

Ohio's Adoption of the Common Core: Timeline

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 2008 | The National Governors Association, state education commissioners, and other groups begin organizing development of common standards in math and English language arts for grades K-12 |
| March 2009 | Race to the Top program is announced, criteria include that states adopt "college- and career-ready standards" |
| June 2009 | House Bill 1 required the State Board of Education to update and revise our academic content standards across all subjects |
| June 2009 | The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) initiative is launched |
| Sept. 2009 | First draft of the Common Core State Standards are released |
| March 2010 | Second draft of Common Core State Standards is released |
| May 2010 | Ohio's New Learning Standards (including the Common Core in math and English) are presented to Ohio's House and Senate Education Committees |
| June 2, 2010 | Final version of the Common Core State Standards is published |
| June 18, 2010 | Ohio's State Board of Education votes to adopt Ohio's New Learning Standards, including the Common Core |

Response to Pioneer Institute's "Controlling Education from the Top: Why Common Core is Bad for Ohio"

In May 2013 The Pioneer Institute produced a white paper that sought to establish why adoption of the Common Core States' Standards (CCSS) by individual states is detrimental. Below is a summary of their specific concerns and a point by point response.

The Pioneer Institute cites six main "problems" related to the Common Core States' Standards.

- 1) Manner of creation and propagation of the standards. The standards were not the result of states working together and that the federal government used coercion (through Race to the Top grants and NCLB waivers) to compel states to adopt the standards.

Fact: States came together through two organizations, the National Governors' Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers, to create the standards. Staff from the Ohio Department of Education participated. Multiple drafts of the standards were placed online for comment. Nearly four hundred of the more than 8000 individuals who took time to submit comments regarding the March 2010 draft of the standards were from Ohio. The Ohio Department of Education held regional meetings to discuss the proposed standards and Ohio's State Board of Education held discussions at multiple public meetings which included opportunities for public testimony.

States (like Texas) that chose not to adopt the CCSS have been granted NCLB waivers. Race to the Top grant participation, like NCLB waivers, is voluntary. Adoption of the CCSS was worth 20 points (4%) of a maximum of 500 total points on the Race to the Top application.

Federal funding such as Title I, IDEA, etc. are not affected by state participation in Race to the Top, receipt of a NCLB waiver or adoption of the CCSS.

- 2) Mediocre quality of the standards. CCSS standards are not rigorous, students will no longer study literature because they will be fixated on informational text, students will no longer be able to take Algebra I prior to 9th grade and the CCSS are not internationally benchmarked.

Fact: The rigor of states' previous standards varied widely. Some states, like Massachusetts, were judged to meet or exceed the rigor of the Common Core State Standards. (Massachusetts chose to adopt the CCSS.) The majority of states, including Ohio, had mathematics and English language arts academic content standards that were rated as poor.

The truth is that Ohio's current standards have resulted in a remediation rate of more than 40% for student enrolling in Ohio public two- and four-year colleges and universities, ACT and SAT tests indicate that less than a third of Ohio graduates are college or workforce ready, and under Ohio's previous standards eighty-three percent of third graders were deemed proficient in reading (2011) while only twenty-seven percent of those third graders met the proficient standard in reading on the National Assessment of Education Progress.

Response to Pioneer Institute's "Controlling Education from the Top: Why Common Core is Bad for Ohio"

The CCSS do not eliminate the study of literature. The standards do, however, include more work with informational text, particularly in subjects other than English. The Gettysburg Address and The Federalist Papers are examples of recommended informational texts.

All Ohio districts have an academic acceleration policy that helps districts determine when and how students should be encouraged to move more quickly through content standards. In addition to local acceleration policies, the newly designed report card provides schools and districts additional weight (credit) for students that have been academically accelerated by subject or grade when calculating their performance index measure. Students in Ohio will continue to be encouraged to master standards at an accelerated rate.

Standards and content sequencing were informed by standards and curriculum from high-performing countries around the world.

- 3) The CCSS are an illegal direction of curriculum and usurp state autonomy.

Fact: States decide for themselves whether or not to adopt the CCSS.

States may and have modified CCSS. There is also no relinquishing of states' autonomy or control of education policy.

Ohio law is clear that no district or school is required to adopt state content standards or model curriculum. Local districts decide which content standards to adopt, which curriculum to use, and which instructional materials and textbooks will be used.

- 4) Vague and unaccountable governance. Who is/will be accountable to the public?

Fact: Governance in Ohio is clear. The state is responsible for adopting and revising content standards and model curriculum and establishing expectations for student achievement. Local districts are responsible for adoption of local content standards, curriculum, choosing instructional materials and textbooks and as well as including teachers, parents and community in local decisions.

Public officials at both the state and local level are accountable to the public for ensuring quality educational opportunities and efficient use of public tax dollars.

Response to Pioneer Institute's "Controlling Education from the Top: Why Common Core is Bad for Ohio"

- 5) Cost. Adoption of the CCSS will be substantial.

Fact: Ohio is already in year three of a four year implementation of the CCSS. Teachers have received training, instructional materials have been purchased and technology has been upgraded mostly through reallocation of existing resources.

Like other states, Ohio has invested time and financial resources in upgrading content standards and curriculum. Changing state standards more than halfway into the implementation would delay improving opportunities for children and increase cost to Ohio taxpayers.

(The cost of developing assessments for the CCSS is absorbed by PARCC and Smarter Balance testing consortia. Ohio currently belongs to the PARCC consortium. PARCC expects to spend approximately \$133 million to develop assessments in mathematics and English language arts.)

- 6) Threats to student and family privacy. It is believed that the U.S. Department of Education will use the CCSS and assessments as a reason to create massive "student databases" that would invade student privacy.

Fact: The CCSS do not require a change in state policy or practice with respect to student data.

Technology and its' impact on individuals' privacy touches nearly all aspects of our lives today. Privacy should be safeguarded, particularly our children's privacy.

Fortunately, Ohio is a national leader in ensuring the privacy of student records. Ohio is one of only two states (New Hampshire being the other) that prohibits access to personally identifiable student data by the state department of education. Each student is assigned an identification number so when data such as test scores is reported to the state education agency, students' identity is protected from disclosure. Ohio also does not share personally identifiable student data with the U.S. Department of Education.

Although Ohio has acted aggressively to protect student privacy, it is important to avoid complacency. The issue of safeguarding the privacy of individual students is the subject of current legislation (H.B. 181 sponsored by Representative Andrew Brenner). This bill provides another opportunity to review current statute and practice.

Common Core Myths and Facts

Myth #1 Governor Strickland unilaterally caused Ohio to adopt new content standards based on the Common Core.

Fact: H.B. 1 (2009) established a process complete and separate from the Common Core. H.B. 1 required the adoption of academic content standards and a time line for periodic review of the standards. "Section 3301.079. (A)(1) Not later than June 30, 2010, and at least once every five years thereafter, the state board of education shall adopt statewide academic standards with emphasis on coherence, focus, and rigor for each of grades kindergarten through twelve in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies."

H.B. 1 did not in any way alter existing law that clarifies that no school or district can be compelled to adopt state academic content standards or model curriculum.

Link: http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/bills.cfm?ID=128_HB_1_EN

Myth #2 Ohio had no input into the development of Ohio's Academic Content Standards (based on CCSS) in English language arts and mathematics. The fact that the Common Core State Standards are copyrighted is proof that Ohio did not contribute to the development of the standards.

Fact: The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) were developed as a result of states' collective efforts. The National Governor's Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) were the primary groups involved in guiding the development of the CCSS. The members of these organizations are states' governors and state superintendents (or chancellors). These are not federal agencies or entities. Ohio participated along with representatives from other states in the creation of the CCSS.

ODE staff was involved in creating the Common Core State Standards. Ohioans participated in regional meetings (hosted primarily by ODE or local educational service centers), and provided comments online as various drafts were posted for public comment. The State Board of Education discussed multiple drafts of the standards for almost a year prior to final adoption in June 2010.

Lastly, NGA and CCSSO did copyright the CCSS, but provide for the following exception: States that adopt the standards are exempt from a requirement to include attribution on all "publications or displays."

Links:

NGA: <http://www.nga.org/cms/about>

CCSSO: http://www.ccsso.org/Who_We_Are.html

State Board meetings: <http://education.ohio.gov/State-Board/State-Board-Meetings>

CCSS: <http://www.corestandards.org/public-license>

Common Core Myths and Facts

Myth #3: Adoption of the standards was mandatory for Ohio and only mathematics and English language arts standards were adopted because that was all that was necessary to secure Race to the Top grant funding.

Fact: H.B. 1 required Ohio to adopt revised academic content standards by June 30, 2010. The State Board of Education complied with that requirement by adopting revised content standards in all four core content areas: science, social studies, mathematics and English language arts, not just mathematics and English language arts.

Race to the Top did include a commitment to rigorous academic content standards but did not require states to adopt the Common Core State Standards. States received points for participating in the development of and commitment to adopting multi-state standards. Race to the Top was a voluntary program. Although the state chose to participate in Race to the Top, no district was required or compelled to participate.

Ohio's commitment to adopt the CCSS was worth 20 points (4%) out of a total of 500 possible points when scoring the application (page 26 of the Race to the Top application.)

Links:

Ohio Race to the Top application <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase2-applications/ohio.pdf>

USDOE website Race to the Top application:
<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/applicant.html>

Myth #4 Standards-based education is outcome-based education and content standards drive funding to schools and districts. The standards are the only measure applied to schools, districts and teachers.

Fact: Outcome-based education was a phrase coined in the 1980s and early 1990s used to describe an educational approach characterized by critics as a move away from traditional education. Critics of outcome-based education frequently pointed to instructional approaches such as whole language reading instruction and "reform" mathematics.

Ohio does not use outcome-based education. Ohio utilizes a "standards-based" approach to education. Standards-based education developed as a result of the *rejection* of the low expectations, lack of accountability and one-size-fits-all rigidity of outcome-based education. Standards-based education provides information to parents and communities on the effectiveness of schools and districts.

Ohio districts are required to evaluate teachers using the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) or a locally adopted framework that aligns to the main elements of OTES. Specific elements of the

Common Core Myths and Facts

evaluation process are negotiated locally. Student performance is one component of the evaluation process and comprises 50% of the overall rating criteria.

The district report card (when fully implemented in August 2015) will include nineteen measures organized in six components. Three of the components (Achievement, Progress and Gap-Closing) utilize results from state assessments. The other three components (Graduation, Prepared for Success and K-3 Literacy) are based primarily on data collected from outside organizations (ACT, SAT, AP, IB) or assessments chosen by districts themselves (K-3 reading diagnostics).

Links:

Standards-Based Definition: <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Academic-Content-Standards/Academic-Content-Standards-Resources/Academic-Content-Standards-Terminology-Definitions>

OTES: <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System>

School/District Report Card: <http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Accountability-Resources/Explanation-of-Ohio-s-new-Report-Card.pdf.aspx>

Myth #5 Ohio does not permit local decision-making with respect to content standards, curriculum or instruction.

Fact: State law makes it clear that although the state adopts content standards and model curriculum that districts may use, no district or school can be compelled to adopt either state content standards or model curriculum. ORC 3301.079 (B) states:

(B) (1) The state board shall adopt a model curriculum for instruction in each subject area for which updated academic standards are required by division (A)(1) of this section and for each of grades kindergarten through twelve that is sufficient to meet the needs of students in every community. The model curriculum shall be aligned with the standards, to ensure that the academic content and skills specified for each grade level are taught to students, and shall demonstrate vertical articulation and emphasize coherence, focus, and rigor. When any model curriculum has been completed, the state board shall inform all school districts, community schools, and STEM schools of the content of that model curriculum.

(2) Not later than June 30, 2013, the state board, in consultation with any office housed in the governor's office that deals with workforce development, shall adopt model curricula for grades kindergarten through twelve that embed career connection learning strategies into regular classroom instruction.

(3) All school districts, community schools, and STEM schools may utilize the state standards and the model curriculum established by the state board, together with other relevant resources, examples, or

Common Core Myths and Facts

models to ensure that students have the opportunity to attain the academic standards. Upon request, the department shall provide technical assistance to any district, community school, or STEM school in implementing the model curriculum.

Nothing in this section requires any school district to utilize all or any part of a model curriculum developed under this section.

The Operating Standards for schools and districts further clarifies local authority and responsibility:

Links:

ORC Section 3301.079: <http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/3301.079>

Operating Standards: <http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/School-Choice/Career-Tech/Operating-Standards/Operating-Standards-for-Ohio-Schools.pdf.aspx>

Myth #6 Ohioans were not involved in creation of the CCSS.

Fact: Ohio's Race to the Top application specifies (page B-1 (1)) that "Ohio has been *actively engaged* in the Common Core State Standards' development to establish internationally benchmarked standards, building toward college and career readiness." The application further stipulates that all 50 states and the District of Columbia were engaged (at that time) in developing common state standards and that Ohio "participated in all writing, reviews and hearings" of the CCSS. The application also mentions that ODE staff played "key roles" in the development process and further mentions the release and review of multiple drafts of the CCSS in September 2009 and March 2010. Page B-1 (3) of the application references the ongoing work to revise social studies and science standards outside of the CCSS process. Page B-1 (2) also includes a description of the process used to gather input which included regional meetings, state board meetings and public comment.

Myth #7 Ohio teachers will have less freedom if their district adopts the CCSS.

Fact: Fewer, clearer and higher standards allow time for teachers to help every child to be prepared for success. Ohio's common sense standards establish goals for student learning but allow teachers to do what they do best – customize instruction to better meet each child's needs.

Myth #8 ODE is conducting on-site evaluations of districts to see how well schools are aligning and integrating Common Core standards because the standards are compulsory.

Fact: Ohio is a local control state where local communities decide which standards, curriculum and textbooks are used in district classrooms. Ohio's Operating Standards do require districts to have

Common Core Myths and Facts

adopted courses of study, but it's clear that what is adopted is a local choice. There are no Common Core "site visits."

Myth #9 Local control does not exist because academic performance and graduation assessment control state funding to school districts.

Fact: There is no relationship between district's academic performance on district report cards and state funding to school districts. The State Board of Education is responsible for setting expectations for student learning. Although the department of education publishes both the report card and financial data, student performance is not used as part funding formulas.

Links:

ORC Chapter 3317 (school funding statutes): <http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/3317>

ORC Chapter 3302 (performance standards): <http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/3302>

Myth #10 The content standards dictate curriculum, instructional materials, and performance standards.

Fact: As noted previously, state law makes it clear that local boards have the authority and responsibility for adoption of content standards, curriculum, instructional materials and hiring of staff. State content standards simply set the expectations for what students should know and be able to do at each grade level.

Myth #11 The Common Core State Standards include a data-reporting component.

Fact: The CCSS do not require reporting of personally identifiable data to the U.S. Department of Education. Ohio does not provide personally identifiable student information to the federal government and has no plan to do so.

CCSS does not require collection of additional data.

Ohio does not permit the Ohio Department of Education to have access to personally identifiable student information.

Ohio did receive a funding to improve existing K-12 and higher education data systems and to connect the two existing systems into a single system. Work on upgrading data systems began before Common Core was announced.

Common Core Myths and Facts

The main focus of Ohio's data systems is continuous improvement and accountability. Data collection provides the answers to questions such as: Do our primary and secondary schools adequately prepare students for success after high school? Do they use tax dollars efficiently?

Links:

Common Core State Standards: <http://www.corestandards.org/>

Educational Management Information System manual:

<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Data/EMIS/EMIS-Documentation/Current-EMIS-Manual>

Myth #12 Changes to FERPA were made to help facilitate increased data collection required by the Common Core.

Fact: Ohio state law prohibits access to personally identifiable student information by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). As mentioned previously, there are no new data collection requirements mandated by the Common Core and Ohio does not provide personally identifiable student information to the U.S. Department of Education.