# How to read the report card

Public schools and school districts in Ohio are given one of five ratings — excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch or academic emergency — on the state report card. The state awards the best possible rating from among four methods of calculating academic performance:

## ► METHOD 1: Meeting state goals

There are 25 Indicators — attendance rate, graduation rate and 23 state tests. For districts, how many did they meet? For schools, what percentage of applicable indicators did they meet?

#### ▶ METHOD 2: Performance-Index score

Through the performance-index score that tracks students' results, schools and districts can benefit when students perform better even if the district's passing rate is unchanged.

STATE STANDARDS ME	T	GRADE	PERFORMANCE INDEX SCORE
24-25 standards o	r 94-100%	Excellent	100-120 points
19-23 standards o	r 75-93.9%	Effective	90-99.9
13-18 standards o	r 50-74.9%	Continuous Improvement	80-89.9
9-12 standards o	r 31-49.9%	Academic watch	70-79.9
0-8 standards o	r 0-30,9%	Academic emergency	0-69.9

# ► METHOD 3: Showing Improvement

Districts and schools can improve one rating, up to "continuous improvement" if their performance-index score climbs at least 10 points over two years, the score improved each of the two years and the most recent improvement is at least 3 points.

### ► METHOD 4: Federal measure

The No Child Left Behind Act requires districts to show improvement on reading and math tests for all students, and among groups (such as black, white, Asian and Latino students, as well as those in special education). Districts that meet this goal can be rated no worse than continuous improvement; conversely, those that miss it in multiple areas for three consecutive years can do no better than continuous improvement.

Report card key							759	6 PASS	ING RATE	FOR ALL							FOR AT	TENDAN	NCE, 90	% FOR (	GRADU	ATION				THE 25 STATE STANDARDS  75% PASSING RATE FOR ALL TESTS EXCEPT 85% FOR 11TH GRADE, 93% FOR ATTENDANCE, 90% FOR GRADUATION													
● Met standard ○ DId not	meet s	tandard	NC Not cal	culated	-			4																						E MET									
▼ State rating down from las	t year	▲ State	rating up f	rom last year	3	RD		4TH			TH	6			ГН	8	TH		1(	JTH,	GRADE			11	TH	RADE				SUR									
▼ or ▲ State rating moved tw	o ranki	ngs from la	ast year		GH	ADE		GRADI	E	GR	ADE	GRA	ADE	GR	NDE	GRA	ADE		HIO GR	ADUAI	ION TEST	1	_	HO GRA	ADUATIO	ON TEST	•	병	NO	₽ VE									
— No change				DEDEODMANOE	ca l	9		9	9		9		9		9		9	돐		9	щ	9	돐		9	щ	G	AN	IATI	A P									
No vitalige			STATE Standari	PERFORMANCE OS INDEX	MATH	READING	MATH	READING	WRITING	MATH	READING	MATH	READING	MATH	READING	MATH	READING	CITZENSHIP	MATH	READING	SCIENCE	WRITING	CITIZENSHIP	MATH	READING	SCIENCE	WRITING	ATTENDANCE	GRADUATION	E									
DELAWARE COUNTY	STATE	RATING	MET	SCORE	¥	Æ	₹	Æ	¥	A	Æ	₹	낊	A	S	₹	8	등	A	Æ	SS	W.	등	A	S	S	W.	A	GR	8									
Big Walnut		Excellent	24	100.4	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Buckeye Valley	_	Effective	23	98.9	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Delaware		Effective		96.6	•	•		•	•	0	•	<u> </u>	•	0	•	0	•					•		•	•	•	•		•	No									
Olentangy FAIRFIELD COUNTY		Excellent	25	103.3	•			•										•					•			•				No									
Amanda-Clearcreek		Effective	20	95.1	•	0		•		0		0		0	•	0		•							•	•	•			No									
Berne Union	=	Effective	21	98.1	Ö	•	•	•	•	0	•	Ö	•	Ö	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Bloom-Carroll		Effective	21	97.8	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	0	•	0	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Fairfield Union	_	Effective	23	97.6	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Lancaster		Effective	19	95.4	•	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	•	0	0	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		0	No									
Liberty Union-Thurston Pickerington		Effective Excellent	23	99.6 101.1	-		-	-		0		0		0			-	-		-	-		-		-	-		-	-	No No									
Walnut Township	_	Effective	21	97.2	-		0			0						0		-			-				-	-				No									
FRANKLIN COUNTY							0		Sec.	0		Park	and a			0			e de la companya de l	200			0			and a		Book											
Bexley	_	Excellent	24	104.1	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Canal Winchester		Effective	21	95.4	•	•	0	•	•	0	•	0	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Columbus		Watch	5	79.2	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	0	•	0	0	•	0	0		0	No									
Dublin		Excellent	25	104.8													<u>.</u>											-		No									
Gahanna-Jefferson Grandview Heights	_	Excellent Excellent	23 25	100.5 106.2																										No Yes									
Groveport Madison		Cont. Impr		82.9	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0			0		0			0		0	0	No									
Hamilton	_	Cont. Impr		91.5	•		•	Ö	•	0	0	0	•	0	•	•	•	•			0		Ö	0	•	Ö	•	•	•	No									
Hilliard		Cont. Impr	ove. 25	101	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
New Albany-Plain	_	Excellent	25	104.6	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Yes									
Reynoldsburg	<b>A</b>	Excellent	24	98.6	•		•	•	•		•	•	•	0	•		•		•	•		•		•	•	•	•		•	No									
South-Western		Cont. Impr		92.6	0			0	•	0	0	<u> </u>	•	0		<u> </u>	•			•	0	•	-	•	•	0			0	No									
Upper Arlington Westerville	<del></del>	Excellent Excellent	25 24	106.4 99.8	•		-		-	_		-	<u>.</u>				-	-					-							No No									
Whitehall	<del>- 1</del>	Cont. Impr		86.7	0	0		0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	-		0	-	0	0		0		-	0	No									
Worthington		Excellent	25	104	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
LICKING COUNTY									_					_										_															
Granville		Excellent	25	105.9	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	Yes									
Heath		Excellent	25	102.3		•		•	•		•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•			No									
Johnstown-Monroe Lakewood		Effective Effective	21 19	95.1 95.5		0				0	0	0		0	-	-					0		-		-	-	-		0	No Yes									
Licking Heights		Cont. Impr		92.1	0		0	0		0	ĕ	0	•	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	ĕ		-	•	•	0				No									
Licking Valley		Effective	21	96.1	Ö		•	Ö	•	0	•	•	•	Ö	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Newark		Cont. Impr	ove. 15	93.4	0		•	•	•	0	•	0	•	0	•	0	•	0	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	0	•	•	0	No									
North Fork	<b>A</b>	Effective	19	93.3	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	0	•	0	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	•	Yes									
Northridge	<b>A</b>	Excellent	24	99.2	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	No									
Southwest Licking	_	Effective	21	97.4	•		•	•	•	0	•	0		0	•	0		•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
MADISON COUNTY Jefferson		Effective	22	95.5				•		0		0		0																No									
Jonathan Alder	<b>A</b>		24	100.8				-									•					•		•					0	No									
London	_	Cont. Impr	ove. 13	90.6	0	•	0	Ö	•	0	0	0	•	0	•	O	•	•	•	•	•	•	O	•	•	Ö	•	Ö	Ö	No									
Madison-Plains	_	Effective	17	92.4	0	0	0	•	•	0	•	0	•	0	0	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	No									
PICKAWAY COUNTY																																							
Circleville		Cont. Impr		89.7		0	•	•	•	0	•	0	0	0	•		<u>o</u>	0	•	•	0	•	<u> </u>	0	•	0	•		0	No									
Logan Elm Teays Valley		Effective Effective	19 20	94.8		0	•	•	_	0	-			0	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	~	-	-	0	-	•		No									
Westfall		Effective	20	96.8 95.3		0				0		0				0					9		9			<u>Q</u>				No No									
UNION COUNTY		LITOURG	20	55.5	0					0		0		_		0		•	_	_	•					•				140									
Fairbanks	_	Effective	21	95.8	0	0	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
Marysville	_	Excellent	24	99.2	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	No									
North Union	<b>A</b>	Effective	22	95.9	•	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	0	•	•	0	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•				No									