps;
• Reducing the need for special education;
• Increasing the likelihood of healthier lifestyles;
• Lowering the crime rate; and
• Reducing overall societal costs.42

The bottom line: Every dollar invested in early childhood education produces a 10 percent return on investment per year – dramatically exceeding returns on interventions instituted later in a student’s academic experience.43

Six Years Ago, Philanthropy Ohio Reported That…
“Not enough Ohio youngsters have access to quality preschool.”
Access to high-quality preschool programs was uneven and the state suffered from low preschool enrollment, despite high preschool enrollment goals.

Where Does Ohio Stand Today?
Access to Quality Preschool

Ohio has lost ground when it comes to supporting and ensuring high quality early childhood learning experiences for children over the past six years. Despite the watertight research behind the benefits, dedicated investments in early childhood have dramatically declined.

Consider the following:

• Ninety-eight percent of Ohio’s public expenditures occur after age five – after 90 percent of brain development has already occurred.
• The percentage of eligible children served in state preschool programs remains in the single digits.
• Help Me Grow, the state’s home visiting program, serves only one in five eligible children.

Rates of Return to Human Capital Investment Initially Setting Investment to be Equal Across All Ages

Figure 14: ROI for Early Childhood

• While the program is growing, just 880 of Ohio’s 5,800 child care centers participate in the state’s quality rating system, Step Up to Quality. Of the 880 centers, only one-third meet standards beyond the most basic requirements. 

Additionally, Ohio’s FY 2010-11 state budget, as noted in the introduction of this report, eliminated the Early Learning Initiative, cut $11 million from the public preschool program, reduced funding by 20 percent for Help Me Grow, and trimmed the reimbursement rate for child care providers who serve low-income families.

The good news is that Ohio is poised to increase investments to enhance the quality of its early childhood learning experiences. In December 2011 the state learned that it was one of nine chosen to receive a federal Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant. This $70 million award over four years is aimed at improving the quality of programs that serve high-needs children from birth to age five. Its goals include:
• Adding 1,300 newly rated, high-quality early-learning settings;
• Serving 37,000 additional high-needs children in highly rated programs;
• Closing the kindergarten readiness gap by 5 percent for high-needs children; and
• Specifying that by 2020, Ohio will only purchase early learning services in high quality settings.

The proposal also specifies a governance structure that consists of:
• An Early Education and Development Officer in the Governor’s Office of 21st Century Education;
• An Early Childhood Advisory Council;
• An Early Education and Development Innovation Committee; and
• Project Teams for Quality, Access and Financing; Professional Development; Assessment and Standards; and Family Support and Engagement.

The RTT-ELC grant will help Ohio accelerate its progress in advancing early childhood education; it could not have come at a better time. Nearly 75 percent of high-needs children in Ohio enter school without the skills they need to succeed in kindergarten. Data indicate that students who start behind continue to lag their peers even as they progress to higher grades. On the 2011 NAEP, just 30 percent of economically disadvantaged Ohio fourth graders were proficient in mathematics, and only 19 percent were proficient in reading. The majority of these kids will continue to struggle throughout their academic careers; nearly 30 percent of them will fail to graduate from high school. This is the sober reality of not ensuring a strong early education foundation for our state’s youngest and most vulnerable learners.
State leaders should work to ensure that 90 percent of all kindergartners enter school ready to succeed by 2020. To do this, Ohio must:

a. Fully implement all components of the state’s RTT-Early Learning Challenge (ELC) proposal so that the state’s neediest children have access to high-quality early childhood educational opportunities. The steps necessary to accomplish this include:
   i. Moving expeditiously to put in place the governance structure which is driven by the “Early Education and Development Officer in the Governor’s Office of 21st Century Education” and includes the creation of an “Early Childhood Advisory Council” and an “Early Education and Development Innovation Committee.”
   ii. Coordinating early learning data systems.
   iii. Using the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) Single Frame work for Quality.
   iv. Expanding and aligning birth to Grade 3 academic content standards.
   v. Developing an expanded Kindergarten Readiness assessment.
   vi. Reaching the goals of 1,300 newly rated, high-quality settings; 37,000 additional high-needs children in highly rated programs; closing the kindergarten readiness gap by 5 percent for high-needs children; and by 2020, purchasing services in high quality settings.

b. Go beyond full implementation of RTT-ELC grant and make increased investments in high-quality preschool to ensure access for all children, particularly the state’s most at-risk. This investment should not impact funding already dedicated to Ohio’s K-12 system, meaning that additional revenue for early childhood should be identified. On the efficiency front, the state should ensure better coordination among those state agencies that receive funds for early childhood education services. This should be a focus as the state evaluates its total P-20 system approach.
Benchmarking K-12 Standards, Instruction, Assessment and Accountability

**Why it Matters**

Standards for what students should know and be able to do are vital. So, too, is how teachers deliver instruction that is aligned to the standards and informed by performance data resulting from the newly emerging assessments. And, in today’s rapidly-shifting, highly-competitive global economy, accurately measuring student performance is necessary to ensure that students, families, teachers, schools and communities know if they are on track.

That’s why Ohio is implementing the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), leading the development of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and participating in the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium.

Moving forward with these key reforms, explained in greater detail below, Ohio must ensure that its classrooms remain dynamic learning environments where:

- The teaching of academic content is strong and engaging.
- Students are challenged, motivated and encouraged to take risks and achieve mastery.
- Real-world problem solving and critical thinking replace rote memorization.
- Teamwork and group projects are valued as real-world situations.
- Creativity and innovation are honored and used to enrich core learning experiences.
- All students have an opportunity to thrive because their individual needs are met.
This is happening in many classrooms across Ohio. But it must happen in all classrooms for all students.

Figure 15: Implementing Benchmarked Standards

Six Years Ago, Philanthropy Ohio Reported That...

“Ohio’s standards are not yet benchmarked to 21st-century skills and expectations.”

“Ohio is strengthening its accountability and assessment system, but weaknesses remain.”

“Teachers do not have sufficient tools and training to use the standards to plan and deliver daily instruction.”
Key Standards, Instruction, Assessment and Accountability Milestones

For more than two decades, through the leadership of both Democrats and Republicans, Ohio has been among the nation’s leaders in improving its standards, instruction, assessment and accountability features. In 1983 under then Governor Celeste (D) attention was given to school funding. This was followed by the Education 2000 Blue Ribbon Commission in 1988. During Governor Voinovich’s (R) years in office, 1990-1998, Ohio saw the creation and endowment of the School Facilities Commission and increased funding for Head Start. These initiatives were followed by other significant reforms proposed by Governors Taft (R), Strickland (D) and Kasich (R) (see below).

Kicking off the era of standards-based reform efforts in 1999, Achieve, Inc. issued a first-of-its-kind benchmarking study for Ohio entitled “A New Compact for Ohio’s Schools,” which evaluated Ohio’s education reform strategies against domestic best practices. The report was focused on standards, assessments and accountability and helped set a foundation for Ohio’s future education policy agenda. On the heels of that report came numerous education improvement commissions, blue ribbon panels and a series of key enabling legislation:

- Senate Bill 1 (2001) established the state’s first academic content standards and called for new assessments to match the standards. It also expanded accountability measures, predating the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Law.
- Senate Bill 311 (2007) introduced rigorous high school graduation requirements for all Ohio students, including four credits of mathematics, with at least one credit in Algebra II or its equivalent.
- House Bill 1 (2009) made multiple changes to Ohio’s accountability system including revising the state’s academic content standards in all subjects and developing new curricula aligned to the standards.
- Senate Bill 316 (2012) enacted the Third Grade Reading Guarantee which ties student promotion into fourth grade to a score set by the Ohio Department of Education that demonstrates proficiency on the third grade reading achievement assessment.

These bipartisan legislative acts have put Ohio on a path to successfully implement the CCSS, aligned PARCC assessments, educator evaluations and strategies to transform low-performing schools. The goal is to ensure rigorous, meaningful standards are in place and that Ohio’s educators are teaching to these standards to help guarantee that students are college- and career-ready. In these polarized political times Ohio’s elected leadership must act in a bipartisan way to put the needs of Ohio’s students ahead of any political needs and maneuverings. Never should the future of Ohio’s children become a political football for adults.

Where Does Ohio Stand Today?
Benchmarking State Standards to 21st Century Skills through the Common Core

Ohio is one of 45 states and the District of Columbia to adopt the CCSS in English language arts and mathematics. This is a critical first step. The CCSS are internationally benchmarked and define the knowledge and skills students should acquire over the course of their K-12 education so that they graduate ready to succeed in entry-level, credit-bearing academic college courses and in workforce training programs. These standards are:

- Aligned to college and work expectations;
- Clearer, deeper and more focused;
- Rigorous and include knowledge through higher-order thinking skills;
- Built upon strengths and lessons of current state standards;
- Informed by other top performing countries, so that all students are prepared to succeed in the global economy and society; and
- Evidence- and research-based.

Patience and time will be required as Ohio fully shifts to the CCSS. The new standards reflect college- and career-readiness – a level of rigor necessary to assure that Ohio high school graduates are prepared to compete locally, regionally, nationally and internationally with their peers. Implementing the standards will be a challenging transition for both students and educators. For students, it will require higher levels of learning, which in the initial years could result in drops in student test scores and in school and district performance ratings. During this challenging transition period, Ohio must press forward with implementation and help citizens understand that this new system of higher expectations is necessary for the success of the state’s children, families and communities. It will be difficult work for sure, but lowering the state’s cut scores and backing down is not an option. The state must continue to gain ground.
Communicating the Importance of the Common Core State Standards

Ohio must ensure that its students, parents and public understand the shifts that will accompany the CCSS. While there is broad-based support for the CCSS among those who know about them, there are still too many who are uninformed.

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) and the Board of Regents (BOR) have initiated communication and outreach efforts with education partners, but not enough has been done to help parents, families and the public understand the importance of these more challenging standards.

This is an area ripe for a public-private initiative that can communicate the importance of the CCSS and the changes that will be ushered in with them.

While it is natural for ODE and BOR to communicate to their constituents – primarily educators and those who prepare educators – their typical outreach does not include parents, families and the public. To achieve impact, this outreach must occur at the school, district and community levels and be led by those outside of the standard education establishment.

Partnerships among businesses, foundations and community groups also could go a long way in helping to spread the message and ensure broad support for this important work.

There are currently a number of activities underway in Ohio, but much more work remains.

Learning from Other States

Ohio can learn from other states. Take the examples of SCORE (State Collaborative on Reforming Education) in Tennessee, Advance Illinois or The Prichard Committee in Kentucky. Each organization is dedicated to improving academic results for students, and has undertaken broad-based communications campaigns to build awareness and support for the changes in their states – currently all CCSS and PARCC states.

SCORE coordinated the launch of the “Expect More, Achieve More” campaign to build support for Tennessee’s new, higher academic standards. The campaign is led by over 30 education and business organizations across Tennessee with the purpose of preparing Tennessee’s parents, families and public for the coming changes to Tennessee’s system. To date they have produced and distributed close to 500,000 brochures, developed a parent outreach website, and created commercials and Public Service Announcements that air on both TV and radio stations across Tennessee.

In Illinois, Advance Illinois has hosted forums and educator trainings, commissioned research and communicated with legislators and the public about the need for bold, transformative change.

The Prichard Committee in Kentucky trains and supports parent activists through the Center for Parent Leadership. Through its communications campaign known as ReadyKentucky, parents, teachers and the public are receiving critical and timely information on the new standards and other improvement efforts.
Strengthening Assessments

Ohio is one of 24 states leading the creation of K-12 assessments in English language arts and mathematics, aligned to the CCSS, through the PARCC consortium. The goal of PARCC is to “create an assessment system and supporting tools that will help states dramatically increase the number of students who graduate high school ready for college and careers and provide students, parents, teachers and policymakers with the tools they need to help students – from grade three through high school – stay on track to graduate prepared.” These new assessments will replace Ohio’s current achievement tests and the Ohio Graduation Test beginning no later than the 2014-2015 school year.

To reflect the full range of content and skills, the assessments, both formative and summative, will contain a mix of multiple-choice, short answer, longer extended response and performance tasks. They also will be computer based, resulting in the rapid turnaround of student results. And, as other states will be administering the same assessments at the same points in time, Ohio will be able to compare how its students stack up against students across the country – something that cannot be done today.

Providing Teachers with Sufficient Tools and Training

Educator professional development becomes even more essential with the dawn of the CCSS and PARCC.

While Ohio is moving to provide teachers with important tools and training to implement the CCSS with fidelity, the state’s track record for supporting impactful, relevant and job-embedded professional development opportunities is not strong. This must change.

The CCSS requires teachers to shift how they deliver instruction in the classroom. These instructional shifts include content-rich nonfiction and instructional texts, coherence across grades and subjects, reading and writing grounded in evidence and much more application of knowledge and skills in project-based, real-world learning. Ohio’s educators require necessary professional development and support to successfully accomplish these shifts.

The Ohio Department of Education, along with national, state and local partners, has begun to address key professional development, training and instructional resource needs. To that end, the state’s Department of Education has developed:

- An Instructional-Information System designed to inform effective classroom instruction, program evaluation and job-embedded professional development;
- Educator leader cadres designed to work with other Ohio educators to deliver high-quality professional development in better ways to teach this more challenging academic content;

Gaining Ground

Teaching to rigorous standards and basing practice on what is known about teaching and learning demand much more of teachers, including a deeper knowledge of subject matter; a better understanding of how students learn and think; the ability to make complex, on-the-spot decisions; and a commitment to working closely with colleagues to design rich learning activities and appropriate assessments. Professional development is an essential element of comprehensive or systemic reform. The nation can adopt rigorous standards, set forth a visionary scenario, compile the best research about how students learn, change textbooks and assessment, promote teaching strategies that have been successful with a wide range of students, and change all other elements involved in systemic reform – but without professional development, school reform and improved achievement for all students will not happen.

— American Federation of Teachers
• Regional training series for educators that focus on the shift to Common Core learning expectations;
• Toolkits and gap analyses to identify the technology needs of schools; and
• Curriculum models, lesson plans, training videos, newsletters and Web links aligned to existing resources in other states.

Schools across the state are creatively employing ways to enable the new standards. Some schools are lengthening class periods to enable more hands-on, project-based instructional opportunities. Others are implementing block-scheduling and defining common planning time for educators to co-develop units and lessons. Community partners and foundations such as GE Foundation, The Fordham Institute, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, STRIVE, local foundations and many others are supporting states and local districts in implementation.

High-quality professional development opportunities are essential, too, for school leaders – particularly principals. As instructional leaders, principals must understand the new learning expectations and have the leadership, knowledge and skills necessary to help their staffs and students improve. It also is an issue of impact. It is easier and more cost effective for the state to reach 3,500 principals within its schools versus the 100,000 teachers within its classrooms.

Both teachers and principals must be trained to skillfully understand and apply important data emerging from Ohio’s next generation of assessments, including the PARCC assessments. Educators should be equipped to use formative and summative data from the assessments to inform lessons, instruction and teaching methods that result in enhanced student performance. Training specific to data analysis and application is critical because ineffective use of data could negatively impact teaching and learning in Ohio’s classrooms.
Enhancing Accountability and Public Reporting

In introducing new standards and raising expectations for student performance, Ohio also must enhance its accountability system based on a shared vision that drives college- and career-readiness for all students. An effective accountability strategy should work to set a clear expectation for performance, illuminate and reward results and differentiate districts and schools for supports and interventions. Ultimately, the state’s accountability measures should:

1. **Promote Public Reporting:** Report timely, accessible and actionable student data to policymakers, educators, parents and the public.

2. **Highlight Statewide Student Performance Goals:** Be used to manage performance of districts and schools across the state and be widely communicated by state leaders to rally support for improvement and emphasize progress in student outcomes.

3. **Enable School-Level Incentives:** Incentivize schools and districts that continuously improve student performance at all levels and recognize and reward those districts and schools.

4. **Uphold an Accountability Formula that Differentiates and Classifies Schools:** Link supports and interventions to the state’s overall system of instructional support for CCSS implementation.46

As Ohio enhances its accountability system, it must acknowledge the black cloud surrounding allegations of data manipulation in several school districts across the state. When schools and districts manipulate data to make themselves look better, they cheat students, families and taxpayers. Ohio’s students, parents and public have a right to know how schools are honestly performing, whether good, bad or a combination of the two.

To that end, the state should invest in appropriate updates to the K-12 data system that permit validation checks of entered data to assure the integrity of the reports. Ohio must develop a rating and reporting system that provides Ohioans with an accurate portrayal of its K-12 education structure for continuous improvement.
Ohio must get the Common Core right. To that end, the Ohio Department of Education, capitalizing on existing efforts in other CCSS states, should:

a. Prioritize the full and effective implementation of CCSS and other state standards such as science (through the Next Generation Science Standards), social studies and foreign language. At the same time, schools must not sacrifice the arts, music or physical education. The state should consider creating a report card measure that gauges school and district progress toward implementing the standards.

b. Develop a clearinghouse of existing websites and open source instructional tools, such as curriculum frameworks, lesson plans, educator videos, and professional development modules that are aligned with CCSS and offer educators easily accessible and effective resources to improve instructional planning and delivery. The Ohio Department of Education should look closely at the work being developed by the Shared Learning Collaborative supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

c. Adopt rubrics to help schools and districts select instructional materials and professional development aligned to the CCSS and PARCC assessments, including text books, software, apps, real-world projects, etc. Such rubrics can be informed by those already developed in New York, Tennessee and other leading states.

d. Through a public-private partnership, deploy a communications campaign aimed at explaining the impact of the CCSS and PARCC so that Ohio’s students and families understand the initiative and what it means to them personally and to the economic future of the state.

The Ohio Department of Education – in conjunction with partners like Educational Service Centers, colleges of education, education associations, education advocacy organizations and others – must identify, analyze and disseminate high-quality professional development and instructional supports that promote effective teaching, leadership and higher levels of learning. Professional development should be targeted to individual teacher and principal needs, as defined by the new educator evaluations and as it relates to facilitating greater student learning.

Fully transition to Ohio’s next generation of assessments, which includes PARCC, by:

a. Using the high school assessments to provide educators with real-time feedback to inform instruction and enable value-added analysis at the high school level (as one of multiple measures in the evaluation of high school teachers). This approach helps inform teachers and administrators of the effectiveness of their curriculum and teaching.

b. Ensuring full implementation and public reporting of the current statutory requirement for the administration of a nationally standardized assessment that measures college- and career-readiness for all high school students in Ohio (ORC § 3301.0712). This assessment should complement the high school assessments to provide a more complete examination of student progress and school effectiveness.

c. Guaranteeing that results from high school assessments can be used for postsecondary placement purposes and that institutions of higher education use them as such. Establish policies to compel colleges and universities to make the
shift in short order, including the elimination of duplicative placement exams currently in use.

d. Participating in an international assessment (e.g., PISA) that enables Ohio-specific international benchmarking and comparisons. Vanguard states such as Massachusetts and Minnesota have been engaging in this practice for a number of years.

e. Ensuring, by 2014, that all students have ample opportunity to use technology for their daily learning and sufficient bandwidth for online assessments. This will guarantee a seamless transition to Ohio’s next generation of assessments, including PARCC.

PARCC is a new assessment. Thus, Ohio’s Technical Advisory Committee should conduct a review of the state’s next generation of assessments, including PARCC data, and provide the state with an independent analysis of the long-term validity and reliability of the measure.

Ohio should implement a broad K-12 accountability rating system (A-F grades) with an emphasis on using a dashboard of performance measures that strongly signal the state’s commitment to kindergarten readiness, K-12 improvement and college- and career-readiness.

Performance measures should include:

- Key Pre-K-12 academic indicators for all students and key student subgroups.
- Value-added progress and growth measures for all students and each student subgroup.
- Achievement gap closing measures.
- Attendance and graduation rates.

- Early learning measures such as kindergarten readiness, K-3 literacy and numeracy rates and progress measures.
- College- and career-ready indicators such as ACT/SAT participation, ACT/SAT scores, ACT WorkKeys, AP course participation, AP exam scores, career-technical education program completion rates, first-year college remediation rates in English and mathematics, postsecondary coursework participation, credit earned and early college participation.

Input measures could include:

- Progress on CCSS implementation.
- Measures that reflect student education experiences and perceptions, through a student survey such as My Voice.
Promoting Quality Public Charter Schools

Why It Matters

Among the state’s portfolio of publicly funded school choice options, charter schools are the most widely used. Today, approximately 108,000 students attend one of more than 350 charters in the state. Over the last six years, charter school enrollment has increased by more than 50 percent.

The role of charter schools has evolved in Ohio since they first opened in 1998. Once seen solely as competition, charters are now often important allies and partners with school districts. Cleveland’s Plan for Transforming Schools, for instance, includes support for high-performing charters and a strategy to get more students into them. Cincinnati Public Schools is pushing to establish partnerships with charters. And numerous suburban school districts have opened niche charters to better serve the needs of their students.

Charters offer fertile ground for experimentation and innovation, particularly in Ohio’s cities, such as Cleveland and Columbus, where district leaders are working with high-performing charters to help bolster broader district performance.

Six Years Ago, Philanthropy Ohio Reported That…

“Ohio’s public community (charter) schools have no uniform performance standards, uneven accountability and an inequitable allocation of resources.”

Where Does Ohio Stand Today?

Performance Standards for Charter Schools

Over the last six years the state has enacted numerous laws designed to improve performance of and expand accountability for Ohio’s charters, including:

- Mandating the closure of chronically underperforming charters;
- Requiring e-schools and dropout recovery schools to develop performance standards; and
- Prohibiting sponsors with the lowest performing schools to expand their sponsorship to other schools.

The academic performance of Ohio’s charter schools continues to increase. For instance, between 2008 and 2012, the percentage of charter schools rated “academic watch” or “academic emergency” fell by 24 percent. Over that same time period, charters rated “effective”, “excellent” or “excellent with distinction” increased by 17 percent.
Charters also are making progress on value-added measures. Charters in the “Urban 8” areas show a 7 percent increase in value-added over their traditional school counterparts. Furthermore, 29 percent show more than a year’s worth of growth for students, compared to 15 percent for traditional public schools in the Urban 8 areas. Charter schools have been able to attain this improved performance with funding that has been virtually flat in adjusted dollars.

Priority Recommendation:
Promoting Quality Public Charter Schools

The Ohio Department of Education, with authorization from the Governor and Ohio General Assembly, should:
   a. Issue report cards for Ohio’s charter school authorizers, including fiscal performance data;
   b. Develop strong performance standards for e-schools and drop-out recovery schools;
   c. Grant charter schools access to school facilities funding; and
   d. Permit the same charter school boards and board members to govern multiple charter schools.
Addressing K-12 School Funding

Why It Matters

Article 6, § 02 of Ohio’s Constitution states, “The General Assembly shall make such provisions, by taxation, or otherwise, as, with the income arising from the school trust fund, will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state.” This brief, yet significant clause has resulted in more than 20 years of litigation and passionate debate about how Ohio should build a more stable and adequate school finance system. It all began in 1997, when the Ohio Supreme Court issued DeRolph I, which called for a “complete systematic overhaul” of how the state funded schools to ensure an adequate approach.

Regardless of one’s opinion in this debate, members of Philanthropy Ohio believe there is one clear certainty: The State of Ohio has a responsibility to provide stable, predictable and adequate funding to Ohio’s schools. And, the state’s responsibility becomes even more critical during these difficult economic times, when educational investments serve as a powerful tool for building a future-ready workforce and maintaining vibrant communities across Ohio. Investments in education must remain a priority.

Philanthropy Ohio recognizes the challenges that come with prioritizing education investments in this difficult economy and offers two important lenses to focus the discussion:

- **State-level resourcing**: The funding dedicated to schools by the state that is separate and distinct from local funding; and

- **District-level spending**: Equally important is how districts spend their resources. A smart use of resources, including use of shared services with other governmental entities, and a maximized approach to innovation and efficiencies are essential in these challenging economic times.

While the state’s share of funding per pupil has increased by $951 over the past six years, as depicted in Figure 16, other factors have shifted, impacting – if not neutralizing – the effects of the state increase. For instance, over the past six years:

- The state’s student demographics have dramatically shifted, including a 27 percent increase in the numbers of students considered economically disadvantaged and a 22 percent jump in the number of Limited English Proficient students. These students often require a more specialized, resource-intensive approach.

- Many of Ohio’s school districts have faced decreases in local property valuations, impacting local property tax receipts and overall school funding.
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• Most Ohio schools and districts have experienced increased operating costs – from fuel to employee healthcare costs.

These factors have significant bearing on the funding realities of schools and districts across Ohio.

**Six Years Ago, Philanthropy Ohio Reported That…**

“Despite improvements, Ohio’s current funding system still does not – and cannot – ensure stability, equity or appropriate growth.”

“Many school districts and schools do not sufficiently focus on the effectiveness of their spending.”

**Where Does Ohio Stand Today?**

**Stability, Equity and Growth in the Current Funding System**

Unfortunately, Ohio has made little progress on this front. First, over the last seven years, Ohio schools have experienced three funding formulas that have been short-lived and unable to address long-term challenges. This trend started in 2002, with the implementation of the Building Blocks Foundation Formula, which consisted of a series of factors including poverty-based assistance, base cost supplements and a total base cost. Combined, these building blocks – plus special education and career tech weights, parity and gap aid, excess cost supplement and guarantees – were used to calculate a school’s funding allocation. This approach to school funding lasted for about four years.

In 2009, the Evidence Based Model (EBM) was enacted, superseding the Building Blocks Foundation Formula. Essentially, this approach to school funding identified multiple factors used to determine an “adequacy amount” for each district. In the EBM, the adequacy amount was impacted by the Educational Challenge Factor, which considered the unique challenges facing school districts across the state in educating their students. The model also included a guarantee and cap designed to smooth funding increases and decreases to individual school districts. The EBM was in place for two years but never fully funded.

In 2011, Ohio moved away from the Evidence Based Model and enacted a temporary Bridge funding formula. This temporary approach uses FY 2011 state aid per pupil as its baseline and includes a per pupil adjustment amount that is calculated using an index that measures a district’s relative property wealth. A school district’s annual allocation is equal to the adjusted per pupil amount times the number of students served in the school district. The formula also includes a supplemental allocation that guarantees a school district receives at least the same state aid, less federal stimulus, as it did in FY 2011. Under the formula, high-performing districts also receive a $17 per pupil subsidy. At the same time, the state accelerated the phase-out of its “hold harmless” payments for changes to the state’s method of taxation of tangible personal property (TPP). This acceleration greatly affects the amount of money that many local districts receive from the state to offset declines in business property tax receipts. While it was well understood that state payments would eventually disappear, the abrupt nature of the acceleration proved to be another source of instability and loss to many districts’ budgets.
The bottom line is that Ohio leaders have not been able to agree on the best approach to financing schools in a way that alleviates inequities due to the property tax, promotes district flexibility for spending funds and maximizes the opportunity for districts to effectively focus resources to achieve goals for students. Ultimately, none of the three previous school funding approaches (Building Blocks, EBM and Bridge Funding) have benefited from full implementation.

As a result, Ohio still struggles with:

- The identification of revenue sources that do not result in significant disparities across the state.
- Tax caps that limit growth and stability. The impact of H.B. 920 continues to be felt, and the number of districts going to the ballot continues to be high.
- Continued lack of agreement of what “adequate” means. While policymakers have proposed and adopted two approaches for defining the cost of an adequate education – the Building Blocks Approach and the Evidence Based Model – neither achieved a level of agreement needed to withstand the test of time. Ohio’s current “Bridge” funding formula is readily acknowledged to be a transitional funding strategy pending a new funding formula proposal.

There is one area of notable progress. Ohio has increased its share of state funding as a percent of the total, up from 42.9% in 2006-07 to 45.5% in 2010-11. Several contributing factors are at play. First, from 2006-2010, phase out of the TPP occurred. Over that time period the assessment rates on business TPP were phased out (and local revenue reduced) while the reimbursements from the state increased. The state also increased the homestead exemption for senior citizens and disabled property owners. The state took on the responsibility of paying for a larger share of the property tax obligations for these property owners, in part, to help ensure they would support local school levies. Interestingly, this exemption increased the state share but without providing any net new dollars to school districts.

**Focus on Effective Spending**

Ohio’s track record for improving the effectiveness of spending is mixed. In some areas, Ohio has made good progress, but in others, it has not. Of note, the state has made progress in promoting effective and efficient spending practices at the district level. This is thanks, in part, to the work of the Ohio Smart Schools collaborative, which is dedicated to finding new ways for schools to work more effectively and efficiently in a time of tight resources. One major tactic includes advancing strategies for shared services. To that end, examples are surfacing of school districts sharing superintendents, treasurers or back office services and collaborating through Educational Service Centers (ESC) to meet the needs of special education students. Additionally, the Ohio Education Fiscal Data Project is producing information enabling districts to benchmark their spending in a number of key operational categories with comparable districts. The state will soon issue Expenditure Standards that will likely further motivate district efforts.

Despite this progress, Ohio still has a lot of work to do. Consider the following weaknesses when it comes to effective spending.
• **District allocations to schools are not student based.** There have been little or no policy changes that impact how districts allocate funds based on student needs. This could be improved by policies that promote flexibility at the local level and support weighted student funding and money following the child.

• **Disparities continue to exist within districts.** There has been no significant policy push to improve the accuracy and transparency of reporting of actual district expenditures at the building level and evaluating whether district resource allocation practices are based on student needs or provide evidence of effective academic outcomes. Fortunately, a significant federal study conducted by the U.S. Department of Education sheds additional light on this issue and may drive federal policy changes to address this inequity.

• **Spending is not linked to student performance.** Some efforts have been made to link money to performance, but work in this area continues to be weak. Ohio needs to insist that money it is sending to schools and districts is evaluated for effectiveness of student results. These results should be included on the local report card for schools and districts.

• **Rigid teacher compensation policy limits flexibility.** In this area, Ohio, like many other states, is beginning to lay the groundwork for change. However, such change does not come easily or quickly. It is widely recognized that reforming teacher compensation structures is an important element of a broader strategy to improve the quantity of effective teachers and leaders working in schools.

• **Limited transparency.** Little has occurred that would lead to greater transparency in the sharing of meaningful financial information. While financial information is readily available, little of it speaks to how it supports effective programs to improve student performance. It’s also not user-friendly and not understood by the public.

• **Incentives for performance are not part of the state aid formula.** Districts continue to receive state aid based upon their unique set of characteristics (inputs), but there is little in the formula to incentivize innovation or reward performance.
Addressing K-12 School Funding

**Priority Recommendation: Achieving Stable, Predictable and Adequate Revenue for Schools**

As Ohio’s leaders consider a new school funding formula, they need to:

a. Recognize Ohio’s rapidly changing student body – along with the increased expectations for students, teachers and schools – and commit to a funding mechanism that results in stable, predictable and adequate resources, focuses on performance and, ultimately, squelches the school funding debate that has gripped the state for years.

b. Be relentless in identifying spending inefficiencies and promoting efficiencies and productivity within the system. To that end, funding mechanisms should incentivize ways to maximize student improvement through the sharing of resources across organizations and eliminating ineffective programs and initiatives. This includes:
   i. Aligning processes and practices to capitalize on economies of scale, including flexible school days and reworking the school calendar to permit year-round schooling.
   ii. Continuing to push on teacher effectiveness and important human capital decisions.
   iii. Carefully engaging in public pension reform.
   iv. Creating state-level policies that encourage shared services and a consolidation of backroom operations across districts, including student transportation services.
   v. Removing regulations and barriers for districts that pursue innovative educational approaches.

c. Develop a research-based plan to ensure that state funding directly follows the student. This means that dollars follow students to their ultimate public learning venue, do not get tied up in the bureaucracy of a central office, and are flexible enough to accommodate multiple learning delivery methods (e.g. blended learning, online learning), tools (e.g. technology, curriculum and instructional models, textbooks, etc.) and programs (e.g. STEM, Early College and PSEO). It also means that resources going to school buildings should be commensurate with the number of students served in that building, including public charter schools.
Enhancing Postsecondary Education Access, Affordability and Completion

Why it Matters
Postsecondary education is no longer a luxury for Ohioans. It’s a necessity. Fifty-nine percent of Ohio’s jobs will require a certificate or college degree by the year 2020. Currently, 36 percent of Ohio adults have an associate degree or higher. That means the state faces a skills gap of 23 percent – and this skills gap is real. Ohio’s current unemployment rate is 7 percent. Yet the state has more than 70,000 jobs that go unfilled because they require specialized skills. If Ohio expects a strong future economy with jobs that pay family-sustaining wages, then it must close this skills gap by providing residents with access to affordable postsecondary education options and encouraging completion of degrees.

Six Years Ago, Philanthropy Ohio Reported That…
“Too few students have access to affordable higher education.” Higher education was not accessible or affordable for many Ohioans, in spite of the fact that a postsecondary credential was recognized as a requirement for many of the state’s new jobs.
Accessible and Affordable Higher Education

Access and affordability remain serious issues for Ohio’s students and families. Today, a student attending one of Ohio’s 4-year public or private colleges or universities can expect to spend on average $74,765 for a degree. And, students can expect to graduate with an average debt load of $28,683 – ranking the state the seventh highest in the nation for two years in a row (2010 and 2011). These statistics are not helped by the fact that over the last six years Ohio has decreased its investment in need-based student financial aid by more than $52 million. In FY 2006, Ohio invested approximately $121 million in the Ohio Instructional Grant, which was previously the state’s primary need-based grant. In FY 2012, it invested $69 million in the Ohio College Opportunity Grant, the state’s current need-based financial aid program.

Affordability becomes even more complicated by the amount of time it takes many students to graduate – often with too many credits that are not necessary for their fields of study or degree attainment. Not surprisingly, students who do not complete college identify affordability as the main reason. In a recent report from the US Chamber of Commerce, Ohio’s 2-year institutions received a “D” for student access and success and “C” for efficiency and cost effectiveness. Ohio’s 4-year institutions received a “C” in each category.

College Completion is the Goal

Access and affordability impact college retention and completion. And the data are troubling. Chances are that students who can afford to enter the doors of higher education will not go on to complete their credential or degree. Ultimately, too many Ohio students get lost along the way.

Ohio’s 2010 college enrollment and graduation data tell a stunning story. Of 100 students who enroll in a public college or university, eight students will end up graduating from Ohio’s 2-year public colleges in four years. Thirty-two will graduate from Ohio’s 4-year public colleges in eight years.
Here’s a look at the flow of high school graduates in Ohio’s public colleges and universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Four-Year Ohio Public University</th>
<th>Public University Regional Campus</th>
<th>Public Two-Year College in Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduates Enrolling</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>7,223</td>
<td>13,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning for Sophomore Year</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating with Degree/</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential in Six Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2009, Ohio has been focusing its state funding to increase degree yield, not simply increase the numbers of students enrolled. In fact, it was in that year that state lawmakers modified the State Share of Instruction formula to focus funding, in part, on successful academic outcomes including course and degree completion. This represented a major shift for Ohio, which previously focused higher education funding on student enrollment – paying little attention to student outcomes and results.

But the most compelling driver of the college completion agenda is the ability for students to find gainful employment in jobs that pay a family-sustaining wage. The majority of Ohio’s job openings today and projected into the future will require some postsecondary education. Adding to the challenge, Ohio is not currently graduating enough individuals with degrees and certificates to meet current and future workforce needs. The Lumina Foundation estimates that Ohio will need to double its recent average annual increase in college completion – from 3.2 percent to 6.4 percent – to fill the anticipated number of new jobs requiring postsecondary education and training between 2008 and 2018. If those jobs go unfilled, then Ohio risks losing them to other states.

As a result of these combined factors, the Ohio Board of Regents commissioned the Complete College Ohio Task Force to develop a strategic set of recommendations for increasing the percentage of Ohioans with degrees. Released in November 2012, Complete College Ohio offers 20 recommendations that impact college completion and include a wide selection of tactical options. The report’s centerpiece recommendation calls for each college, university and adult career technical center in Ohio to develop its own “Campus Completion Plan.”

Key local initiatives also are underway, including the Higher Education Compact of Greater Cleveland. Cleveland Mayor Frank Jackson formally launched the initiative in October 2011 upon a recommendation from civic leaders, educators and college and university presidents. The Compact is a promise from leaders to do what it takes to remove obstacles that keep Cleveland youth from going to and succeeding in college. Another significant initiative underway is Completion by Design, which aims to share new approaches to student success, including college completion best practices, data sharing and statewide policy development. The initiative involves Sinclair Community College, Lorain County Community College, Stark State Community College and the Ohio Association of Community Colleges. It is funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
Finally, the state cannot underestimate the importance of sub-baccalaureate credentials such as certificates, associate degrees, state-issued education credentials, corporate certificates and badges. As pointed out by the Lumina Foundation in a recent Focus story on Dayton, these are cost-effective, flexible and highly accessible means for providing just-in-time training and education. And, too often, business leaders across the state speak of open positions which go unfilled because of workers who lack specific technical skills.60

At the state- and local-levels, Ohio must continue to emphasize best-in-class college completion policies and practices to ensure that students’ and families’ time and money result in degrees and credentials that are linked to employment opportunities and hold value in the marketplace. The state’s economic future depends on it.

**Priority Recommendation: Prioritizing Postsecondary Completion**

16 The Governor, Ohio General Assembly, Chancellor of the Board of Regents and Ohio’s college and university presidents must continue to prioritize a postsecondary completion agenda that seeks to catapult Ohio among states with the highest college completion rates in the nation by 2020. This should be done by:

a. Continuing to shift the State Share of Instruction formula to a performance-based system that rewards and incentivizes postsecondary degree completion. Currently, Ohio’s public university presidents have joined together to update the performance funding formula.

b. Advancing progress in student orientation, guidance and advising, improving assessment and placement practices, redesigning developmental education and creating model career pathways to shorten time to degree completion, among others.

c. Issuing report cards for Ohio’s public colleges and universities that publicly disclose freshmen-to-sophomore retention, remediation, completion and transfer rates, and address access and affordability, debt load and job placement after graduation. The report card concept should leverage data already collected by the Board of Regents, the Ohio Education Research Center and others used for the production of broader performance reports in Ohio and across the country.

d. Implementing the recommendations and policies of the Complete College Ohio Taskforce, which were unveiled in November 2012.
Accelerating the Pace with Support from Ohio’s Philanthropic Community

Fully implementing the 16 recommendations in this report will require commitment, grit and strategic focus at the local-, regional- and state-levels. Ohio’s philanthropies remain committed to working closely with partners – including K-12, higher education, business and community leaders – at each level to support, implement and accelerate student achievement through targeted investments.

These investments, which total more than $300 million annually, will seek to connect projects and initiatives across the education continuum. And, as a result of their unique role in the education arena, Ohio’s philanthropists will continue to fund R&D that fosters innovative education policies and practices, in ways that the state and local districts often cannot.

At the state-level, Philanthropy Ohio and its members will use this report as a guide to align philanthropic effort, investments and research in education over the coming years. This approach will maximize the collective impact of investments and advance complementary and transformative education initiatives, working in conjunction with local, state and federal education priorities and investments. Specifically, Philanthropy Ohio will encourage its members to engage in the following state-level functions:

- Advocating for critical state policies and investments to improve student achievement – particularly during the state’s biennial budget processes, beginning with the 2014-15 state operating budget.
- Serving on committees, task forces and work teams to ensure successful design and implementation of state-level initiatives.
- Meeting regularly with state-level elected officials to share thoughts and concerns about how to generally improve education in Ohio.

At the regional- and local-levels, Philanthropy Ohio will urge philanthropists to align resources and grantmaking to support efforts that work toward the recommendations in this report. Examples include:

- Participating in local P-20 education councils and / or establishing P-20 councils in communities or regions.
- Identifying critical education and funding gaps and developing a strategic plan for closing the gaps.

Grantmakers bring – in addition to their working capital – a unique ability to take risks, create knowledge and act objectively for the greater good. These assets can be powerful tools for change and improvement in education, but only if they are deployed wisely.

– Grantmakers for Education
• Supporting and implementing the CCSS, including professional development for teachers and principals.
• Working with local districts to identify critical technology and bandwidth needs to ensure student access to technology.
• Promoting innovative school models in communities and working with local schools to launch new and innovative models.
• Communicating the importance of the new standards and expectations to students, parents and other community members – ultimately building a “community of supporters” for the work.
• Encouraging local K-12 and institutions of higher education to support students in becoming college- and career-ready through dual enrollment opportunities, Post-Secondary Enrollment Options and credential programs.

Finally, to achieve maximum coherence and impact at all levels, this work will be guided by the following tenets:

• **Discipline and focus** – Not only supporting a policy or initiative through its launch, but helping to see policies through to implementation.
• **Collaboration and coalitions** – Collaborating with partners to achieve greater impact and engaging stakeholders and building coalitions to gain input, provide support and ensure sustainability.
• **Persistence and agility** – Building capacity to get the job done, and exercising flexibility when necessary for ultimate success.
• **Communications and awareness** – Helping to communicate and build awareness about the importance of the reforms that result from the grantmaking.

While the investments of Ohio’s philanthropic community are a critical piece of the state’s education puzzle, they represent just a small fraction when compared to the state’s $11 billion investment in P-20 education. Thus, **Philanthropy Ohio proposes a partnership with Ohio’s elected officials, policymakers and education leaders.** As part of this partnership, Philanthropy Ohio urges the state’s top policymakers to embrace the recommendations contained in this report – along with the tenets of discipline and focus, collaboration and coalitions, persistence and agility and communications and awareness – as they go about identifying, launching and implementing education policies and practices.

This coordinated approach is the only way to make the most of investments across the board and achieve meaningful change in student performance. Ohio’s foundations are committed to moving the needle in education further and faster. Collaborative efforts across all education sectors will dramatically accelerate the work.

---

As foundations, we have a hard time following policies down to the ground. We are engaged through the enactment of new policies but, too often, move on before those policies have taken hold.

— Robert Schwartz
Associate Dean, Harvard School of Education
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