

Chair Manning, Vice Chair Bird, Ranking Member Robinson and members of the House Primary and Secondary Education Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of House Bill (HB) 200. I am Dr. Cameron Ryba, Superintendent of Strongsville City Schools. As one of the Superintendent's selected to be a member of the original report card study committee and a member of the bipartisan workgroup with Representative Jones that developed HB 200, I am testifying today in support of this bill.

When our workgroup first met, we set six goals for our work. Today, I would like to highlight a few of those goals that provided the foundation for our work and the bill that is in front of you today for consideration.

First, we were driven to evolve the report card, within the constraints of it being predominantly based on state testing, to be a reporting system that is equitable to all school districts and all students. Secondly, we wanted it to be a truthful and accurate representation of what students know and can do, as well as an expanded reflection of the work being done for the betterment of our students at the building and district level. Finally, we wanted the report card that is clear and understandable to all stakeholders, so that it can be a tool that drives change and improvement through a supportive structure.

With multiple bills and many insights being shared, it is wonderful to witness robust conversations occurring regarding the reform of the state report card. However, I challenge all of us to not get stuck on the differences between our views or opinions, but the commonalities in our vision for a better system.

I would like to take a few moments to highlight some commonalities in thought and some work that still needs to be done.

As we look at the state report card and the *Achievement* component, achievement of students should be measured, but through a means that most accurately represents the achievement of our students at all ability levels. That is why HB 200 states that the achievement measure will be based solely on the performance index component. With the addition of the "Approaching Proficient" category to this measure, as well as setting the bar for success at an achievable standard versus a mathematical impossibility, we are providing the most accurate measure we can to capture the achievement of all students that supports a focus on growth versus a binary benchmark as indicated by the indicators met component.

Even with these enhancements, *Achievement* is still a measure of socioeconomic status - it is just a better measure than is currently in place. To help further our goal to implement a supportive system that is focused on student growth, the *Progress* component will continue to measure the growth of our students overall, while the *Gap Closing* component will look at both the achievement and growth of all students, as well as our various student groups. By allowing multiple pathways for students to meet the state-set *Gap Closing* criteria through either achievement or progress, we are providing a pathway for our students, buildings, and districts to be recognized and rewarded for working towards the set expectations.

Based on federal regulations, there will not be changes to the *Graduation Rate* component in terms of what will be measured. However, what HB 200 has proposed is more comprehensive reporting to share the story of the graduating class. It will share the story of mobility and detailing the graduation rate for students that spent all 4 years in the district. It will share the story of our students with disabilities that have decided to continue their educational services beyond their graduating cohort. And it will share the story of students did not receive a diploma with their cohort.

As we look at telling the story of our graduating class, there is so much more than just the graduation rate. There has been much discussion about *Prepared for Success*. Should it be a component that is measured or reported? I support the position of HB 200 in that this should be reported only to give context and insight into the work the district and buildings are doing to provide varied pathways for students and their success after high school.

In a similar lens, there is much debate as to how we should measure and report on K-3 Literacy. Between HB 200, SB 145, and the Ohio Department of Education, I believe there is common ground that will lead to a better and more accurate measure. For both *Prepared for Success* and K-3 Literacy, there is so much complexity in the current measurement that we are not meeting our goal of presenting information in a way that is an accurate reflection of the work being done, nor in a way that is easily understandable by internal and external stakeholders. For both measures, I am advocating for a measure that meets the desired outcomes – that our students are prepared by the end of third grade to be successful readers and our graduates are prepared with the knowledge and skills necessary to be career, college, or military ready after high school.

Finally, I would be remiss to not share some thoughts on the rating system and the differences between HB 200 and what is being suggested as other options. Whether it be letter grades, stars, or descriptors, we are making a determination as to which symbols we want to use that best capture the spirit and foundational focus for our state accountability system. If we want to make a statement to our district leaders, our teachers, our staff, and our students that we believe in a system of accountability that is focused on growth and support, it is time to move away from old paradigms of what is comfortable to us, and move to what is needed for our students.

Courage is the ability to take action even when you cannot predict the outcome. I cannot share with you today that every component of HB 200 is going to work out as intended. However, what I can share with you is that if we don't make a change, if we don't break from what we have always done, we will never realize what we could be. Please have the courage to listen intently, to reflect deeply, and to continue to make decisions based on what is best for every student in Ohio.

If we can come together to make these changes, we can create a meaningful future for public education - a future that provides supportive accountability and encourages a culture within our schools that affords the ability to foster and develop critical thinkers - to foster and develop creative, collaborative, empowered and resilient learners that have the skills and knowledge necessary to not only find success on a standardized test, but to find success in life.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony as a proponent of HB 200. I am glad to answer your questions.