

House Bill 176 Testimony

Bradford R. Findell, PhD

Greetings Chairman Brenner, Ranking Member Fedor, and Members of the House Education and Career Readiness Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to write in opposition to House Bill 176, which proposes to replace Ohio's Academic Content Standards with those of Massachusetts from a decade ago.

I write as a member of the mathematics department at The Ohio State University. The views are my own, based upon expertise and long experience in mathematics standards and assessments and in the mathematical preparation of teachers. During 2016, I served on the Advisory Committee for the revision of Ohio's Learning Standards for Mathematics, representing the Ohio Department of Higher Education. Prior to that, I served as a member of the legislatively authorized Mathematics Standards and Assessment Review Committee, appointed by the Chancellor. Although my comments relate to mathematics standards, the following points may apply to standards in other content areas as well.

Ohio's Mathematics Learning Standards are quality standards that are broadly accepted among and supported by teachers, parents, and higher education faculty members across Ohio.

During 2016, the Ohio Department of Education facilitated an extensive and rigorous process for revising Ohio's standards in mathematics and English language arts. (During 2017, a similar process has been underway for the science and social studies standards.) The public comments regarding the 2010 mathematics standards and the proposed revisions revealed broad support for the standards as well as significant appreciation for the revisions.

From among 385 mathematics K-12 standards, teachers, parents, and others made 647 comments on 242 of these standards, an average of less than 3 comments per standard. Only 34 of the standards received 5 or more comments. In response to the comments, the working groups and advisory committee proposed revisions, the vast majority of which maintained the substance of the standards but improved their clarity, sometimes merely by embedding footnotes. Forty-one standards (about 10.6%) were moved, deleted, added, or substantively revised.

Ohio's educators want stability and continuity, but HB 176 would create instability and disruption.

Ohio's teachers and students have seen three different assessment systems in the past four years. Nonetheless, because the standards have remained constant they have been able to maintain and build upon their locally-developed curricula for achieving these standards. Schools and districts have invested considerable time and money in textbooks, technology, and

professional development aligned to Ohio's Learning Standards, and the changes in the 2017 standards will require only minor repurposing of those investments.

Moving to the pre-2009 Massachusetts standards and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), as proposed by HB 176, would cause significant disruption in classrooms, schools, and districts across the states, requiring that teachers and administrators develop new local curricula based upon new invest in textbooks, technology, and professional development.

Ohio's standards have been developed and revised by Ohioans for Ohio. The Massachusetts standards and the ITBS, in contrast, were developed without any input from Ohio, and Massachusetts educators have revised their standards twice since 2009. Never mind the lack of alignment between the Massachusetts standards and the ITBS.

In closing, please respect Ohio's educators and vote against HB 176. I would welcome the opportunity to speak with any of you regarding Ohio's standards and assessments in mathematics.

Respectfully submitted,

Bradford R. Findell, PhD
Associate Director, Mathematics Programs for Teachers
Department of Mathematics
The Ohio State University