

Illinois 5Essentials Rostered Survey Pilot Report

This document provides a summary of the findings from the 2014 Illinois 5Essentials Rostered Survey pilot which was conducted with five Illinois school districts. The purpose of this pilot was to assess the feasibility of conducting a rostered survey for the entire state. This document includes: background on the rostered survey pilot; a list of the participating districts; a description of how roster information was acquired and the survey was administered; feedback from pilot districts; and a list of findings from the pilot. Appendix A, Summary of District Responses, details the responses that were given by district administrators when they were interviewed by UChicago Impact following the survey process.

Background

The pilot survey window was originally scheduled to align with the Illinois 5Essentials non-rostered survey window: March 17 through April 25. However, necessary teacher roster information was not submitted in a timely fashion, which caused the administration window to start a week late. Thus, the rostered survey pilot was conducted between March 24 and April 25. The districts that participated in the pilot included:

- North Chicago SD 187
 - Second survey administration
 - Second time administering a rostered survey
- Prairie-Hills ESD 144
 - Race to the Top District
 - Second survey administration
- Edinburg CUSD 4
 - First survey administration
- East St Louis SD 189
 - Race to the Top District
 - Second survey administration
- Bunker Hill CUSD 8
 - First survey administration

Survey Pilot Process

Roster Collection

The first step in initiating the pilot was for UChicago Impact to acquire the necessary roster information, which included the list of schools within each of the participating districts along with the list of students in grades six through twelve, and all eligible teachers for each school. Prior to collecting the roster information, UChicago Impact reviewed with ISBE what roster information would need to be collected. Upon review, ISBE confirmed they would provide the student and school information from their data system. It was also agreed that – due to the Employee Information System being closed at the time of

the roster collection - teacher data would be collected by ISBE from the districts directly, reviewed for quality assurance, and submitted to UChicago Impact in the agreed upon format .

UChicago Impact encountered problems with each set of roster data submitted by ISBE. For example, the student data contained student names that were not in participating districts and the school data contained schools that do not receive a school report card and thus were not eligible to receive a 5Essentials Report. The teacher data, however, presented the most significant issues and ultimately led to the delay of the pilot. The data collected from districts frequently was incomplete or included incorrect information, such as teacher ID's not being included for entire schools, the ID number entered was not in the same form as the state ID number, or teachers' email addresses were not included. These issues required significant communication back and forth between UChicago Impact, ISBE and participating districts in order to make corrections to the teacher rosters.

Survey Administration

The next step of the pilot was the survey administration itself. How respondents log into a rostered survey is largely where a rostered survey differs from a non-rostered survey. To take the non-rostered survey, a teacher, student, or parent visits the survey URL, selects the appropriate survey, selects their school, and then begins the survey. Students who took the rostered survey would also start by visiting the survey URL and selecting the appropriate survey, but on the following page they were asked to enter login information, which was their state student ID number and birthdate. For the rostered survey pilot, teachers entered a username and passcode that was contained in an invitation emailed to them directly from the 5Essentials Survey site. Parents from these participating districts who completed the parent survey continued to use the non-rostered survey login process. Additionally, the parent survey was opened on the same date as the non-rostered survey to accommodate administrators who had planned for their parents to take it on March 17.

UChicago Impact did not receive very many phone calls or emails to the 5Essentials Support line from districts in the pilot. The few inquiries that were received were typically requests from teachers that either needed their survey invitation resent to them or new teachers who had not been included on the teacher roster and needed instructions on how to take the survey provisionally. Taking the survey provisionally is usually a method that is used by respondents who were not included on the original roster, such as new students or teachers. However, the entire student populations from two schools in one of the pilot districts took the survey provisionally. The administrator from this district reported that students could not log in because they were using their building-level student ID numbers, as opposed to the state student ID numbers that were provided to UChicago Impact. This resulted in about 1,400 provisional surveys that had to be reconciled after the survey window closed (or roughly 1/4 of the students surveyed).

Pilot District Feedback

Survey pilot feedback was collected through a questionnaire and interviews with district leaders.

Roster Collection

Superintendents and district administrators reported that communication from UChicago Impact and ISBE regarding their role in the pilot was sufficient. These administrators also reported that the roster information they needed to provide was clear and readily available; however, most administrators, admitted they delegated the task of collecting and providing the roster information to someone else in their office. As it relates to improving the roster collection process, administrators shared that they would like communication from ISBE or UChicago Impact sent to support staff in addition to superintendents.

Survey Administration

Regarding the survey administration, district administrators reported that a rostered student survey allowed them to know exactly which students needed to complete the survey and whether they had, in fact, done so. One administrator reported that students not included on the student roster were unable to complete the survey, although they also reported they were unaware of the option for respondents to complete the survey provisionally. Conversely, another administrator reported that there was confusion among her staff and students about which student ID should be entered when logging into the survey. This was the same district that had two student populations take the survey provisionally.

Administrators reported the rostered teacher survey made it clearer as to which teachers should complete the survey. The rostered teacher survey was also described as being convenient for two reasons: invitations were emailed directly to the teachers; and the ability to log in and out of the survey allowed for teachers to step away and then come back to the point in the survey where they had left off. The interviewed administrators were split when it came to whether they preferred a rostered or non-rostered survey. The administrator who preferred a non-rostered survey stated that she felt more control to administer the survey to staff and students when all she needed was the survey site URL.

Findings

This list below includes the main findings from the pilot:

- There needs to be greater quality assurance parameters for roster information before this data is submitted to UChicago Impact.
- The teacher roster information needs to be already housed in an ISBE database with quality assurance parameters for the data put in place.
- Communication with districts and schools should include assistant administrators and other individuals who would potentially support implementation process.
- Superintendents are usually not the individuals who are providing roster information.
- At some schools, “student ID” refers to an identification number special to the school and does not mean a student’s state ID number.
- The provisional login option was not known to certain administrators and prevented students and teachers not included on the respective rosters to take the survey.

Appendix A: Summary of District Responses

The following questions were asked to each district. The summary of their responses are italicized. In the statement questions, the number listed indicates the number of districts who responded in that category. The notes within the response categories of statement questions include elaborated responses to the questions.

To what extent do you disagree or agree with the following statements about the rostered survey pilot?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Communication between the district and UChicago Impact regarding the rostered survey pilot was efficient.			4 <i>Districts felt that the content and amount of emails that came before and during the administration was satisfactory.</i>	1 <i>One district felt the steps were clearly laid out ahead of time.</i>
Communication between the district and ISBE regarding the rostered survey pilot was efficient. *			3 <i>Districts felt onboarding process and expectations were clear.</i>	
The roster information the district was required to provide to ISBE was clearly communicated.			4 <i>The districts perceived the data to be clear, but admitted that they delegated the task to someone else.</i>	1 <i>This district thought that the template that was provided was very clear.</i>
The information the district needed to provide for the roster was readily available.			2 <i>These districts assumed the data was available but admitted this task was delegated to a tech person at the district, so were not able to sufficiently answer the question.</i>	3 <i>These districts felt the information was easily accessible</i>

**Two districts said they did not have a response for this question because they did not recall receiving a lot of communication from ISBE.*

1. What recommendations do you have for an alternative way to streamline the roster collection process?

Districts made two main suggestions for streamlining the roster collection process:

- *Incorporating support staff earlier and providing more time to provide data. The superintendents reported that they were not usually the person collecting the roster information, so including other staff members such as assistant administrators or technical directors would make the process easier.*
- *Additionally, the administrators spoken with said that having more time to collect the data would make the process easier.*

The following questions were only asked of those districts who administered the non-rostered survey last year (East St Louis SD 189 and Prairie-Hills ESD 144).

2. What were the pros and cons of administering the rostered survey to **students (vs the non-rostered survey administration last year)**?

- Pros:
 - *Last year, there was some confusion about which students were eligible as well as which students had not yet completed the survey. The rostered survey enabled principals or survey coordinators to know exactly who the students were who needed to take the survey, and whether they had in fact completed it.*
- Cons:
 - *Students who were not included on the roster did not have login information and thus could not complete the survey. Although the 5Essentials Rostered Survey login page has a provisional login that allows students who aren't on the roster to take the survey, this administrator reported that her school principals were unaware of this feature.*
 - *One school did not realize that the state student ID's needed to be entered as opposed to building-level ID's that are more commonly used by the school, so all students took the survey provisionally.*

3. What were the pros and cons of administering the rostered survey to **teachers**?

- Pros:
 - *Teachers received invitations and reminders directly from the 5Essentials Survey site, which took some of the burden off of the principal to have their teachers complete the survey.*

- *With a rostered survey, only one survey could be completed per set of login credentials. This allowed teachers to know whether or not they completed the survey.*
- *The ability to log in and out made the rostered survey more convenient for teachers because teachers could step away from their computer and return later to continue from where they left off.*
- Cons:
 - *One superintendent said that requiring login credentials made it more difficult to administer the survey to teachers and believed it was the reason for their lower response rates. This superintendent intended to have everyone complete the survey in one sitting during a staff meeting but there were issues with teachers not being able to find the email invitation that contained their username or passcode or they were not on the teacher roster for their school.*

4. What would make the process of the **rostered survey** easier for districts in the future?

Administrators unanimously stated that receiving information about the process sooner would enable them to more thoroughly communicate the steps to their principals.

5. Overall, which do you prefer (check one):

Number indicates how many administrators voted for the response.

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| a. A rostered survey | 1 |
| b. A non-rostered survey | 1 |

If you chose b, why do you prefer a non-rostered survey?

This administrator felt they had more control in administering the survey without the burden of login credentials. They were able to provide the survey URL to their teachers and students and have the respondents complete it in during the designated survey window.