# Today’s Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introductions, outcomes and norms</th>
<th>15 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background and context</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>APR subcommittee process</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>APR subcommittee recommendations</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discussion: Indicators</td>
<td>35 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Voting: Indicator targets</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Discussion: Distribution of Domain Points</td>
<td>25 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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When introducing yourself please share the following:

- Name
- Organization and role
- Experience with the PEP Steering Committee
  - For **experienced** members
    - What you have enjoyed
  - For **new** members
    - What you are hoping to contribute
PEP Membership 2019

- **Christy Borders**, Illinois State University
- **John Burkey**, Large Unit District Association
- **Siobhan Cafferty**, Loyola University Chicago
- **Ann Chan**, Elgin School District, U-46
- **Sara Dail**, Sterling Public Schools, CUSD 5
- **Tim Duggan**, Northeastern Illinois University
- **Sophia Gehlhausen Anderson**, Illinois Board of Higher Education
- **Vince Gay**, Noble Network of Charter Schools
- **Nelson Gerew**, Chicago Public Education Fund
- **Justize Gottman**, Golden Apple Scholar, North Park University
- **Herschel Hannah**, Bloomington School District, D87
- **Greg Hobbs**, Illinois PTA
- **Tammy Knippenberg**, Lexington High School, CUSD 7
- **Nancy Latham**, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
- **Matt Lyons**, Chicago Public Schools
- **Rob Muller**, National Lewis University
- **Barbara O’Donnell**, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
- **Felipe Perez**, Chicago Public Schools
- **Jennifer Smith**, Monticello Middle School, CUSD 25
- **Mindy Sjoblom**, Relay Graduate School of Education
- **Steve Tozer**, University of Illinois, Chicago
- **Brad White**, Lewis and Clark Community College
- **Robert Wilhite**, Concordia University
Outcomes of today’s meeting

- **Review and discuss** APRS subcommittee recommendations for indicator targets and weights

- **Refine** recommendations to elevate to the ISBE team for their consideration
Norms

- Push and probe each other’s thinking respectfully
- Seek to understand context and look for general principles that apply
- Name the perspective you bring
- Equity of voice
- Openly share resources and ideas
- Add questions to the chat box, when appropriate
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1. **Introductions, outcomes and norms**  
   - 15 min

2. **Background and context**  
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3. **APR subcommittee process**  
   - 15 min

4. **APR subcommittee recommendations**  
   - 60 min

5. **Discussion: Indicators**  
   - 35 min
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   - 5 min
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   - 25 min

8. **Next Steps**  
   - 5 min
ISBE: Vision, Mission and Goals

VISION

Illinois is a state of whole, healthy children nested in whole, healthy systems supporting communities wherein all people are socially and economically secure.

MISSION

Provide leadership and resources to achieve excellence across all Illinois districts by engaging legislators, school administrators, teachers, students, parents, families, and other stakeholders in formulating and advocating for policies that enhance education, empower districts, and ensure equitable outcomes for all students.
ISBE: Vision, Mission and Goals

GOALS
Every child in each public school system in the State of Illinois deserves to attend a system wherein...

- All kindergartners are assessed for readiness.
- Ninety percent or more of third-grade students are reading at or above grade level.
- Ninety percent or more of fifth-grade students meet or exceed expectations in mathematics.
- Ninety percent or more of ninth-grade students are on track to graduate with their cohort.
- Ninety percent or more of students graduate from high school ready for college and career.
- All students are supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.
- Every school offers a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.
The Whole Child

A child within an ecology of multiple and interconnected parts nested in overlapping systems

Community

School

Home

Cognitive

Social

Physical

Emotional
The Annual Program Reporting System that ISBE is building, with the support of the PEP committee, seeks to serve the following three capacities:

- **Educative**
- **Equitable**
- **Restorative**
ISBE set out to redesign its program reporting system with these goals and principles in mind:

**GOAL:** The goal of this new system is to ensure all new Illinois teachers are learner-ready on day one in the classroom, and that data is used as a tool for accountability and continuous improvement to strengthen teacher preparation statewide in the long term.

**PRINCIPLES:** We will create transparency and accountability systems that are fair, clear, and supportive based on the following three principles:

1. Fairly measures program performance and provides metrics and program context so that it is not biased against programs based on demographics.
2. Clearly indicates program performance in a way that is understandable to program staff, K-12 educators, prospective candidates and the public.
3. Provides equitable supports to programs based on their context.
The pilot period began with data collection from teacher preparation programs. These were used to set the targets we will discuss today.

**Data collection window**
- **Mar**
- **Apr**
- **May**
- **Jun**
- **Jul**
- **Aug**
- **Sept**
- **Oct**
- **Nov**
- **Dec**

**ISBE releases reports to programs**

**Subcommittee sets targets and weights**

**ISBE prepares the system for full implementation in 2020**

**Spring (Virtual)**
- **PEP Meeting to:**
  - Discuss Principal guide
  - Review some of the accountability structure
  - Provide recommendations on communications
  - Discuss potential future research

**Late Summer (F2F)**
- **PEP Meeting to:**
  - Review 2020 IPP continuous improvement and accountability system with contextual data

**Winter (Virtual)**
- **PEP Meeting to:**
  - Review draft public reports
  - Provide recommendations on communications and messaging
The focus of today’s meeting is to solicit steering committee input on draft targets for the 2020 IPP continuous improvement and accountability system.

- Spring (Virtual) PEP Meeting to:
  - Discuss Principal guide
  - Review some of the accountability structure
  - Provide recommendations on communications
  - Discuss potential future research

- Late Summer (F2F) PEP Meeting to:
  - Review 2020 IPP continuous improvement and accountability system with contextual data

- Winter (Virtual) PEP Meeting to:
  - Review draft public reports
  - Provide recommendations on communications and messaging

ISBE prepares the system for full implementation in 2020.
Twelve indicators will be considered in the 2020 IPP Continuous Improvement and Accountability System

- As a reminder, each domain is comprised of three to six indicators that specify the various aspects of programs’ performance that are to be measured.

- There are a total of **18 proposed indicators** for the IPP Continuous Improvement and Accountability System.
  - ISBE will **continue to pursue the remaining seven indicators** for a comprehensive Continuous Improvement and Accountability System release in the future.
Other continuous improvement and accountability systems across the country were examined to help inform the 2020 IPP Continuous Improvement and Accountability System.
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Today we will focus on the work of the APRS Teacher Preparation Subcommittee

- Christy Borders
- Tim Duggan
- Robert Muller/Pamela Jessee
- Barbara O’Donnell
- Tom Philion
- Mindy Sjoblom
- Jennifer Smith
- Brad White

Thank you for your thoughtful participation.
The APRS Subcommittee has been working toward the following outcomes:

Produce **recommendations** to the PEP committee that include:

- A **set of minimum standards and weights** to measure the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and to support the continuous improvement, with accountability (i.e., what are the thresholds for satisfactory program performance?)

- A system of **accountability and support** that will aid as teacher preparation programs continuously improve the quality of teacher candidates.

  - **Note:** the APRS and PEP will convene on this topic following today’s committee work.
Some elements of the APRS recommendations are outside of the purview of our discussion today

**Within scope for today’s meeting**

- State targets recommended by the subcommittee
- Minimum targets recommended by the subcommittee

**Out of scope for today’s meeting**

- Additional indicators
- Changes to existing indicators
- Metrics and assessments used to determine candidate proficiency, e.g.
  - Minimum GPA
  - Consideration of n-size
  - Candidate entrance test
  - How candidate knowledge and skills is measured
Outcomes of today’s meeting

**Review and discuss** APRS subcommittee recommendations for indicator targets and weights

**Refine** recommendations to elevate to the ISBE team for their consideration
The following phrases and terms will be used during our discussion today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Points</th>
<th>The amount of points a domain is worth with respect to the total amount of points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Target</td>
<td>The number at and above which a program earns the maximum points available for a particular indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Standard</td>
<td>The minimum acceptable standard for each individual indicator, the number at or above which a program begins to earn points available for a particular indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicator</td>
<td>Outcome or characteristic of a preparation program, program provider, candidate or completer than can be measure to gauge program performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Thematic grouping of related metrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table shows some of the data you will see throughout the remainder of the morning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Selection</td>
<td>Academic Strength-Candidate entry GPA</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Strength-Candidate Entrance Test</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Diversity &amp; Demographics</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome or characteristic of a preparation program, program provider, candidate or completer than can be measure to gauge program performance.

The minimum acceptable standard for each individual indicator, the number at or above which a program begins to earn points available for a particular indicator.

The number at and above which a program earns the maximum points available for a particular indicator.
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### Domain 1: Candidate Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Selection</td>
<td>Academic Strength-Candidate entry GPA</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Strength-Candidate Entrance Test</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Diversity &amp; Demographics</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subcommittee discussion
Clarifying questions for Domain 1
### Domain 2: Knowledge and Skills for Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of Teaching Subjects</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Teaching Skill</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subcommittee discussion**
Clarifying questions for Domain 2
## Domain 3: Performance as Classroom Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance as Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>Demonstrated Teaching Skill</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subcommittee discussion
Clarifying questions for Domain 2
### Domain 4: Contribution to State Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution to State Needs</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement – Entry Into Teaching</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement in High Needs Schools</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence in Teaching- Beyond year 3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence in Teaching- High Needs Schools</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completers in High Needs Subjects</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subcommittee discussion
Clarifying questions for Domain 4
# Today’s Agenda

1. Introductions, outcomes and norms  **15 min**
2. Background and context  **15 min**
3. APR subcommittee process  **15 min**
4. APR subcommittee recommendations  **60 min**
5. **Discussion: Indicators**  **35 min**
6. Voting: Indicator targets  **5 min**
7. Discussion: Distribution of Domain Points  **25 min**
8. Next Steps  **5 min**
Process for discussion for each domain

- **Small group discussion** (15 minutes)
- **Whole group Discussion** (5 minutes/indicator)
- **Input** (1 minute/indicator)
Small group discussion (15 minutes)

Small group discussion
In small groups discuss the following:
- Support the current recommendations or
- Propose alternative targets—with rationale
Whole group discussion (5 minutes for each indicator)

Whole group discussion

Following each small group share-out will be discussion with the full committee
# Today’s Agenda

<p>| | |</p>
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<td>2</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>APR subcommittee process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>APR subcommittee recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discussion: Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Voting: Indicator targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Discussion: Distribution of Domain Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using colored paper for input will allow us to capture committee feedback during today’s meeting

- This input will allow committee members to provide real-time feedback during meetings
- Used to gauge preliminary areas of agreement and areas of concern
- We will use this process to review the draft recommendations from small groups
  - We will discuss areas where there are modifications or concerns and articulate next steps
Key

Support recommendation as originally presented

Support revised recommendation

Unable to make a recommendation
## Domain 1: Candidate Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Selection</td>
<td>Academic Strength-Candidate entry GPA</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Strength-Candidate Entrance Test</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Diversity &amp; Demographics</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Domain 2: Knowledge and Skills for Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Skills for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of Teaching Subjects</td>
<td>80% X</td>
<td>100 % X</td>
<td>87.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Teaching Skill</td>
<td>80% X</td>
<td>100 % X</td>
<td>93.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Domain 3: Performance as Classroom Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance as Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>Demonstrated Teaching Skill</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Domain 4: Contribution to State Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to State Needs</td>
<td>Placement – Entry Into Teaching</td>
<td>25% X</td>
<td>75 % X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement in High Needs Schools</td>
<td>10% X</td>
<td>25 % X</td>
<td>24.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistence in Teaching - Beyond year 3</td>
<td>20% X</td>
<td>50 % X</td>
<td>49.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistence in Teaching - High Needs Schools</td>
<td>30% X</td>
<td>60 % X</td>
<td>31.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completers in High Needs Subjects</td>
<td>20% X</td>
<td>50 % X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today’s Agenda

1. Introductions, outcomes and norms       15 min
2. Background and context                15 min
3. APR subcommittee process             15 min
4. APR subcommittee recommendations     60 min
5. Discussion: Indicators                35 min
6. Voting: Indicator targets             5 min
7. Discussion: Distribution of Domain Points   25 min
8. Next Steps                            5 min
Distribution of domain points

- Contribution to State Needs: 20%
- Candidate Selection: 20%
- Performance: 30%
- Knowledge and Skills for Teaching: 30%
Clarifying questions
Discussion: Distribution of domain points

What are your initial reactions to the distribution of domain points?

Considering the minimum targets discussed today, does the distribution seem in line with an educative, equitable and restorative system?
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Next Steps

Full Group

- Our next meeting will be December 11, 2019 and will focus on the Illinois Preparation Profile Continuous Improvement and Accountability system as a whole.

Subcommittees

- The APR subcommittee will continue to meet to discuss accountability and support structures.
Thank you!

Please complete your exit slip before you depart.