

Reclaiming Local Control



How did this happen?



Columbus Controlled Ed



- 1) They make the rules**
- 2) They enforce the rules**
- 3) They report the numbers**

Follow the Money



Who's Behind Ohio's Ed Reform?

- Corporatists
- Chamber of Commerce
- “Philanthropic” Community
- U.S. Department of Education

Who's aiding and abetting?

- Your elected officials

Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI)



- National, copyrighted Standards paid for by Bill Gates
- Federally Directed Data Mining of our Children and Families without Consent and without Restriction
- Federally Mandated Teacher and Principal Evaluations and Personnel Structure
- National/Common Assessments driving local curriculum and determining Ohio graduation criteria

***Fundamental Transformation of
American Education***

RACE TO THE TOP ASSURANCES

COMMON CORE STANDARDS

HIGHLY ALIGNED,
COMMON ASSESSMENT

DATA SYSTEMS TO INFORM
INSTRUCTION – EMBED TECH

FED. LEVEL TEACHER & PRINCIPAL
EVALUATIONS (OTES-OPES-RESA)

TEACH FOR AMERICA AND
CHARTER SCHOOL EXPANSION

CODIFIED THROUGH LEGISLATION
OF BOTH STRICKLAND & KASICH AS
**REQUIRED BY THE ASSURANCES OF
OHIO'S GRANT SUBMITTED 1/19/10**

HB1 & HB290 2009, HB153 2011,
HB525 & HB555 2012, SB316 2012,
HB59 & SB21 2013, HB367 & HB487
2014 and, HB74 & HB64 2015

& PERPETUATED BY NCLB WAIVER

Selection Criteria	Points	Percent
A. State Success Factors	125	25%
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs' participation in it	65	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	
B. Standards and Assessments	70	14%
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	9%
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	138	28%
Eligibility Requirement (b)	eligibility	
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	50	10%
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	
F. General	55	11%
Eligibility Requirement (a)	eligibility	
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	3%
TOTAL	500	100%

Common Core Standards



NEVER TESTED, ANYWHERE, EVER

Copyright

This website and all content on this website, including in particular the Common Core State Standards, are the property of NGA Center and CCSSO, and NGA Center and CCSSO retain all right, title, and interest in and to the same.

Public License for Use of Common Core State Standards

Use of the Common Core State Standards is permitted by NGA Center and CCSSO pursuant to, and subject to the terms of, a Public License, which is available on this website.

NGA & CCSSO – NO LIABILITY

They not only own and control the copyright, content and licensing...

but they have Disclaimer against any LIABILITY resulting from the use of Common Core Standards

Disclaimer

NGA Center and CCSSO do not warrant, endorse, approve or certify the information on this site, nor do they make any representation as to the accuracy, completeness, efficacy, or timeliness of such information. Use of such information is voluntary on your part. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process or service does not constitute or imply endorsement, recommendation or favoring by NGA Center and CCSSO.

The information, products and services offered on or through the Website are provided "as is" and without warranties of any kind either express or implied. To the fullest extent permissible pursuant to applicable law, we disclaim all warranties, express or implied, including, but not limited to, implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

Ohio Teacher Evaluation - OTES

- **Required by Race to the Top**
- **Federally prescribed, codified by Ohio legislature**
- **Ties every student score to the teacher for evaluation purposes**
- **Destroys classroom autonomy**
- **Forces teachers to collect and enter massive amounts of data**
- **Destroying teacher morale and creativity**

It's All About the Data



**Imbed technology to
Inform Instruction =**

- **Massive Data Mining**
- **Massive Profiteering**
- **Massive Big Brother**

MULTI-STATE HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT DATA SYSTEM

A Framework for a Multi-State Human Capital Development Data System

Brian T. Prescott
Director of Policy Research
Western Interstate
Commission for Higher
Education
and
Peter Ewell
Vice President
National Center for Higher
Education Management
Systems

The rise of a globalized knowledge economy requires us to understand the distribution of skills and abilities in our population. It is no longer sufficient to know how many resources are devoted to the development of our nation's human capital. Today, we also must be able to demonstrate and understand the outcomes of our educational processes.

This growing need has energized interest in building longitudinal data systems capable of following individual students throughout their educational careers. Heightened by the abortive attempt to create a federal student unit data system and three rounds of statewide longitudinal data systems (SLDS) federal grants, the pace has accelerated dramatically with the inclusion of a \$250 million funding set-aside for data systems and the required data system assurance by states to access State Fiscal Stabilization Funds in the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA). Additionally, efforts are underway to help guide this development, including those being undertaken or funded by the Data Quality Campaign (DQC), the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE).


Despite growing commitment and funding, significant obstacles persist. The intensity of simultaneous activities in this arena may result in efforts that are hurried and uncoordinated, with states independently designing and implementing their own systems. An unfortunate end result may be a patchwork of systems that cannot be easily aligned within a


A multi-state data exchange – what we have chosen to call a human capital development data system – that enables policymakers to look comprehensively at the stock and flow of human capital has become essential for effective policymaking and planning in the globalized knowledge economy. Technology now permits the development of longitudinal systems that follow individual students from elementary school through college or directly into the workforce, but existing systems, organizational boundaries, and governance issues all present formidable barriers. This paper argues that the development of longitudinal data systems should be guided by two basic questions only, while allowing for meaningful disaggregation to examine how policies and practices may be disparately affecting individuals based on race/ethnicity, income, or other characteristics. It may be unwise to seek some form of an “ideal” data warehouse with all conceivable data

The authors would like to thank the participants at the June 29, 2009, meeting in Olympia, WA, for their contributions to the discussion about how to develop a framework for a multi-sector, multi-state data exchange. Special thanks also goes to Jeff Stanley and Hans L'Orange at the State Higher Education Executive Officers for their feedback on prior drafts of this document and to Annie Finnigan and Candy Allen at WICHE for their editing and graphic design expertise. Our gratitude also goes to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which provided funding for this paper.

Conclusion

Acknowledgments

- 
- DEVELOP “HUMAN CAPITAL” FOR “STATE STAKEHOLDERS”
 - FAILURE OF *THREE* ROUNDS OF FEDERAL GRANTS
 - ARRA – STIMULUS REQUIRED DATA SYSTEM ASSURANCE IN EXCHANGE FOR STATE STABILIZATION FUNDS

- 
- “STOCK & FLOW OF HUMAN CAPITAL”
 - DISAGGREGATION OF DATA TO SHAPE POLICY TO EQUALIZE OUTCOMES

- 
- AGENDA DRIVEN SPECIAL INTERESTS – NOT CITIZENS AND STATE LEGISLATURES

Centralized Managed Workforce



U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan,
June 8, 2009

“Hopefully, some day, we can track children from preschool to high school and from high school to college and college to careerWe want to see more states build comprehensive systems that track students from pre-K through college and then link student data to workforce data. We want to know whether Johnny participated in an early learning program and then completed college on time and whether those things have any bearing on his earnings as an adult...

Federal Student Data Initiatives

Expanding Evidence Approaches for Learning in a Digital World

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Technology

Promoting Grit, Tenacity, and Perseverance: Critical Factors for Success in the 21st Century

February 2013

DRAFT

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Technology

Excerpts: *Learning in a Digital World*

- ◆ “Some of these new digital learning resources are sophisticated systems capable of collecting large amounts of fine-grained data as users interact with them . . . [L]earners will generate vast quantities of data”
- ◆ These “deeper learning objectives” align with the Common Core standards and the Next Generation Science Standards, which “emphasize deeper learning objectives.”
- ◆ Can measure “noncognitive” aspects such as collaboration, persistence, leadership, by capturing “micro-level data on [students’] problem-solving sequences, knowledge, and strategy use, including each student’s selections or inputs, the number of attempts a student makes, the number of hints and feedback given, and the time allocated across each part of the problem.”
- ◆ Can “track data about students as they transition among education settings”
- ◆ Can combine education data with “data from social service agencies” to “better understand relationships between students’ conditions outside school and their in-school behaviors and experiences”

Real-time Behavior Management

Using Technology to Create Feedback Loops for Classroom Behavior

(using *ClassDojo*, a “real-time behavior management tool”)

“Students receive the feedback on their positive and negative behaviors in real time. A positive behavior is acknowledged with a chime and a green badge that appears on the student’s avatar, and a negative behavior is marked by a buzzer and a red badge.”

Google Education Apps



Free Stuff Isn't Free – Chromebooks



“With your permission, you give us more information about you, about your friends, and we can improve the quality of our searches. We don't need you to type at all. We know where you are. We know where you've been. We can more or less know what you're thinking about.”

--Eric Schmidt, Executive Chairman,
Google Inc.

AIR = PARCC = SBAC



Published today...

Cleveland Plain Dealer 10.20.15 – Patrick O’Donnell

Ohio's new state tests in 2016 will have questions from Arizona, Florida and Utah

COLUMBUS, Ohio - A few hundred Ohio educators and the **American Institutes for Research** are piecing together the state's new English and math tests for 2016 from questions that have already appeared on state tests in Arizona, Florida and Utah.

There have also been a few rumors about the new exams, the latest coming last week when some teachers worried that AIR had purchased questions from PARCC to use on Ohio's exams.

That's not true, said ODE official's and AIR's Cohen.

Cohen said AIR had considered buying right to use some questions, but decided against it. And though **AIR is also a major provider of the Smarter Balanced exams for many states**, Cohen said AIR can't use them in Ohio.

Behavioral and Social Science Research



About Us

AIR is one of the world's largest behavioral and social science research and evaluation organizations. Our overriding goal is to use the best science available to bring the most effective ideas and approaches to enhancing everyday life. For us, making the world a better place is not wishful thinking. It is the goal that drives us.

Founded in 1946 as a not-for-profit organization, we conduct our work with strict independence, objectivity and non-partisanship. [Learn more about our history.](#)

The intellectual diversity of our 1,800 employees enables us to bring together experts from many fields in the search for innovative answers to challenges that span the human life course.

Our Mission

AIR's mission is to conduct and apply the best behavioral and social science research and evaluation towards improving people's lives, with a special emphasis on the disadvantaged.

Over Testing of Ohio students - Update

Jim O'Connor – Princeton High School Social Studies Teacher and Department Chair (22 years)

Subjects: AP Human Geography, Ohio Mock Trial, Honors Economics, American Government

Recent Editorials:

Google: “Over Testing Students Ohio O’Connor” – 3

“Feds Out of the Classroom O’Connor” – 1

“ODE Micromanaging O’Connor” - 1

Over Testing and Nationalizing Education



- ❖ **Roots of over testing and nationalizing public education can be traced back to the No Child Left Behind (2001) and Race to the Top (2010) legislation.**
- ❖ **Common Core Standards and Testing took over 2014-15.**

Serious Backlash but Real Change Lacking

- ❖ Students in Ohio still taking the same number of tests
- ❖ An early “Testing Window” was closed for this year, but schools have option to take the tests (3 hours each) one day or take each test over two days (90 minutes each)
- ❖ Virtually the same number of tests as last year.
- ❖ PARCC Tests dropped – replaced by the American Institute of Research (AIR).
- ❖ How many tests???

[Grade 5 ELA](#) [PDF]

[Grade 6 ELA](#) [PDF]

[Grade 7 ELA](#) [PDF]

[Grade 8 ELA](#) [PDF]

[High School ELA](#) [PDF]

and provide an outline of the content and skills to be measured on the test. They contain information about individual tests, including the number of test items, the number of points on the test, and show how the learning standards are grouped in order to report the test results.

[Grade 3 Math](#) [PDF]

[Grade 4 Math](#) [PDF]

[Grade 5 Math](#) [PDF]

[Grade 6 Math](#) [PDF]

[Grade 7 Math](#) [PDF]

[Grade 8 Math](#) [PDF]

[Algebra I](#) [PDF]

[Geometry](#) [PDF]

[Integrated Math I](#) [PDF]

[Integrated Math II](#) [PDF]

Mathematics Blueprints

Test blueprints serve as a guide for test construction and provide an outline of the content and skills to be measured on the test. They contain information about individual tests, including the number of test items, the number of points on the test, and show how the learning standards are grouped in order to report the test results.

[Biology](#) [DOCX]

[Grade 4 Social Studies](#) [DOCX]

[Grade 5 Science](#) [DOCX]

[Grade 6 Social Studies](#) [DOCX]

[Grade 8 Science](#) [DOCX]

[American Government](#) [DOCX]

[American History](#) [DOCX]

Science and Social Studies Blueprints

The Ohio Department of Education has released a set of Draft test specification documents, including description of the assessment components and item types, assessment blueprints, and item specifications, to help educators and the general public better understand the design of Ohio's State Tests in Science and Social Studies. These documents are used to guide the development of the Ohio's State Tests for Science and Social Studies.

The Manipulation of Interpretation

- ❖ **The following slide should shock most people.... But for the folks at the Ohio Department of Education, its standard practice.....**
- ❖ **The Manipulation of Interpretation**

	Did not yet meet expectations	Partially met expectations	Approached expectations	Met expectations	Exceeded expectations	
	Limited	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Accelerated	Proficient or above
Grade 3 Math	11%	24%	26%	34%	5%	65%
Grade 4 Math	9%	27%	28%	34%	2%	64%
Grade 5 Math	10%	22%	32%	32%	4%	68%
Grade 6 Math	9%	24%	32%	32%	3%	67%
Grade 7 Math	8%	25%	36%	29%	2%	67%
Grade 8 Math	20%	29%	25%	25%	1%	51%
Algebra I	8%	28%	28%	34%	2%	64%
Geometry	2%	9%	31%	52%	6%	89%
Integrated Math I	14%	26%	23%	34%	3%	60%
Integrated Math II	1%	9%	28%	50%	12%	90%

ODE Defines Proficient



Performance Level Recommendations for Ohio's State Tests

Math			
Basic		Proficient	
18	24%	29	26%
18	27%	32	28%
15	22%	26	32%
13	24%	27	32%
10	25%	18	36%
13	29%	22	25%
9	28%	16	28%
9	9%	19	31%
11	26%	21	23%
9	9%	18	28%

English Language Arts			
Basic		Proficient	
18	21%	31	32%
14	23%	26	29%
18	22%	31	32%
18	19%	29	28%
20	18%	31	28%
15	17%	22	28%
21	11%	33	18%

Social Studies			
Basic		Proficient	
33	19%	44	41%
44	20%	58	21%
31	18%	42	36%
27	23%	39	49%

Science			
Basic		Proficient	
30	26%	48	24%
25	22%	38	23%
20	24%	29	41%
26	19%	30	33%

Observations/Conclusion



- ❖ Enough research now exists to support the following assertion:
- ❖ The Growth of Standardized Testing labels students, punishes teachers, reduces classroom creativity and critical thinking, increases anxiety, wastes valuable class time and narrows the curriculum. It has changed the culture of schools from caring about the well-being of students to the test scores they produce.
- ❖ Here's some data to chew on:
- ❖ Since 2010, Ohio's public school national ranking has dropped from 5th to 18th place (Education Week National Quality Counts)
- ❖ Columbus and ODE – its time to Change the Outcome and return resources and control to the local school district and democratically elected school boards

Common Core is the Glue...

We collect “billions of records of data” –
“We’re pulling data from everywhere – tens of thousands of places.”

“Common Core is the glue that ties everything together.”

Shawn Bay, CEO of eScholar,
speaking at US Department of Education’s
“Datapalooza,” October 2012

Consider what they are asking us to believe

That a national assessment directed and paid for by the Feds, which is aligned to copyrighted standards, which have NEVER been tested anywhere and were NOT developed by Educators and Academic Professionals but rather by a former consultant of McKinsey & Company (yes, the firm that advised Enron) who just so happened to become the President of the College Board last year and has aligned the SAT to Common Core is

...a state-led, voluntary initiative.

It's time for our local boards and parents to demand that the Governor and state legislature admit they were bought off by the Feds, and duped by a corporatist posing as a philanthropist, in order to monopolize the education industry and nationalize education.

Your Authority – Your Responsibility

- 1) **Opt Out** (Safe Harbor in place for 15/16 school year)
- 2) **Local Board – LARA HB212 Resolution & ORC**
- 3) **Local Board Candidates & HB212 – NO VOTE 2015**
- 4) **Petition to Defeat School Levy**
- 5) **State Representative & Senator – NO VOTE 2016**

2nd Amendment & CCS



Northwest Local School District

Educating Tomorrow's Leaders Today

Popular Links



Select Language

Search this site



[Home](#) [About Us](#) [Board](#) [Schools](#) [Departments](#) [Parent Info](#) [More Info](#) [Forms & Links](#)

WATCH - PROTECT OUR KIDS: THE SANDY HOOK PROMISE

You can watch this program on . . .

The Northwest Local Schools Forum - "ProtectOurKids: The Sandy Hook Promise" will be available on Time-Warner Cable, Waycross Channel 4* AND Cincinnati Bell Fioptics channel 854:

Tue., 10/13 - 8:00 p.m., Fri., 10/16 - 11:00 a.m., Sat., 10/17 - 4:00 p.m.

The
Federalist
P A P E R S
P R O J E C T



Common Core Textbooks Teaching Bald Faced Lies About The 2nd Amendment

BY STEVE STRAUB - 528 COMMENTS · IN SECOND AMENDMENT

THE BILL OF RIGHTS: Amendments 1-10

Amendment 2 (1791): Right to Bear Arms

This amendment states that people have the right to certain weapons, providing that they register them and they have not been in prison. The founding fathers included this amendment to prevent the United States from acting like the British who had tried to take weapons away from the colonists.



Federal Title VII & LGBT



Pepple & Waggoner, Ltd.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
Crown Centre Building
5005 Rockside Road, Suite 260
Cleveland, Ohio 44131-6808
(216) 520-0088
Fax (216) 520-0044
www.pepple-waggoner.com

SCHOOL LAW UPDATE SEMINAR

Canton, Ohio
September 17, 2015

“Student and Staff LGBT Issues”

Presented by
Mark J. Jackson, Esq.

Students

- A. Like employment discrimination, the State of Ohio does not have any laws specifically prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. All specific student protections for these classes exist under federal law.

Restrooms

1. Title VII prohibits discrimination regarding the “terms, conditions, or privileges of employment” as well as practices that “segregate, or classify in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his/her status as an employee.” Access to restrooms is a condition of employment. *See Wedow v. Kansas City*, 442 F.3d 661 (8th Cir. 2006).
2. If an employer denies a transgender employee access to the restroom that matches the employee’s gender identity, requires the employee to use a private facility, or conditions access on receipt of a doctor’s note or proof of genital surgery, it is subjecting transgender employees to disparate treatment compared to non-transgender employees who are not subjected to these requirements.



Questions and Answers