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Good afternoon Chair Lehner, Vice Chair Huffman, Ranking Member Sykes and members of the Senate Education Committee. My name is John Monteleone and I am the Assistant Superintendent of Oberlin City Schools.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today about Senate Bill 216. I am here as an opponent to the bill and will focus my concerns on the proposed language regarding changes to the “N-Size.”

For accountability and reporting purposes, each state under ESSA must define the minimum number of students (n-size) required in a subgroup before data can be reported. In an effort to ensure Ohio’s reporting requirements create new opportunities for students of color, students with disabilities, English learners, girls, as well as boys, and low income students; the State Board included an *n*-size of 15 in Ohio’s ESSA application, to be phased in over three years.

I applaud the State Board for this transition from 30 to 15. The n-size of 30 was unnecessarily large, which meant there was far less reporting about individual groups of students than there should have been. As a practitioner, please allow me to provide you with a real life example of how the n-size of 30 led to a subgroup of students in Oberlin not receiving the supports and interventions they should have been receiving. Due to English language learners historically not being reported on Oberlin’s report card, it led to students not properly being screened, identified, and serviced properly. Since the proposed transition from 30 to 15, this has prompted our district to place forth more intentional efforts to provide students with the proper supports, and our teachers with the proper training. The reality is that if this oversight is happening in our district, it is surly happening with subgroups in other districts across the state as well. We see patterns of troubling clusters of underperformance across the state. In our own ESSA state plan submission, we ourselves recognized that only 39.3 percent of students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup are proficient in English language arts, leaving a gap of 60.7 percent. Patterns such as these point to an urgent need to address systemic inequities among groups of students that prevent ALL students from reaching their full potential. We cannot improve overall outcomes without improving outcomes for our historically underserved subgroups. To think otherwise is providing ourselves with false hope.

Therefore, the transition from 30 to 15 over time holds districts and schools accountable for accurately, transparently, and accessibly measuring the data and making the data widely available.

Thank you for allowing me to testify today and share my concerns about SB 216. I would be happy to answer any questions the committee might have.