



Illinois State Board of Education

James T. Meeks, Chairman
Tony Smith, Ph.D., State Superintendent

December 31, 2017

ESSA 3-8 Indicator Working Group Report

Introduction

The 3-8 Indicator Working Group was charged with recommending to the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) an indicator or indicators to place weight on the 3-8 years in Illinois' accountability formula. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires states to have a measure of school quality in their accountability system, and ISBE has chosen to include a measure of 3-8 quality—which signals to districts the importance of those years. ESSA has strict requirements for indicators to be included in the formula. The working group's charge is to recommend indicators that comply with those requirements.

The 3-8 Indicator Working Group consisted of district and school administrators, teacher leaders, support personnel, and members from Illinois education research, policy, and advocacy groups. The 3-8 Indicator Working group was led by Dr. Karen Sullivan. (See Appendix A for group members and schedule.)

The 3-8 Indicator Working Group met monthly throughout the summer and fall of 2017. Group members participated in person in Chicago and Springfield locations that were linked together by video conference or they were able to participate by telephone conference. Meetings lasted an average of two hours each and meeting events, discussions, and decisions were captured in notes taken during each meeting.

Technical Criteria, Principles, and Values

ESSA Technical Criteria

The ESSA requirements for the technical criteria for the 3-8 indicator include that it must be

- valid, reliable, and comparable across all local education agencies in the state;
- capable of being disaggregated for each student demographic group; and
- supported by research that high performance or improvement is likely to increase student learning or will aid in the meaningful differentiation of schools.

As specified in ESSA, academic indicators must be given considerably more weight than the school quality/student success indicators. ISBE currently recommends that 75% of the overall weight be placed on P-12 academic indicators while the remaining 25% be placed on school quality indicators. A specific breakdown of how this weight is distributed between P-8 and high school indicators is provided below:

- P-8 academic indicators—75%

- PARCC & DLM-AA (2018–19: ELA 10%; Math 10%) (thereafter: ELA 7.5%; Math 7.5%)
- Growth: Linear Regression (50%)
- EL Proficiency (ACCESS) (5%)
- Science (2018–19: 0%) (thereafter: 5%)
- P-8 student quality indicators/student success indicators—25%
 - Chronic Absenteeism (10%)
 - Climate Survey (5%)
 - Fine Arts* (0%)
 - [P-2] (5%)
 - [Elementary/Middle Indicator] (5%)
- High school academic indicators—75%
 - SAT (2018–19: ELA 10%; Math 10%) (thereafter: ELA 7.5%; Math 7.5%)
 - Graduation (4-, 5-, and 6-year rate) (50%)
 - EL Proficiency (ACCESS) (5%)
 - Science (2018–19: 0%) (thereafter: 5%)
- High school student quality/student success indicators—25%
 - Chronic Absenteeism (7.5%)
 - 9th grade on track (6.25%)
 - College and Career Ready Indicator (6.25%)
 - Climate Survey (5%)
 - Fine Arts* (0%)

Principles

In addition to the ESSA technical criteria for indicators, the 3-8 group and P-2 group jointly considered the following principles to guide their recommendations:

- The accountability system represents a method of articulating what is important to us in defining a successful school. It will necessarily be incomplete—many things that define a successful school are not easily measured, particularly in a manner compliant with ESSA—but that value is critical. The state’s definition of a high-quality education should be as continuous as possible from birth through the workforce.
- No accountability measure should drive bad educational practice. We believe the best of educators, and believe it is important for accountability indicators to encourage best practices in school administration and teaching.

- Social-emotional development is critically important, but that does not inevitably mean that social-emotional development should be included in the accountability system; the measurements of that development may not be appropriate for accountability purposes.
- Data collection is a burden. The accountability system should be cognizant of that, and any proposed new data collection should include attention to whether there are other burdens that could be reduced to free up the needed capacity.
- We are in uncharted territory. We approach this work humbly, with the goal of doing the best we can with the information we have, learning from experience (ours and that of other states), and revisiting our decisions over time.

Values

The 3-8 Indicator Working Group began its work by articulating 25 critical values in 3-8 education, with the idea that measurements for those years should reflect those values. The working group then rated each of the 25 values according to whether the value met the principles and ESSA technical requirements and whether there was a known research base in support of that value for 3-8 education. The 3-8 Indicator Working Group also rank ordered the values according to the ratings the group had given each value for its potential as an indicator (see Appendix B, Table 1).

In subsequent meetings, the 3-8 Indicator Working Group individually considered each of the 12 top values to determine whether there is a measurable indicator of that value appropriate for inclusion in an accountability formula. The group also examined research or consulted with researchers or experts in the field to discuss the values. The attached table (see Appendix B, Table 2) summarizes the values identified by the working group, and then briefly notes the working group's initial thinking about whether or not the value can be reflected in the accountability formula.

Final Committee Recommendation

The 3-8 Indicator Working Group's recommendation focuses on two indicators: overweighting of chronic absenteeism in the 3-8 years at 5% and participation in acceleration and enrichment at 0%.

- The group recommends that at this time the 5% designation for a 3-8 indicator be assigned to chronic absenteeism (as defined in the ESSA plan) using the scoring method identified in the state's ESSA plan (pages 74–75). The group is aware that the Illinois Attendance Commission is identifying other aspects of the definition and data collection of chronic absenteeism.
- The group recommends that participation in acceleration and enrichment be added to the plan as a 3-8 indicator worth 0% of the school's overall score. We respectfully request that ISBE formally revisit this indicator after the 2019–20 school year and after implementation of new state laws requiring the collection of data related to access to enrichment and accelerated placements to determine whether this indicator should be given greater weight.

When the 3-8 Working Group determined that a value could not be included in the accountability formula, in most cases, we made recommendations of next steps for ensuring that the value is

reflected elsewhere in the ESSA plan or in some other important Illinois policy. We felt strongly that these values are important, and hope that many of them will be expressed through the school improvement process (both in rubrics and as part of state-provided supports).

As with the other groups that have made recommendations in the ESSA process, the 3-8 Indicator Working Group felt strongly that it was not appropriate to use indicators that are primarily a proxy for resources. The working group also was sensitive about the burden of data collection on our schools.

We would ask the state board to review recommendations across K-2, 3-8, and College and Career Readiness to ensure that there is alignment in the system and the goals of the overall accountability system are maintained.

The 3-8 Indicator Working Group appreciated the opportunity to look at measures for school success beyond standardized test scores. There was a high value placed on indicators that reflected a well-rounded curriculum but frustration that there is no good working definition that would lend itself to inclusion within the accountability framework. The working group strongly recommends that the ISBE convene a diverse stakeholder group that will continue the conversation and to define a rich, well-rounded curriculum in the hope that the state's ESSA plan could reflect this value more fully in the future.

While we reached “reluctant” consensus on our recommendations, it was the expressed hope of the group that the future work on a “rich, well-rounded curriculum” would yield an indicator that would become a part of the accountability framework.

The group also expressed support for exploring how to align the high school college and career readiness indicator to the 3-8 grade span. While there did not appear to be a way to craft an indicator that met all of the ESSA requirements and was backed by research, the group considers this a promising space that ISBE should explore as a potential indicator in years to come.

The 3-8 Indicator Working Group also felt strongly that we would like to see the school quality/student success indicators receive more weight than currently allocated within the overall accountability framework in future ESSA plans.

Appendix A

3-8 Indicator Working Group Members

Chair

Karen Sullivan, Indian Prairie School District 204
Ben Boer, Advance Illinois
Sara Boucek, Illinois Association of School Administrators
Lauren Burdette, Office of the Secretary of Education
Samuel Byndom, Urbana School District #116
Eric Calvert, Illinois Association for Gifted Children
Dave Deets, Harmony Intermediate and Ellis Elementary, Belleville, IL
Shannon Ferholz, Illinois Association of Regional School Superintendents
Aimee Galvin, Stand for Children
Jennifer Garrison, Association of Illinois Rural and Small Schools
Jessica Handy, Stand for Children
Kelly Hansen, Barrington Community Unit School District 220
Susan Hilton, Illinois Association of School Boards Statewide School Management Alliance
Melissa Kaczkowski, Superintendent of Roselle School District 12, LEND
Donna Leak, Community Consolidated Schools District 168, SCOPE
Jorge Macias, Illinois Advisory Council on Bilingual Education
Katharine Olson, Assistant Superintendent for Northbrook District 27, ED-RED
Bethany Patten, Governor's Office
Susan Price, Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education
Monique Redeaux-Smith, Illinois Federation of Teachers
Jennifer Smith, Teach Plus
Marleis Trover, Association of Illinois Rural and Small Schools
Carolyn Welch, Illinois Association for Gifted Children
Paige Williams, Advance Illinois
Pam Witmer, Illinois Network of Charter Schools
Daniel Woestman, Belvidere School District
Angela Zajac, Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education

Illinois State Board of Education

Claudia Quezada, Innovation System Supports
Phyllis Bliven, Early Childhood
Lynn Burgett, Early Childhood
Jason Helfer, Teaching and Learning
Marci Johnson, Teaching and Learning
Gil Sanchez, Teaching and Learning
Melina Wright, Innovation System Supports

Members, Groups Consulted with 3-8 Indicator Working Group

Cindy Kazanis, Jeff Breshears, Jacqueline Matranga, Brent Malicote, California Department of Education

Julie Furigay, University of Chicago

Jeff Broom, Sara Kemper, Bridget Lee, Chicago Public Schools

Daniel Losen, Center for Civil Rights Remedies

Eric Calvert and Carolyn Welch, Illinois Association for Gifted Children

Kimberly Charis, National Association of School Boards of Education

Acasia Wilson, Educators for Excellence Chicago

American Association for School Administrators Redefining Ready Cohort

Melissa Kaczowski, DuPage County Regional Office of Education

Midwest Comprehensive Center, AIR

Cheryl Harris, Project Lead

Jeremy Rasmussen, Notetaker

Daniel Botting, Notetaker

Meredith Lukow, Notetaker

Corrin Pitluck, Notetaker

Meeting Dates

May 25 (Joint Meeting with P-2)

June 22, 2017

July 6, 2017

August 10, 2017 (Joint Meeting with P-2),

August 31, 2017

October 13, 2017

November 6, 2017

December 4, 2017

Appendix B

Table 1. 3-8 Values and Criteria Crosswalk

3-8 Working Group Values	Criteria			
	Meets Principles	Meets ESSA Technical Requirements	Has Research Base	Possible Indicator
1. Students are grade appropriate and ready for next step. (13)	11	10	8	9
2. Alignment between P-2/3-8/9-12. (12)	12	4	4	5
3. Quality teachers with best practices in the classroom (Danielson).* (12)	11	2	4	7
4. Access to extracurricular activities/clubs/teams. (12)	10	3	6	3
5. Social/emotional wellness using best practice.* (13)	11	4	7	4
6. Balance of curriculum (academic/social-emotional/behavioral).* (12)	12	0	6	2
7. Differentiated Learning. (11)	10	2	6	2
8. Parental/community involvement. (13)	11	2	9	2
9. Service Learning. (10)	8	3	4	1
10. Equity—all students have access to high-quality opportunities. (13)	11	7	8	7
11. Trauma-informed practices. (10)	9	1	7	1
12. Access to enrichment and acceleration.* (13)	11	8	8	9
13. Attendance.* (13)	12	12	11	13
14. Access to fine arts. (13)	11	6	8	6
15. Access to world languages. (12)	11	5	6	5
16. Student-based outcomes. (7)	6	4	5	4
17. High quality curriculum and resources.* (12)	10	2	9	2
18. MTSS/RTI and access to various disciplines. (10)	9	3	7	3
19. High-quality leadership.* (12)	9	1	8	0
20. Comprehensive assessment plan (formative/multiple measures).* (9)	8	4	4	4
21. Access to community resources/wrap around.* (12)	11	3	6	2
22. Safe schools/positive school climate. (11)	10	8	9	6
23. Access to technology/21st century learning/digital citizenship. (11)	10	5	6	2
24. Curriculum coherence. (9)	7	1	4	0
25. Cultural competency. (8)	7	0	5	0

*Items also noted as values in the P-2 group. Number of members who responded to each item is in parenthesis and number that voted for each criteria is noted in each column.

Table 2. Disposition of Values the 3-8 Indicator Working Group Considered for the Accountability Formula

Value	Recommend for Inclusion?	Rationale	Next Steps
Attendance (Chronic Absenteeism)	Yes	This indicator is already in the plan and there is a strong research base to support its inclusion.	The group recommends the 5% given to the 3-8 indicator go toward overweighting chronic absenteeism until further work can be done surrounding a well-rounded curriculum.
Students are Grade Appropriate and Ready for Next Step (Grades)	No	The group felt strongly that the measurement could potentially create the wrong incentives.	
Access to Enrichment and Acceleration	Yes, as a zero-weight indicator with a recommendation to revisit after 2019–20	The Illinois Association for Gifted Children proposed the following indicator: Student Participation in Acceleration and/or Enrichment, with at least 5% of children 3-8 participating in either acceleration or enrichment. ¹ The group felt strongly that improved access to enrichment and acceleration is a value, and many members of the group appreciated that the indicator provided an avenue for low-resource schools to meet the needs of children who are capable of acceleration. Proponents of the indicator cited a desire to put pressure on districts and schools to engage in behaviors that would remedy a significant gap in access to enrichment. Opponents argued that the state does not have adequate data to assess the scope of this issue, and that there is still a possible correlation with poverty. The group also discussed the connection of this indicator to a rich, well-rounded curriculum.	New state laws require the collection of data relating to access to enrichment and accelerated placements. The group reached a consensus that the new data should be reported in a manner that draws attention to it by including it within the framework at 0%. The group also agreed that the issue of including this indicator in the accountability formula should be revisited in two years (after the 2019–20 school year) to discuss whether there are improvements needed in the data collection, and whether the indicator should then be included in the accountability formula.
Skilled Instruction	No	Could not be measured in a manner consistent with ESSA requirements.	Ensure that this value is reflected in implementation of school improvement rubric.

¹ The full proposal is available here: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1JwJwKfXpVSL3lbgvJoGvZZnRUUFG3tyAsfWHx9jpdVw/edit#slide=id.g2a7f47f211_0_112.

Value	Recommend for Inclusion?	Rationale	Next Steps
Quality Teachers with Best Practices in the Classroom	No	Could not be measured in a manner consistent with ESSA requirements.	Ensure that this value is reflected in implementation of school improvement rubric.
Equity—All Students Have Access to High-Quality Opportunities	No	Not well defined and could not be measured in a manner consistent with ESSA requirements; group specifically sought to avoid using metrics that were a proxy for resource levels given long-standing inequalities in Illinois school funding.	Ensure that this value is reflected in implementation of school improvement rubric.
Safe Schools/ Positive School Climate/ Discipline Data	No	The group specifically sought to avoid using metrics that were a proxy for resource levels given long-standing inequities in Illinois school funding.	
Access to Fine Arts/World Languages (Well-Rounded Curriculum?)	No	Not well defined, Fine Arts already identified as a future indicator.	The group would like to see ISBE establish a working group to set a working definition of a rich, well-rounded curriculum.
Student-Based Outcomes	No	Could not be measured in a manner that is consistent with ESSA requirements; group specifically sought to avoid using metrics that were just a proxy for resource levels given long-standing inequities in Illinois school funding.	Ensure that this value is reflected in implementation of school improvement rubric.
Comprehensive Assessment Plan (Formative / Multiple Measures)	No	Could not be measured in a manner that is consistent with ESSA requirements.	Ensure that this value is reflected in implementation of school improvement rubric.
Alignment Between P-2/3-8/9-12	No	More of a value statement than a true indicator.	Ensure that the overall plan reflects alignment between P-2, 3-8, and 9-12.
Social / Emotional Wellness Using Best Practices	No	Could not be measured in a manner that is consistent with ESSA requirements.	Ensure that this value is reflected in implementation of school improvement rubric. ²

² Note: References to the “school improvement rubric” under “Next Steps” are to the version of the rubric ultimately adopted by ISBE to support its ongoing school improvement process (IL-EMPOWER), and reflect our goal that ISBE’s rubric reflect the values of the work group. References under “Rationale” to the “Illinois Balanced Accountability Measures (IBAM) proposed school improvement rubric” are to a draft rubric developed by IBAM that is currently being field-tested by ISBE.

Appendix C

Addenda Submitted by Groups

Illinois Association for Gifted Children
Statement on Proposed P-2 and 3-8 School Quality Indicators

IAGC applauds the inclusion of the school quality indicator related to participation in enrichment programming and accelerated learning settings. The indicator sets basic targets for school districts that are consistent with ESSA's requirements that state plans address the needs of advanced students. Combined with planned changes to Illinois' academic growth model, the inclusion of this school quality indicator will help connect academic interventions for advanced students with learning outcomes, helping to shine a light on successful local practices.

IAGC believes that ISBE can further enhance the impact of this indicator by immediately giving it a "weight" of 2% in the overall school rating framework. The original intent of including indicators of school quality beyond test scores in the accountability framework was to present a more holistic view of schools and districts.

By only giving weight at grades 3-8 to an indicator based on chronic absenteeism, the school quality indicators for this grade band miss an opportunity to connect quality indicators for grades 3-8 with the focus on college and career readiness at grades 9-12. The path to college and career readiness does not begin in high school. Unfortunately, bright students from low-income and diverse backgrounds who lack access to appropriately challenging curriculum and talent-development oriented enrichment opportunities in the elementary and middle grades are at severe risk of underachievement and of placing into less rigorous coursework in high school compared to equally bright non-disadvantaged students. However, sustained participation in enrichment programming in elementary and middle school has been shown to increase likelihood of student participation and success in advanced high school coursework (VanTassel-Baska, 2007). The high school college and career readiness indicator includes a focus on participation in advanced coursework. The 3-8 school quality indicators should align with this concept, and the proposed indicator of participation in enrichment and accelerated placement would provide that alignment.

ESSA is, fundamentally, legislation focused on educational equity. Unlike NCLB, which focused on equity almost exclusively through a deficit-based lens, ESSA challenges states to address equity across the spectrum of achievement. There was broad consensus on the workgroup that expanding access to advanced learning opportunities should be a state priority. Weighting the proposed indicator at 2% would help close gaps in access to enrichment and acceleration by incentivizing schools to address equity holistically. On the flip side, many schools serving diverse and predominantly low-income populations already provide quality enrichment and acceleration opportunities. The accountability framework should help these schools tell their stories.

Further, giving weight to the indicator for participation in enrichment and acceleration is fair to schools. During school accountability workgroup meetings, members heard testimony from school leaders representing low-income communities, small rural schools, and large, diverse metropolitan districts who indicated the goals incorporated in this indicator were achievable and that the indicator would present a more well-rounded view of their schools to state and local stakeholders. Providing students with opportunities for acceleration and enrichment is arguably more within a school's zone of control and less correlated with poverty than is remedying chronic absenteeism. While schools may have limited opportunity to influence certain risk factors associated with chronic absenteeism, schools can take direct action to provide access to enrichment and

accelerated learning opportunities, especially given that there is often little cost to acceleration beyond initial assessment of student need. The indicator also allows for flexibility in developing enrichment options that meet local priorities.

While IAGC acknowledges that chronic absenteeism negatively influences academic and intellectual growth, the association believes that weighting chronic absenteeism as 10% of the overall district rating sufficiently recognizes its importance without also giving it the full additional weight of the elementary and middle school quality indicator (for a total of 15% of the summative rating at grades 3-8.)

Therefore, IAGC encourages ISBE to weight the acceleration and enrichment indicator, assigning 2% of the 5% reserved for 3-8 school quality indicator to this indicator. Weighting participation in enrichment and acceleration at 2% of the 3-8 school quality indicator initially leaves 3% for chronic absenteeism (for a total of 13% of the summative rating at grades 3-8). Down the road, that 3% represents room for future indicators that could be developed to operationalize the ESSA Plan goal of ensuring access to a “broad and rich curriculum” across the state. IAGC strongly supports the immediate weighting of the participation in acceleration and enrichment indicator at grades 3-8 due to the body of evidence demonstrating the positive outcomes of these interventions for advanced students in these grades. Additionally, including the enrichment and acceleration indicator supports the commitment of those involved in the ESSA accountability framework development process to incorporate additional important factors within the accountability system that allow schools to tell their stories and that capture appropriate opportunities being provided to students.

While IAGC also supports the immediate weighting of the P-2 indicator at 2%, it could be initially unweighted as recommended in order to gather more information at these early grades. However, if the indicator were to be weighted immediately at 2%, this would still allow room at grades P-2 to weight access to services for English learners at the level recommended by the P-2 workgroup. (IAGC, as an organization advocating for diverse students with exceptional learning needs, supports the recommendations of the P-2 workgroup and the Latino Policy Forum to give weight to the indicator related to access to appropriate services for dual language learners.)

With the passage of Illinois laws requiring districts to allow accelerated placement and providing for data collection around enrichment and acceleration, along with the availability of state and federal funds to support local efforts to meet the needs of advanced students and provide related professional development for teachers, the time is right for Illinois’ accountability framework to recognize schools for providing more appropriate instruction for advanced learners. Therefore, IAGC supports the weighting of the acceleration and enrichment component of the 3-8 school quality indicator at 2%.

IAGC would also like to express its gratitude to Elliot Regenstein, chair of the P-2 School Quality Indicator workgroup, Karen Sullivan, chair of the 3-8 School Quality Indicator workgroup, and to ISBE for providing opportunities to give input into this important work on behalf of Illinois students.

Contact:

Eric Calvert, Ed.D.
IAGC Policy and Advocacy Co-Chair
ecalvert1@gmail.com

Carolyn Welch
IAGC Policy and Advocacy Co-Chair
carolynwelch@comcast.net

SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS: Access to Acceleration and Enrichment

ERIC CALVERT, ED.D.

**NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR TALENT
DEVELOPMENT**

CAROLYN WELCH, J.D.

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION FOR GIFTED CHILDREN

IL Opportunity and Excellence Gaps

Illinois' "opportunity gaps" have grown in the NCLB era

- In 2003, 85% of IL school districts offered programs for gifted and advanced students in elementary grades, and 78.9% of districts offered programs in middle school (ISBE). In 2016, only 27% of districts reported providing such programs (Dwyer & Welch, 2016).
 - Districts serving predominately low income students were least likely to provide programming. Families least able to provide enrichment outside of school are currently least likely to have access to enrichment in school.

As a result, Illinois' "excellence gaps" are among the widest in the nation

- 15% of 4th graders and 12% of 8th graders who did not qualify for free or reduced price lunch in Illinois scored at the advanced levels on the 2013 NAEP math test, while only 2% of students who qualified for free or reduced price lunch scored at advanced levels (Plucker, 2016).
- White students are 9X more likely to score at this level than Black students, 3X more likely than Hispanic students.

One-third of Illinois students are already at or above "proficiency" thresholds and need further challenge.

Key Points

- A continuum of advanced coursework and support at K-8 is needed to align with the advanced coursework component of the 9-12 college and career readiness indicator. (College and career readiness begins in kindergarten, not high school.)
- An access to acceleration and enrichment indicator is needed to encourage equitable access to opportunities and begin narrowing economic and racial excellence gaps. Quality indicators should reward less resourced schools that seek to close excellence gaps, not just proficiency gaps.
- More focus on inputs is needed to allow schools to tell their stories and help the state to connect effective practices to student outcomes, especially at K-8
- School quality indicators will set priorities as to what resources and supports are provided through IL-EMPOWER.
- Data collection on access to acceleration and advanced learning opportunities will begin in the 2018-19 school year. An acceleration and enrichment metric would meet ESSA criteria for disaggregation by student subgroup.

Evidence: Acceleration Works

- A meta-analysis synthesizing 100 years of research, covering 172 empirical studies, found that, when high-ability students were accelerated, they exceeded the academic achievement of their non-accelerated, but similar high-ability peers by nearly one-year on a grade-equivalent scale (Steenbergen-Hu, Makel, & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2016)
- Despite popular beliefs, acceleration has not been found to be detrimental to students social and emotional well-being or growth and, in fact, has small to moderate benefits (Steenbergen-Hu & Moon, 2011)
- Acceleration is an intervention shown to work in schools of all sizes and populations (Southern & Jones, 2007) and that aids teachers in differentiating more effectively.

Evidence: Quality Enrichment Opportunities Work

Meta-analysis findings on the impact of enrichment programming (Kim, 2016):

- Effect sizes of positive impact on academic achievement:
 - middle school (1.37)
 - elementary school (0.57)
- Effect sizes of positive impact on social emotional development:
 - middle school (0.93)
 - elementary school gifted students (0.44)

Excellence Gaps Can't be Closed by Focusing on High School Alone

- **“Waiting until [students] are in high school for college readiness is as crazy as starting parenting when a kid is 13. You miss the opportunity. For kids who live in poverty, it will take a childhood to break down myths about college and get the child to a place where they can see college in their future.” (Hanover, 2017)**
- **Grant-funded research has shown that access to advanced curriculum and participation in talent development (non-remedial) enrichment can:**
 - Dramatically increase readiness of minority students to successfully participate in college prep-level curriculum in high school (Project Excite)
 - Be a catalyst for schoolwide gains in achievement in low income elementary schools (Project Athena)

Proposal Overview

- **Recognize districts for providing access to quality opportunities for academic acceleration and enrichment**
 - Support *acceleration* options to ensure appropriate challenge and maintain student engagement for advanced learners
 - Support quality *enrichment* options to better ensure access to a broad, appropriate curriculum and incentivize the creations of opportunities, especially for students with *emerging* ability. (Reduce opportunity gaps now to reduce excellence gaps tomorrow.)
- **Create infrastructure to help identify effective models**
 - Better achievement and growth measures can only help effective local models spread when *outcomes* can be connected to *inputs*
- **Option: Raise expectations for % of students participating in acceleration and enrichment gradually over time (phase-in)**

Proposed Indicator

Student Participation in Acceleration and/or Enrichment	K-8: Initially, at least 5% of students per grade level are participating in one or more of the following:
Acceleration	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A documented accelerated placement (e.g., early admission to kindergarten/first grade, single subject acceleration, or whole grade acceleration) in a setting with older students• A course to which students are assigned based on advanced cognitive ability or advanced achievement compared to local age peers and in which curriculum is substantially differentiated from the general curriculum to provide appropriate challenge and pace (e.g., an accelerated math class)
Enrichment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An enrichment program featuring advanced academic content for a minimum of 90 minutes per week during the regular school day (on average across the school year) taught by a teacher who holds a gifted education endorsement, master's degree in gifted education, or who has received at least 15 documented clock hours in professional development in gifted education

Goals are Achievable

- Accelerative options can be provided at low cost
 - Effective evaluation processes used to determine accelerated placements can leverage assessment data most districts already collect
 - Over the course of a K-12 education, acceleration can actually save money vs. moving students through school in lockstep based on birthdate.
- Proposed enrichment options support quality but are minimally prescriptive regarding structure to allow for district customization to meet local priorities
- Recommendations include broadly achievable thresholds for reaching benchmarks and can incorporate realistic ramps that promote excellence while recognizing current conditions

Support is Available to Build Capacity

- Illinois higher education institutions and the Illinois Association for Gifted Children already offer a wide array of research-based professional development, resources, and models. Scalable capacity exists to support teachers and districts if incentives are in place.
- ISBE has previously supported creating professional development materials related to advanced students. These can be updated for the ESSA era and provided through IL-EMPOWER as a low-cost path for all districts to meet proposed indicator criteria
- ESSA presents an opportunity to address opportunity gaps in access to adequately trained educators for gifted and talented students:
 - Title II reforms in ESSA *require* states to address gifted education professional development in implementation plans
 - Title II funds may be used to support gifted education professional development

Including Enrichment and Acceleration in Accountability Leads to Change

- Ohio includes identification and services for gifted students in its school accountability framework (beginning prior to ESSA)
 - Since gifted education indicators became a factor in overall school ratings:
 - The number of minority and low income students identified as gifted has increased
 - A multi-year trend toward fewer students receiving services has been reversed
 - These improvements can be attributed to changes in the school accountability framework. There have been no funding model changes and no changes in how data is collected.

Questions?

Eric Calvert: eric.calvert@northwestern.edu

Carolyn Welch: carolynewelch@comcast.net



A Union of Professionals

Position Statement

ESSA Accountability

Context

President Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015, requiring states to develop new school accountability systems. Throughout Illinois's stakeholder engagement process, the Illinois Federation of Teachers and the Chicago Teachers Union have sought every opportunity for our members' voices to be heard on these issues impacting their day-to-day work with students. We have represented our 103,000 members during three rounds of public comment on the ESSA plan, as well as attending over 100 meetings convened since early 2016 by the Illinois State Board of Education, the state P20 Council, the Illinois Early Learning Council, and the Illinois Balanced Accountability Measures Committee. We are greatly concerned that, while ISBE continues to solicit practitioner feedback, the input of our members is ignored. Separately, many of the new accountability measures may be valuable indicators of general school quality under normal conditions of education. However, when these measures are combined and are used to differentiate school performance, they potentially lose their value as indicators of quality and distort the educational process similar to the undesirable impact high-stakes testing has had on classrooms over the past fifteen years. ESSA provides an opportunity to move away from the failed policies of NCLB, and there is still time for Illinois to get ESSA right, basing school accountability on fair, meaningful multiple measures and differentiated supports with a commitment to resource equity and sufficiency.

Issue: Proposed accountability indicator to overweight chronic absenteeism at both grades P-2 and 3-8

CTU-IFT Position

CTU and IFT oppose the overweighting of chronic absenteeism as an accountability indicator.

Rationale: During development of the state ESSA plan in 2016, we supported the inclusion of an indicator measuring chronic absenteeism. As participants in the ISBE P-2 and 3-8 workgroups in 2017, however, our members spoke against overweighting chronic absenteeism, because research shows it to be an indicator of student poverty, which is clearly linked to student health considerations, including asthma, oral health, behavioral health, exposure to violence and trauma, and acute health issues. While chronic absenteeism is a good "trigger" for identifying students in need of additional supports, overweighting this indicator will once again stack the deck against the schools serving our most vulnerable students. Instead, the state should focus on truly advancing equity, by providing necessary and sufficient inputs and then measuring student access to social and academic services and supports, inclusivity of a broad and rich curriculum, and access to wraparound services, all of which would help schools intervene early with students and families who are on-track to be considered chronically absent.



A Union of Professionals

Issue: Proposed accountability indicator to measure participation in acceleration and enrichment at both grades P-2 and 3-8

CTU-IFT Position

CTU and IFT oppose the inclusion of an accountability indicator that measures participation in acceleration and enrichment.

Rationale: We wholeheartedly agree that acceleration and enrichment opportunities are vital components to a well-rounded educational experience. However, our members equally value their students having access to fine arts, foreign languages, daily P.E., fully staffed libraries, career and technical education, wraparound services, and other social and academic support services. All of these opportunities contribute to a rich educational experience. As we have asserted throughout public comment periods in 2016, and during stakeholder meetings in 2017, we believe an all-encompassing, inclusive indicator is necessary to focus on the various inputs that create a well-rounded educational experience. Stakeholder discussions have focused on measuring participation rates in acceleration and enrichment, and we believe this type of metric could be applied to all inputs. Rather than single out one component, we again take this opportunity to advocate for an indicator that measures all aspects of a well-rounded education—which would include, but not be limited to, acceleration and enrichment—for all students.

Resources

- [IFT ESSA webpage](#)
- [Healthy Schools Campaign – chronic absenteeism](#)
- [Darling-Hammond et al, Pathways to New Accountability Through the Every Student Succeeds Act](#)

December 15, 2017



Position Statement ESSA Accountability

December 21, 2017

The Governor's Office appreciated the opportunity to participate in the ISBE 3-8 Indicator Working Group and concurs with many of its discussion points. The potential to align 3rd-8th grade activities with both the 9th grade on track indicator and the high school college and career readiness indicator is a particularly exciting space for future work. However, one point of significant disagreement between the Governor's Office and the rest of the working group members regarded the weighting of academic indicators compared to school quality/student success indicators. Governor Rauner does not believe the school quality/student success indicators should receive more weight than currently allocated within the overall ESSA accountability framework. Illinois weighs non-academic school success indicators at 25%, which is higher than most states. The P-2 and 3-8 groups faced significant difficulty in creating evidence-based school quality/student success indicators focused on student outcomes. The Governor's Office is excited about the potential for including non-academic indicators, as long as, per the federal law, they remain weighted significantly below the academic indicators.

Appendix D

Reference List of Resources Reviewed

- Allensworth, E.M., Gwynne, J.A., Moore, P., & de la Torre, M. (2014). *Looking forward to high school and college: Middle grade indicators of readiness in Chicago public schools*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research. Retrieved from <https://consortium.uchicago.edu/publications/looking-forward-high-school-and-college-middle-grade-indicators-readiness-chicago>
- American Association of School Administrators. (n.d.). *AASA east coast cohort capstone: K–8 ready framework [PowerPoint]*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Balfanz, R. (2009). *Putting middle grades students on the graduation path: A policy and practice brief*. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association. Retrieved from https://www.amle.org/portals/0/pdf/articles/policy_brief_balfanz.pdf
- Baltimore Education Research Consortium. (2011). *Destination graduation: Sixth grade early warning indicators for Baltimore city schools*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <http://baltimore-berc.org/pdfs/SixthGradeEWIFullReport.pdf>
- Boddie M. (2017). *Fifth indicator: Chronic absenteeism*. Policy Update 23(6), (Alexandria, VA NASBE). Retrieved from
- Charis, K. & Losen, D.J. (2017). *School climate and student discipline*. Policy Update 24(4), (Alexandria, VA NASBE).
- Deussen T., Hanson, H., & Bisht, B. (2017). Are two commonly used early warning indicators accurate predictors of dropout for English learner students? Evidence from six districts in Washington state (REL 2017–261). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- DuPage County Regional Office of Education, the Legislative Network of DuPage County and the Illinois Association of School Administrators. (n.d.). *DuPage: Kindergarten-grade 8: High school ready framework*. DuPage, IL: Author.
- Educators for Excellence. (2017). *Sounding the alarm: Building the climate and culture our students need*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved from <https://e4e.org/what-we-do/policy-solutions/sounding-alarm>
- English, D., Rasmussen, J., Cushing, E., & Therriault, S. (2016). *Leveraging the Every Student Succeeds Act to support state visions for college and career readiness*. Washington, DC: College and Career Readiness and Success Center. Retrieved from https://ccrcenter.org/sites/default/files/AskCCRS_LeveragingESSA.pdf
- Hall, E. (2017). *Identifying a school quality/student success indicator for ESSA: Requirements and considerations*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Hanover Research. (2014). *Critical academic indicators*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://gssaweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Critical-Academic-Indicators->

[1.pdf](#)

- Hanover Research. (2016). *The shift toward college and career readiness in elementary school*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.hobsons.com/resources/entry/white-paper-the-shift-toward-college-and-career-readiness-in-elementary-sch>
- Hein, V., Smerdon, B., and Sambolt, M. (2013). *Predictors of postsecondary success*. Washington, DC: College and Career Readiness and Success Center at American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from <https://ccrcenter.org/products-resources/predictors-postsecondary-success>
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2016). *Illinois State Board of Education quality framework for Illinois school districts*. Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/quality-framework-160505.pdf>
- Learning Policy Institute. (2017). Where measures of SEL and school climate might fit in an accountability system. Palo Alto, CA: Author.
- Long, D. (2017). *Policy update: National Association of State Boards of Education: Career and technical education*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education. Retrieved from http://www.nasbe.org/wp-content/uploads/Long_CTE_Final.pdf
- Lorenzo, S.J. (2017). *Policy update: National Association of State Boards of Education: Social and emotional learning*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education. Retrieved from http://www.nasbe.org/wp-content/uploads/Lorenzo_5th_SEL_Final.pdf
- Neild, R. C., Balfanz, R., & Herzog, L. (2007). *An early warning system*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved from http://new.every1graduates.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Early_Warning_System_Neild_Balfanz_Herzog.pdf
- Neild, R.C., Balfanz, R. (2006). *Unfulfilled promise: The dimensions and characteristics of Philadelphia's dropout crisis*. Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Youth Transitions Collaborative and Project U-Turn. Retrieved from https://pyninc.org/docs/projectuturn_annualreport2006.pdf
- West, T.C. (2013). *Just the right mix: Identifying potential dropouts in Montgomery County Public Schools using an early indicators approach*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools. Retrieved from http://montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/sharedaccountability/reports/2013/Just%20the%20Right%20Mix_MCPS_West2013.pdf

ESSA 3-8 Indicator Working Group: Report Summary

The 3-8 Working Group recommends that ISBE include the following two indicators for their accountability formula: (1) overweighting of chronic absenteeism in the 3-8 years at 5% and (2) participation in acceleration and enrichment worth 0% of a school's overall score. The group recommends that the 5% designation for chronic absenteeism be scored by using the method identified in the state's ESSA plan. The group also recommends that ISBE revisit the 3-8 indicator after the 2019–20 school year after evaluating any newly available data or by examining indicators adopted by other states with an eye toward giving participation in acceleration and enrichment greater weight in the accountability formula.

The 3-8 Working Group also hopes that ISBE will consider their recommendations on how to reflect the critical values outlined in this report in the ESSA plan or in some other important Illinois policy. The group felt that these values are crucial to 3-8 education and hope that many of them will be expressed through the school improvement process (both in rubrics and as part of state-provided supports).

Lastly, the 3-8 Working Group strongly recommends that ISBE convene a stakeholder group tasked with defining a well-rounded curriculum in a way that lends itself to inclusion in future ESSA plans. It is this group's hope that both indicators on well-rounded curriculum and quality/student success will ultimately become a part of the accountability framework.