



Illinois State Board of Education

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

ILLINOIS ARTS INDICATOR RECOMMENDATION REPORT

Presented to the Illinois State Board of Education

on

December 19, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

INTRODUCTION..... 4

BACKGROUND 4

 WORK GROUP 4

 GOALS 5

 GUIDING PRINCIPLES 5

 PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING THE MEASURE 6

RECOMMENDATION 7

 SUBMEASURES OF THE ARTS INDICATOR 7

Participation 7

Quality..... 8

Student Voice 8

 WEIGHT: STUDENT PARTICIPATION AND QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION 9

 NON-PUNITIVE AND EQUITABLE: ADJUSTING FOR RESOURCES10

 IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE12

CONCLUSION13

REFERENCES15

APPENDIX A: WORK GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND MEETING LOGISTICS16

 ILLINOIS ARTS INDICATOR WORK GROUP MEMBERS16

 ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION16

 MIDWEST COMPREHENSIVE CENTER, AIR16

 MEETING DATES, LOCATIONS, AND LOGISTICS17

APPENDIX B: TASKS AND TIMELINE.....18

APPENDIX C: SUPPORTING RESEARCH.....18

APPENDIX D: SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS.....20

APPENDIX E: POSITION STATEMENTS21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2017, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) tasked the Illinois Arts Indicator Work Group (Work Group) with recommending the measure and weight for the fine arts (arts) indicator as part of the *Illinois Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan*. The arts are essential to a complete, competitive, and well-rounded education for all students. Recognizing this, ISBE includes the arts as a school quality indicator, making Illinois one of only two states with a distinct arts indicator and the only state applying it to elementary as well as high schools. During its year-long process, the Work Group benefited from its diverse, statewide membership, which included arts education organizations, administrators, teachers, unions, higher education, researchers, and other key stakeholders.

The Work Group recommends that the arts indicator measure combine three key elements (submeasures) – student participation in arts coursework, quality of instruction, and student voice – into a composite measure that gives a comprehensive, nuanced picture of the arts in Illinois schools. The recommendation uses the same combination of submeasures for elementary and high schools, thereby providing consistency.

The Work Group recommends that the indicator take effect and receive five percent weight starting in School Year (SY) 2020/21, followed by a three-year phase-in:

- Year 1 (SY 20/21) considers only *student participation*, weighted at five percent.
- Year 2 (SY 21/22) adds *quality of instruction*, weighting it at two percent and participation at three percent.
- Year 3 (SY 22/23) incorporates *student voice* but weights the submeasure at zero percent to reflect the need to address the challenges of a student survey.

The State Plan allows for the arts indicator to receive five percent weight in SY 20/21. In addition, the Work Group's Data & Research Team examined multi-year scenarios using relevant, school-level data, conducting the most extensive analysis to date of Illinois statewide arts education data.

The Work Group took the issue of inequity of school resources seriously throughout this process. While there appears to be no strong correlation in Illinois between student arts participation and school funding, the arts indicator includes concrete provisions to avoid being punitive. It enables all schools to receive partial points for attaining meaningful rates below targets. The indicator also distinguishes between schools in lower- and higher-funded districts, and through SY 21/22, applies to schools in lower-funded districts only if it increases their summative score.

As a result, the arts indicator is the only Illinois indicator that accounts for school resources. In its first two years, it will go beyond holding schools in lower-funded districts harmless: it will give them the opportunity to increase their score if they are already making strides in the arts. It will make Illinois' accountability system *more* equitable.

The recommendation herein embodies the Work Group's guiding principles: student-centered, fair, actionable, multi-disciplinary, aligned with ISBE's overall vision of education, and meeting ESSA requirements. The arts indicator is educative, equitable, and non-punitive. Through the arts indicator, schools can tell a fuller, more diverse story of their success.

INTRODUCTION

In 2017, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) charged the Illinois Arts Indicator Work Group (Work Group) with recommending the measure and weight for the fine arts (arts) indicator, part of Illinois' new system of school accountability and support under the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA). The arts encompass dance, media arts, music, theater, and visual arts and are included as a distinct indicator within the set of school quality/student success indicators. The inclusion of the arts indicator underscores the importance of the arts as essential to a complete, competitive, and well-rounded education for all Illinois students.

BACKGROUND

The *Illinois ESSA State Plan* established a new system of school accountability and support. Under this system, schools receive points based on academic indicators (such as math proficiency, science proficiency, and graduation rates) and indicators of school quality/student success (such as chronic absenteeism and 9th Grade On-Track). The arts are a distinct indicator of school quality/student success for both elementary and high schools. The Illinois State Board of Education received nearly 3,000 comments calling for a *weighted* distinct arts indicator, more than all other comments combined.

The arts indicator is included in the State Plan but currently has no weight. The State Board of Education made a commitment to weighting this indicator when a sound method of measurement is determined. To that end, the Work Group was formed to study the implications of various measures, to identify and analyze the potential impacts a weighted arts indicator could have on schools of varying resource levels, and to recommend a single or composite arts measure that adheres to the ESSA requirements and is educative, equitable, and non-punitive.

The arts indicator gives Illinois a unique opportunity to lead the nation in arts education. Illinois is one of only two states (the other, Connecticut) to include a distinct arts indicator in its ESSA school accountability and support system. Unlike Connecticut, however, the Illinois arts indicator applies to elementary as well as high schools, and the Work Group's recommendation addresses student participation, quality of instruction, and student voice. Additionally, the measure reflects the Work Group's shared concern for lower-funded schools and is designed to take resources into account.

The rest of the nation is watching to see if Illinois takes advantage of this unprecedented opportunity to empower students and schools through the arts in ESSA.

WORK GROUP

The Illinois Arts Indicator Work Group formed in January 2018 to begin the process of developing the recommendation. Chaired by Arts Alliance Illinois, the Work Group consisted of 27 members, representing some of the state's most impactful and respected organizations in arts education and in the wider education community. Members included arts education organizations, administrators, teachers, unions, higher education, researchers, and other key stakeholders.

A subgroup called the Data & Research Team (DRT) was assembled and led by Ingenuity. This group played a key role in assisting the Work Group in gathering, analyzing, and sharing findings with the group at large to ensure that decisions aligned with Work Group principles and ESSA requirements. Both the Work Group and DRT met regularly, beginning on March 7, 2018, to leverage collective expertise. Work Group members participated in person in Chicago or joined remotely by video conference. For a full list of Work Group members, see Appendix A.

GOALS

The Work Group was charged with the following primary goals:

- Develop a recommendation for a single or composite arts indicator measure,
- Determine the weight of the indicator, and
- Provide sound rationale for the recommendation.

The Work Group had the following secondary goals:

- Assess the data landscape of arts education in Illinois, identifying relevant, currently available data as well as data gaps that may exist; and
- Using currently available data, gain an overall understanding of arts education access, participation, and quality throughout Illinois.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

As its first action, the Work Group determined guiding principles to govern the *process* of delivering a final recommendation on the arts indicator. Given the innovative nature of the indicator, these principles ranged from the more concrete, such as a commitment to remain focused on the primary goals of the group, to the more abstract, such as the collective agreement to be audacious in the approach to crafting the recommendation.

The following is the full list of principles:

- Focused – Centered and directed by its primary goals (see above).
- Inclusive – Statewide, engaging a wide array of stakeholders and reflecting Illinois’ diversity.
- Collaborative – Recognizing the equal value of all voices and seeking consensus.
- Transparent – Sharing information and deliberating openly.
- Audacious – Creative, seeing opportunity in challenges, and willing to consider new approaches.

In addition, the Work Group collectively determined principles that must be present in any *product* presented to ISBE. These principles include the following:

- Student-centered – First and foremost, the measure helps advance the needs of Illinois students.
- Essential – Built on the foundational belief that the arts are essential to a complete, competitive education.
- Fair – Aspirational but not punitive, understanding that resources vary by school.
- Aligned – The measure will be aligned to Illinois’ overall vision and goals for education.
- Actionable – It is clear how a school can improve its performance relative to the indicator.
- Multi-disciplinary – Recognizing that the arts encompass five unique disciplines: dance, media arts, music, theater, and visual arts.
- Meets ESSA requirements:
 - Reliable, valid, and comparable across all local education agencies in the state;
 - Calculated the same way for all schools;
 - Disaggregated by subgroups of students (gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disability, and English language learners);

- Different from other measures the accountability system uses for any other indicator; and
- Contributes to meaningful differentiation by demonstrating varied results across all schools.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING THE MEASURE

The Work Group approached its task willing to explore a wide variety of ideas and possible solutions. Its members brought to the deliberations the same creativity and collaboration that characterize the arts. The process began with broad concepts and ideal possibilities and then, through subsequent rounds of analysis and discussion, the ideas were narrowed down and tested against the group's guiding principles, ESSA requirements, and other factors. This process was repeated as many times as necessary to thoroughly discuss and explore all ideas until the Work Group reached a final recommendation. See Appendix B for the Work Group's timeline.

RECOMMENDATION

The Work Group recommends that the arts indicator measure combine three key elements (submeasures) – participation, quality, and student voice – into a composite measure that provides a comprehensive, nuanced picture of the arts in elementary and high schools. Weighted at five percent starting in School Year (SY) 2020-21, this data-informed measure accounts for the resource gap among Illinois schools and infuses a greater degree of equity into the accountability system.

The following table summarizes the overall measure:

Summary – Arts Indicator Measure for Elementary and High Schools		
Year 1 / SY 2020-21*	Year 2 / SY 2021-22*	Year 3 / SY 2022-23
Participation: Enrollment 5% (2.5, 5 points)	Participation: Enrollment 3% (1.5, 3 points)	Participation: Enrollment 3% (1.5, 3 points)
	Quality: Arts Endorsed Teachers 2% (1, 2 points)	Quality: Arts Endorsed Teachers 2% (1, 2 points)
		Student Voice: Survey 0% (0 points)
* Indicator applies to schools in lower-funded districts only if it increases their summative score.		

SUBMEASURES OF THE ARTS INDICATOR

The arts indicator consists of three submeasures: student participation in arts coursework, quality of instruction, and student voice. It establishes consistency by using the same combination of these submeasures for both elementary and high schools. Built upon straightforward definitions, the weighted submeasures offer clear, actionable pathways for schools to tell their story of success and, as needed, improve their score.

PARTICIPATION

To determine student participation in arts coursework, the submeasure calculates the participation rate, defined as the percent of students enrolled in arts coursework. Specifically, the rate equals the school’s total number of students enrolled in one or more arts courses divided by (*l*) that school’s total number of students. The Illinois State Board of Education already collects this data annually from every school.

Participation serves as a more effective measure than access because it reflects students’ actual engagement in the arts, rather than simply the possibility of it, that is, the availability of arts courses. In addition, unlike participation, access does not meet the ESSA requirement of disaggregation by student subgroup.

QUALITY

The arts indicator, however, goes beyond student participation in arts learning. It measures the quality of that learning by considering the qualifications of the teachers providing it. To what extent are students receiving their arts instruction from teachers who have an arts endorsement? This question defines the quality submeasure, calculated as a school's total number of students enrolled in one or more arts courses taught by an arts-endorsed teacher divided by (/) that school's total number of students enrolled in one or more arts courses.

As with participation, the quality submeasure is data ready and focuses on the student. The Illinois State Board of Education currently collects the necessary data from all schools annually and can disaggregate it by student subgroup.

The Work Group recognizes concerns about Illinois' overall supply of educators, across all subject areas. In its 2018 Triennial Report "Educator Supply and Demand in Illinois," ISBE analyzed the increase in unfilled positions from SY 2015/16 to 2016/17 and noted, "The primary driver of the increase was an increase in unfilled school service personnel staff, ... [which] was offset by a 17 percent decrease in unfilled instructional staff positions" (Illinois State Board of Education, 2018). Moreover, concerns over teacher supply are not particular to the arts. The issue impacts student and school performance in other subject areas and indicators, including ones with greater accountability weight than the arts indicator.

Many members of the Work Group expressed their strong commitment to increasing teacher supply. The arts themselves, in fact, can actually improve a school's ability to build and sustain an effective teaching staff. Research has shown that including the arts in schools helps increase teacher satisfaction and lower teacher turnover rates (Bellisario & Donovan, 2012).

STUDENT VOICE

The arts serve as a particularly effective channel for student voice. Given this, it seems particularly appropriate to consider incorporating student voice, that is, student perceptions of their arts education, into the arts indicator as a third submeasure. "Research indicates that students who believe they have a voice in school are seven times more likely to be academically motivated than students who do not believe they have a voice (Quaglia Institute for School Voice and Aspirations, 2016). Inclusion of a submeasure of this kind will further support students in their quest to become lifelong learners.

The Work Group recommends that ISBE explore a survey for capturing student voice but recognizes that no such survey currently exists. To provide time for exploring and potentially developing the survey, the indicator does not include it until Year 3 (SY 22/23), and then only as a placeholder.

The placeholder's zero percent weight reflects the need to address concerns over the implementation and veracity of a survey collecting student perception data. The State Board should first consider whether it can collect the data through existing tools such as the University of Chicago's "My Voice, My School" survey.

WEIGHT: STUDENT PARTICIPATION AND QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

The Work Group recommends that the arts indicator receive an overall weight of *five percent*, equal to each of the other school quality/student success indicators. This weight reflects the arts indicator’s equal importance but guarantees that it does not take precedence over any other school quality/student success indicator. This weight designation affirms the essential role of the arts in ensuring student success, an assertion backed by extensive research (Appendix C), and continues Illinois’ momentum toward a balanced, holistic accountability system through ESSA.

The indicator’s five percent weight will be comprised of the student participation submeasure and the quality of instruction submeasure beginning in Year 2, when both submeasures are fully implemented. Student participation and quality of instruction will receive three percent and two percent weight, respectively. This apportionment distinguishes student participation as the more important barometer of a school’s strength in the arts, while still acknowledging the need for high-quality instruction delivered by an arts-endorsed teacher.

Points for student participation are allocated as follows:

Student Participation		
Elementary Schools		
Rate	Year 1 (of 5 points total)	Year 2 (of 3 points total)
≥ 90%	5 points	3 points
50–89%	2.5 points	1.5 points
High Schools		
Rate	Year 1 (of 5 points total)	Year 2 (of 3 points total)
≥ 50%	5 points	3 points
25–49%	2.5 points	1.5 points

Points for quality of instruction are allocated as follows:

Quality of Instruction		
Elementary and High Schools		
Rate	Year 1 (n/a)	Year 2 (of 2 points total)
≥ 80%	n/a	2 points
50–79%	n/a	1 point

NON-PUNITIVE AND EQUITABLE: ADJUSTING FOR RESOURCES

All Illinois students, no matter which school they attend, need and deserve quality arts education. An effective system of school accountability and support recognizes that this student need, in and of itself, is an equity issue. For this reason, the Illinois school code identifies the arts as a fundamental learning area and explicitly calls for each school district to ensure that each school makes the arts available (Illinois Administrative Code, 2007).

Throughout its deliberations, the Work Group considered inequity of school resources and emphasized that the arts indicator should be fair, aspirational but not punitive, understanding that resources vary by school. The Work Group gave significant, deserved attention to the equity concern articulated in the *Illinois ESSA State Plan*, adopted before the state’s reform of the funding formula. Given the systemic nature of the issue, concern over equity must be equitably applied to all indicators, and the Work Group took it seriously.

The DRT conducted extensive data analysis to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the arts and school funding in Illinois. It was the most extensive analysis to date of Illinois statewide arts education data. The most significant finding is that there appears to be no strong correlation between student arts participation and school funding.

Consider these two questions: In what percent of Illinois elementary schools are half or more of students enrolled in at least one arts course per year? In what percent of elementary schools do half or more of the arts-enrolled students receive instruction from an arts-endorsed teacher per year? Among higher-funded districts, the results are 79% and 70%, respectively. Among lower-funded districts, the results are 80% and 71%. The results in the higher- and lower-funded districts are virtually identical.

The Work Group’s recommendation, nevertheless, includes concrete provisions to guard against the indicator being punitive. The arts indicator is the only Illinois indicator that accounts for inequity. It distinguishes between schools in districts at or above 60% funding adequacy (resource threshold) and below that threshold, that is, higher- and lower-funded districts, and then adjusts as follows:

- For schools in higher-funded districts, the indicator will apply as outlined above, starting in SY 2020/21 (Year 1).

- For any given school in a lower-funded district, the indicator will not apply until SY 2022/23 (Year 3), unless applying the indicator to that school would increase that school's summative score.
- For every school in a lower-funded district, ISBE will calculate that school's summative score *with* and *without* application of the arts indicator. The Illinois State Board of Education will then automatically apply the arts indicator calculation that results in the higher summative score for that school.

Therefore, the arts indicator is non-punitive and will actually make Illinois' accountability system *more* equitable. In its first two years, the arts indicator will go beyond holding schools in lower-funded districts harmless: it will give them the opportunity to *increase* their score if they are already making strides in the arts.

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

The Work Group recommends that the arts indicator take effect and receive five percent weight starting with SY 2020/21. This start date provides one full year (2019/20) for all schools to prepare without the indicator applying. In addition, to make implementation even more gradual, the Work Group recommends a three-year phase-in of the arts indicator submeasures as follows:

- Year 1 (SY 20/21) considers only *student participation* in arts coursework.
- Year 2 (SY 21/22) adds consideration of the *quality* of that coursework with the inclusion of arts-endorsed teachers.
- Year 3 (SY 22/23) includes the possibility of incorporating *student voice* into the indicator.

Given that ISBE already has essential and reliable data to study this indicator's effect on schools, the arts indicator can be implemented in SY 20/21 without further study. The Work Group acknowledges that the *Illinois ESSA State Plan* states that the arts indicator “will receive 0% [weight] for the next four school years” (Illinois State ESSA Plan, 2017, p. 48). The State Plan, however, also includes a provision for applying a weighted arts indicator worth five percent starting in SY 19/20 (p.47).

Furthermore, when approving the State Plan, the State Board indicated its willingness to implement the weighting earlier if possible. During the Board's March 15, 2017 meeting, upon approving the arts indicator as part of the State Plan, the chairman stated, “We don't want a zero hanging out that long, and so I think we are going to speed up that process.”

The assumption in the State Plan was that ISBE would need to collect four years of data, but the data required to generate the first two submeasures of this indicator is already available. It requires no additional data collection. This fact makes it possible to illustrate how the recommended arts indicator would have looked in prior years, which the Work Group has done for each of the past six school years. More details about the existing administrative data collected by ISBE and the Work Group's analyses of this data are available in Appendix D.

Reliable administrative data is currently available. The Work Group acknowledges that schools may need more time to adjust to the addition of the arts indicator as a weighted component of the school accountability and support system. The Work Group recommends phasing in the different elements of the indicator over the course of three years (see above).

The arts are the very antithesis of the worn, over-testing regime of No Child Left Behind. Through the arts indicator, schools can tell a fuller, more diverse story of their success than the accountability system's current indicators allow and without the burden of increased reporting. The arts indicator is evidence-based, thoroughly studied, data-ready, phased-in, and non-punitive. Illinois should not needlessly delay schools their opportunity to tell – and receive credit for – their successes in the arts. We should allow those schools to more fully tell their stories now.

CONCLUSION

The Work Group’s recommendation embodies the guiding principles. It is multi-disciplinary, encompassing all five artistic disciplines (dance, media arts, music, theater, and visual arts), and rooted in the reality – affirmed by the State Board in establishing the arts indicator – that the arts are essential to a complete, competitive, and well-rounded education for all Illinois students. The recommendation is student-centered, promotes student voice, and aligns with our state’s vision of whole, healthy children who are empowered through creativity.

The recommendation is not only educative, but also equitable and non-punitive. It has fairness built into it, deliberately and thoughtfully accounting and adjusting for resources to an extent not seen in any other indicator. It is actionable; the measures are straightforward and offer a clear, attainable path for schools to improve performance, as needed. At the same time, the recommendation meets ESSA requirements, from meaningful differentiation to disaggregation by subgroup.

At the onset of this process, the Work Group was encouraged to be innovative in its conversations and development of the fine arts indicator. Therefore, the Work Group encourages the State Board to keep the following in mind when making decisions related to the adoption and implementation of this indicator:

- This recommendation innovatively and meaningfully addresses student access and quality of instruction in the arts, and
- This recommendation is data-informed and takes into consideration the realities of lower-funded schools, offering a viable solution to reward schools in their efforts to offer a well-rounded education.

The issue of resources was a shared concern among all Work Group members and was woven into the group’s guiding principles to ensure that this important consideration was not overlooked. Over time, partnerships among local and statewide entities were forged among Work Group members. These partnerships have the potential to connect schools with valuable public and private funding and professional development opportunities.

In addition to connecting schools with arts education advocates, the Work Group wishes to point out that there are federal funding opportunities that school districts and schools should be aware of and explore further. As stated in a recent report released by the Hewlett Foundation:

The Every Student Succeeds Act includes at least 12 different funding opportunities that state educational agencies, local educational agencies [school districts], and schools can use to implement arts integration interventions for students in all grades, from prekindergarten to Grade 12. These funding opportunities can be used to support activities such as teacher professional development, school improvement efforts, supports for English learners, arts integration courses, instructional materials, [and] extended learning time programs (Porter, Anderson, Gonring, Towne & Callahan, 2018).

It is also important to note that “Title IV of ESSA explicitly identifies programs in the arts and arts integration as allowable activities, and it provides for dedicated assistance for arts education. The *Every Student Succeeds Act* also offers funding for arts integration interventions that address the needs of specific student subgroups, such as economically disadvantaged students and English learners” (Porter et al., 2018).

The State Board of Education made a deliberate move towards innovation in approving the arts indicator as part of the *Illinois ESSA State Plan*. Illinois now has the rare opportunity to become the first state in the nation to have a distinct, weighted indicator in the arts as a measure of school quality – a dynamic arts indicator that integrates

student participation, quality of arts instruction, and student voice. The Work Group looks forward to partnering with ISBE to continue this positive trajectory – ensuring that every student, in every school, in every grade, has access to quality arts education.

REFERENCES

- Bellisario, K., & Donovan, L. (2012). *Voices from the field: Teachers' views on the relevance of arts integration*. Cambridge, MA: Lesley University.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2018). *Educator supply and demand in Illinois*. Retrieved from <https://www.isbe.net/edsupplydemand>
- Illinois State Board of Education (2007). *Public school accountability framework*. Retrieved from <https://www.isbe.net/documents/oneark.pdf>
- Quaglia Institute for School Voice and Aspirations. (2016.) School voice report 2016. Retrieved from quagliainstitute.org/dmsView/School_Voice_Report_2016
- Porter, B., Anderson, J., Gonring, P., Towne, L., & Callahan, K. (2018). *Arts education policy and advocacy grantmaking: Evaluation of intent, impact, and lessons (2007-2017)*. Retrieved from <https://hewlett.org/library/arts-education-policy-and-advocacy-grantmaking-evaluation-of-intent-impact-and-lessons-2007-2017/>

APPENDIX A: WORK GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND MEETING LOGISTICS

ILLINOIS ARTS INDICATOR WORK GROUP MEMBERS

Jonathan VanderBrug, *Arts Alliance Illinois* – Work Group Co-Chair * ♦
Karla Rivera, *Ingenuity* – Work Group Co-Chair * ♦
Julia deBettencourt, *Chicago Public Schools, Department of Arts Education* ♦
Sara Boucek, *Illinois Association of School Administrators*
Kassie Davis, *CME Group Foundation*
Jonathan Furr, *Education Systems Center, Northern Illinois University*
Al Goldfarb, *Western Illinois University*
Michael Hernandez, *Franczek Radelet*
Kurt Hilgendorf, *Chicago Teachers Union*
Paul Kassel, *Northern Illinois University*
Jeffrey Waraksa, *Chicago Public Schools, Department of Arts Education*
Josh Kaufmann, *Teach Plus Illinois*
Galatea Kontos, *Teaching Artist, Northeastern Illinois University*
Jessica Kwasney, *Teacher, Eugene Field Elementary School, CCSD 64*
Aaron Mercier, *Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools*
Darcy Nendza, *Illinois Music Education Association*
Hannah Oakley, *Office of the Governor*
Keira Quintero, *Teacher, Oliver Wendell Holmes Elementary School, Oak Park, District 97*
Monique Redeaux-Smith, *Illinois Federation of Teachers*
Jesus Sanchez, *Art Teacher, Chicago Public Schools*
Steven Shewfelt, *Ingenuity* – Data and Research Team Chair * ♦
Michael Skura, *Illinois Art Education Association* * ♦
Harvey Smith, *Illinois Report Card, Northern Illinois University**
Robin Steans, *Steans Family Foundation*
Paige Williams, *Advance Illinois*
Diana Zaleski, *Illinois Education Association* *
Paul Zavitkovsky, *Center for Urban Education Leadership, University of Illinois at Chicago* *

* Data and Research Team Member

♦ Writing Team

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Jason Helfer, *Deputy Superintendent for Teaching and Learning*
Howard Hammel, *Student Information System Project Manager*
Theresa Moy, *Data Quality Information Manager*

MIDWEST COMPREHENSIVE CENTER, AIR

Janice Keizer, *Project Lead, Work Group Meeting Facilitator*

MEETING DATES, LOCATIONS, AND LOGISTICS

Date	Type of Meeting	Location
February 9, 2018	Data & Research Team	Conference Call
February 28, 2018	Data & Research Team	Ingenuity
March 7, 2018	Full Work Group	ISBE Thompson Center/VTEL
March 28, 2018	Data & Research Team	Ingenuity
April 27, 2018	Full Work Group	ISBE Thompson Center/VTEL
May 4, 2018	Data & Research Team	Ingenuity
June 22, 2018	Full Work Group	ISBE Thompson Center/VTEL
July 23, 2018	Data & Research Team	Ingenuity
August 22, 2018	Data & Research Team	Conference Call
August 24, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/ZOOM
September 7, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/ZOOM
September 17, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/ZOOM
October 11, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/ZOOM
October 19, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/ZOOM
November 13, 2018	Data & Research Team	Conference Call
November 16, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/GoToMeeting
November 29, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/GoToMeeting
November 30, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/GoToMeeting
December 6, 2018	Full Work Group	American Institutes for Research/GoToMeeting
December 7, 2018	Writing Team	American Institutes for Research/GoToMeeting
December 11, 2018	Writing Team	American Institutes for Research/GoToMeeting
December 12, 2018	Writing Team	American Institutes for Research/GoToMeeting
December 13, 2018	Writing Team	American Institutes for Research/GoToMeeting

APPENDIX B: TASKS AND TIMELINE

STEP	ACTIVITY	TARGET DATES
1	Outreach to key potential Work Group members	Jan-Feb 2018
2	Work Group meets for the first time, establishes guiding principles, and discusses scope and mission. Data & Research Team forms.	Feb-March, 2018
3	Work Group approves the foundational documents (goals, principles, process, and timeline)	April 2018
4	Broad concepts gathered. A list of all-inclusive, general ideas (42 in total) for possible measures is gathered from Work Group members.	April-May 2018
5	From the list of broad concepts, Work Group identifies the universe of possible measures, throwing out ones that are clearly not workable.	May-June 2018
6	Work Group narrows the long list of possible measures to a list of approximately 4-6 viable options. Consideration of % weight begins in greater detail.	July-Aug 2018
7	Work Group further narrows the list of possible measures to 2-3 specific options. Also, 2-3 weight options considered.	Sept-Oct 2018
8	Work Group decides and approves the measures and weight it will formally recommend to ISBE	Dec 11, 2018
9	Work Group formally submits final recommendation and report to ISBE.	Dec 19, 2018
10	Work Group presents the recommendation report to the IBAM Committee.	January 7, 2018
11	The State Board of Education considers and votes on the recommended measures and weight.	January 2019 (tentative)

APPENDIX C: SUPPORTING RESEARCH

- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2017). *Identifying a school quality/student success indicator for ESSA: Requirements and considerations*. Retrieved from <https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-10/CCSSOIdentifyingSchoolQualityStudentSuccessIndicator1242017.pdf>
- Connecticut State Department of Education. (2018). *Using accountability results to guide improvement*. Retrieved from http://edsight.ct.gov/relatedreports/Using_Accountability_Results_to_Guide_Improvement.pdf
- Ludwig, M., Boyle, A., & Lindsey, J. (2017). *Review of evidence: Arts integration research through the lens of the Every Student Succeeds Act*. Chicago, IL: American Institutes for Research.
- Wan, Y., Ludwig, M.J., & Boyle, A. (2018). *Review of Evidence: Arts education through the lens of ESSA*. Chicago, IL: American Institutes for Research.
- Von Zastrow, C. (2018). *Using state data systems to report information on arts education*. Retrieved from <https://www.ecs.org/wp-content/uploads/Using-State-Data-Systems-to-Report-Information-on-Arts-Education.pdf>

APPENDIX D: SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS

To develop and test the arts indicator, the Work Group and its Data & Research Team conducted extensive analyses using data provided by ISBE from School Years 2013-2018. This data includes:

- School and grade-level data on total student enrollment and number of students who enrolled in at least one arts course during that school year.
- School and teacher-level data on total number of teachers who taught any course and those who taught at least one arts course during that school year, including those teachers' unique IEIN.
- School and grade-level counts of the number of courses taught in any subject and the number of courses taught in the arts.
- Teacher-level data, by IEIN, of all certifications received and the date on which those certifications were received.

The Work Group also collected data from School Year 2018 on evidence-based funding adequacy. This data is available at the district level only.

The Work Group combined these disparate data sets into a single data table that includes information for all schools across all years between 2013-2018. This data table became the resource for exploring a variety of measure options related to course offerings, teacher certifications in the arts, and student enrollment in the arts. In addition, the Work Group considered a variety of ways to adjust the implementation of the indicator based on the level of resources available in the district of which each school is a part.

The Work Group would welcome further exploration of this data, as well as the analytical tools used to conduct its analyses. To that end, the Work Group is open to sharing the origin data sets from ISBE or the final table that includes the merged information.



Position Statement ESSA Accountability: Fine Arts Indicator

December 5, 2018

The Illinois Education Association (IEA) believes that all students deserve a rich and diverse curriculum that includes the fine and performing arts. However, until all schools are funded at a minimum of 90% of their state determined adequacy targets, the IEA does not support the inclusion of any indicator that would lead to an inequitable and punitive state accountability system.

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) has indicated that their accountability system was designed to be educative, equitable, and non-punitive. ISBE has indicated that a fine arts indicator would violate these values due to inequitable school funding and should receive a weight of zero. The IEA agrees that a fine arts indicator would negatively impact the summative designation for schools for reasons that are outside of the schools control (ISBE, 2017, p.57).

Until all schools are adequately funded, we recommend retaining a fine arts indicator with a weight of zero. In this scenario no schools would be negatively impacted. In addition, this would allow the state to further investigate all proposed fine arts indicators and their hypothetical impact on the summative designations of schools across the state. An educative, equitable, and non-punitive accountability system is the goal. On behalf of our members, IEA urges ISBE to meet this goal for the benefit of students and educators across the state.

References

Illinois State Board of Education. (2017). *State Template for the Consolidated State Plan under the Every Student Succeeds Act*. Retrieved from <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/ESSAStatePlanforIllinois.pdf>



A Union of Professionals



**CHICAGO
TEACHERS
UNION**

Position Statement ESSA Accountability: Arts Indicator

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 sought every opportunity for our members' voices to be heard on the issues impacting their day-to-day work with students. We continually advocated for a broad, rich, and meaningful curriculum that would include, but not be limited to, fine arts; for academic and school quality indicators that are not weighted so as to disadvantage schools due to socioeconomic factors; and for an accountability system that does not define schools by a single score derived from multiple measures since the work done in schools is too complex to be captured by a single "score." We represented our members and advocated for these principles during three rounds of public comment on the ESSA plan, and since early 2016 we attended over 100 meetings convened by the Illinois State Board of Education, the state P20 Council, the Illinois Early Learning Council, and the Illinois Balanced Accountability Measures Committee. While ISBE continues to solicit practitioner feedback, we are greatly concerned that the input of our members is ignored. 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 used to differentiate school performance amid vast inequities in school funding, they lose their value as indicators of quality and distort the educational process similar to the way high-stakes testing has negatively impacted teaching and learning 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 Arts accountability indicator

Position: The IFT and CTU recommend an all-inclusive indicator that equally prioritizes all the educational opportunities necessary for a rich, broad, meaningful curriculum

Rationale: The IFT and CTU wholeheartedly agree that opportunities to engage in the Arts are vital to a well-rounded educational experience. However, our members equally value their students having access to 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 asserted during public comment periods in 2016, and during stakeholder meetings in

2017 and 2018, 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 creating an indicator that only measures the participation and quality of a school's arts programs, but 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, fine arts—for all students.

Issue: Proposed Arts accountability indicator weighing Arts participation and the teaching of the arts by a certified/licensed arts teacher at 5%.

Position: The IFT and CTU oppose adding weight to any indicator within an accountability system that penalizes schools for inadequate resources.

Rationale: National data confirms that wealthier, whiter schools offer more in academic subject areas and the arts. While only 45% of schools nationally report having theatre instruction, 92% of affluent schools vs. 57% of under-resourced schools do so. There are similar disparities in music and visual arts (NCES 2012-14). Having a wide range of academic coursework and opportunities to engage in arts are important to a quality education, but research unequivocally shows not all students have access to these opportunities. In Illinois, there are wide disparities in school funding: some districts are funded above adequacy while others fall far below adequacy targets. While the new evidence-based funding model attempts to bring equity to school funding, it does not eradicate funding disparities nor does it eliminate the impact of decades-long disinvestment. To include an indicator that is so highly correlated to socioeconomic status, will continue the tradition of penalizing schools with fewer resources and perpetuate inequity. Until all schools are funded at a minimum of 90% of their state-determined adequacy targets, the IFT and CTU do not support the inclusions of any indicator that would exacerbate an inequitable and punitive state accountability system.

When developing its new accountability system, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) stated that this system would be educative, equitable, and non-punitive. ISBE acknowledged that a fine arts indicator would be a proxy for resources and therefore would not be in harmony with its vision of an equitable accountability system. To elevate the Arts while not unfairly penalizing under-resourced schools, ISBE recommended the Arts be included in the accountability system with a weight of zero (ISBE, 2017, p.57). In a similar effort, the Arts Indicator Committee recommends that schools within districts falling below a to-be-determined threshold of adequacy be granted an additional two years before required implementation of the Arts Indicator. This is a commendable recommendation and is the only indicator that attempts to concretely address inequity. However, the IFT and CTU believe that an even more equitable approach would be to fully fund all schools to ensure they are can provide a rich, broad, and meaningful curriculum *before* holding them accountable for providing educational experiences that require resources many schools do not currently have.

If an Arts Indicator is to be included in Illinois' accountability system, we recommend its weight remain at zero until all schools are adequately funded. This would ensure that no schools are negatively impacted by the indicator due to lack of resources. It would also allow the state to fully investigate all proposed fine arts indicators, the state's capacity to provide certified and/or licensed Arts teachers to every school, and the potential impact on the summative designations of schools across the state—while not unfairly penalizing schools in the process.

The IFT and CTU believe in an accountability system that is educative, equitable, and non-punitive. On behalf of our members, we urge ISBE to work collaboratively with us to achieve this goal for the benefit and well-being of students, educators and public education in Illinois.

Resources

- [Darling-Hammond et al, Pathways to New Accountability Through the Every Student Succeeds Act](#)
- [IFT ESSA webpage](#)
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2017). *State Template for the Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act*. Retrieved from <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/ESSAStatePlanforIllinois.pdf>
- Journey for Justice Alliance. (2018). *Failing Brown v Board: A continuous struggle against inequity in public education*. Retrieved from www.j4jalliance.com

To: Dr. Tony Smith, State Superintendent of Education
Mr. Ralph Grimm, Interim Chief Education Officer
Dr. Jason Helfer, Deputy Superintendent of Teaching and Learning
Illinois State Board of Education

From: Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee (“IBAMC”)

RE: IBAMC Fine Arts Indicator Recommendations

Date: January 10, 2019

Pursuant to statutory authority, the purpose of this letter is to provide recommendations and feedback to the Illinois State Board of Education regarding the overall composition of the Illinois ESSA State Plan, specifically and inclusive of the Fine Arts Indicator Report as submitted by the Fine Arts Work Group.

Purpose

The Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee (“IBAMC”) was created pursuant to House Bill 2683 (P.A. 99-0193) to provide guidance, recommendations and feedback regarding the ESSA State Plan and any additions, modification and revisions thereof. Thus, in accordance, with ISBE protocols, the IBAMC met on January 7, 2019 to fully analyze and discuss the recommended Fine Arts Indicator as submitted by the Fine Arts Work Group.

Pursuant to statute, the IBAMC consists of ten (10) voting members and one (1) ISBE appointed non-voting members. The voting members are as follows: Sara Boucek, Chair (Illinois Association of School Administrators) (“IASA”), Thomas Bertrand, Vice Chair (Illinois Association of School Boards) (“IASB”), Daniel Booth, Superintendent - Carbondale Elementary School District (Illinois Principals Association), (“IPA”), Jeff Broom, Director of Performance Data and Policy (Chicago Public Schools) (“CPS”), Erin Roche, Principal (Chicago Principal and Administrators Association). Karl Goeke, Teacher McLean Unit 5 Schools (Illinois Education Association) (“IEA”), Kurt Hilgendorf, Policy Advisor (Chicago Teachers Union) (“CTU”), Dr. Mark Klaisner, Executive Director West 40 (Illinois Association of Regional School Superintendents) (“IARSS”), Cathy Mannen, Union Professional Issues Director (Illinois Federation of Teachers) (“IFT”) and Mary Jane Morris, Director of Teaching and Learning (Illinois Education Association) (“IEA”). Additionally, ISBE appointed Matthew Rodriguez, President, Illinois PTA, who unfortunately with Karl Goeke was unable to make the meeting on January 7, 2019.

In accordance with its statutory obligation, the IBAMC has analyzed and debated various issues related to the Fine Arts Indicator. The end goal upon completion of this analysis was to provide

group-wide consensus and recommendation to ISBE regarding the inclusion of Fine Arts Indicator and any subsequent ramifications thereof. However, where consensus was not available, it was important to all members of the IBAMC that explanation and reason be provided. Accordingly, the result is the recommendations and information provided below.

Recommendations

Prior to submitting its recommendations regarding the Fine Arts Indicator, it was very important to every IBAMC member to reiterate and reaffirm the IBAMC's original recommendations set forth on January 26, 2017 regarding the overall weight set forth in the Illinois ESSA State Plan, as well as the inclusion of an "access to broader curriculum" indicator within the Student Success portion of the State Plan.

It is the overwhelming majority position of the IBAMC that the overall weight of the Academic Indicators vs. Student Success Indicators in the State Plan should be revised to 51%/49% from the current percentage allocation of 70%/30%. This approach is not only deeply aligned with the original statutory intent of P.A. 99-0193, but supports a more balanced approach to accountability which highlights academic indicators, but also celebrates and allows for multiple measures of school quality through Student Success Indicators.

Additionally, although IBAMC does support the inclusion of fine arts within the accountability plan, the IBAMC reaffirms its support for a more comprehensive approach which celebrates a school's dedication to a broad and rich curriculum. In addition to the arts, the IBAMC believes that access to the following should be considered: world languages, science, social sciences, vocational education, physical education and enrichment and advanced learning opportunities. It has always and will remain the focus of the IBAMC to advocate for a multi-measured approach to accountability that celebrates the opportunities provided to the enrichment of the whole child, rather than a single measure approach focused on "one test on one day".

Fine Arts Indicator as submitted by the Fine Arts Work Group

As noted above, the IBAMC remains committed to the inclusion of the Arts within the State Plan as one piece of a well-rounded educational experience for students, however, by overwhelmingly majority consensus, the IBAMC¹ does not recommend that ISBE adopt the Fine Arts Indicator in its current form as submitted and set forth in the "Illinois Arts Indicator Recommendation Report". It is very important to commend and celebrate the dedicated and comprehensive work of the Fine

¹ Every stakeholder with the exception of the Chicago Principals and Administrators Association indicated that it would not support the Fine Arts Indicator as originally submitted by the Fine Arts Work Group. The Chicago Principals and Administrators Association abstained from said vote as it needed to consult further with its members.

Arts Work Group. We strongly believe that their detailed process and method of recommendation will serve as an example for future working groups. Their use of data and thoughtful analysis was extremely helpful to IBAMC as it completed its analysis and recommendation.

Moreover, IBAMC shares the Work Group's guiding principles as set forth on pages 5-6 of the Report, especially its commitment to setting forth a fair, non-punitive and balanced indicator. As set forth in the Report, the Fine Arts Work Group recommends the Indicator measure three key elements, student participation in the arts, quality of the arts education provided and student voice. The IBAMC's concerns and recommendations are set forth below.

Student Participation in the Arts

The first recommendation of the Fine Arts Work Group is that schools should be assessed based on the participation of students enrolled in arts coursework (*Illinois Arts Indicator Recommendation Report*, Pages 9-11). The Fine Arts Work Group recommendation is that student participation rate equals the school's total number of students enrolled in one or more arts courses divided by the school's total number of students. The Work Group further recommend that points be assigned in a "cut score" method. For elementary schools and high schools, the proposal is that if 90% or more of elementary school students or 50% or more of high school students participate in arts coursework, the school (in year 1) would receive full point allocation. If between 50-89% of elementary students and 25-49% of high school students participate in arts coursework, the school would receive half of the point allocation. If the schools have student participation that is below 50% or 25% at the respective school types, no points would be allotted. However, the Work Group made an equitable and non-punitive recommendation that any school within in a district who is not funded at more than 60% of adequacy as detailed through the District's Evidence Based Funding Metric would not be subject to the indicator unless the indicator would increase the school's overall summative designation.

First, IBAMC believes that the participation thresholds are too high and need to be adjusted downward. The following example was provided by Daniel Booth, Superintendent of Carbondale Elementary School District No. 95 and previous Principal of Carbondale High School District No. 165: Carbondale High School for a number of years has had award winning Band/Choral programs that traditionally place in the top 3 in the State. They also have various other electives which focus on the arts. With that, as a whole, its participation rate is most likely on average between 25-30%. If the participation rates stay as proposed, Carbondale High School in year 1, despite its award winning programs, would receive half of the allocated points at best. The IBAMC believes that this exact example would apply to a number of elementary and high school districts within the

state. For that reason, the IBAMC recommends the participation rate at both the elementary and high school levels be decreased to avoid the inevitable unintended punitive consequence.²

Second, the IBAMC believes that ISBE should examine the possibility of a “sliding scale” approach versus a hard “cut score” approach. As indicated above, whether an elementary school has a participation rate of 89% or 50%, the school would receive half of the total points, rather than the entire point allocation. This did not have unanimous IBAMC support, but did carry a majority support to examine the possibility of using said sliding approach, similar to what is used when determining the growth calculations within the Academic Success Indicators in the State Plan.

Third, and most important, the IBAMC felt very strongly that the funding adequacy level of 60% that was used as part of the “equitable and non-punitive” adjustment was by far too low. All voting members (with the exception of CPS and CPAA (which was due to the need to talk to their respective members for a formal position) recommended that the minimum threshold should be 90% of adequacy. The IBAMC very much respects and supports the Fine Arts Work Group’s adjustment based on inadequate funding and commends its approach, but takes deep issue with its finding that schools with a financial adequacy percentage of 60% is considered highly funded. The threshold for Tier 3 funding within the Evidence Based Funding Formula is 90%, accordingly, any school who is funded lower than 90% is a Tier 2 or Tier 1 school which receives the overwhelming majority of new education funding due to that lack of resources and funding. To set the adjustment lower than 90% has little to no support of the IBAMC. We firmly believe that this indicator should not apply and/or punish schools who are not at least at the 90% adequacy threshold.³ With that, we unanimously support the Fine Art Work Group’s recommendation that if a underfunded school’s summative rating would be positively impacted regardless of its funding level, the indicator should apply. We believe this supports the very core of a rigorous yet balanced approach to accountability.

Therefore, as it relates to this sub-measure, for the following reasons as set forth above, the IBAMC recommends that ISBE not adopt the sub-measure as proposed, but rather looks to decrease the participation rate at both the elementary and high school levels, explore the possibility of a sliding scale approach to point allocation and set the minimum funding adequacy for the purposes of indicator application to a minimum of 90%.

² At this time and due to the short time provided for analysis, the IBAMC does not have a specific recommendation as to where the participation rates should be decreased to, but remains willing and open to discuss with the Fine Arts Work Group and ISBE based on further data analysis.

³ For calculations purposes and to see the vast effect it has on schools, please see the following data analysis as provided by the Fine Arts Work Group: <https://ingenuity-dataviz-shinyapps.io/ESSA-Arts-Data-Exploration/>

Quality of The Arts Education Provided

Second, the Fine Arts Work Group support, as a concept, the addition of a sub-measure that assesses the quality of a school's arts program. Its Report suggests using as a quality metric (a proxy for program quality) as the percent of students taking arts courses whose course is taught by a teacher with a Professional Educator License (PEL) and a specific Fine Arts Content Area Endorsement as compared to the total number of students enrolled in one or more arts courses (*Illinois Arts Indicator Recommendation Report*, Pages 8 and 11).

The majority of IBAMC questions whether the measure is sufficient as a measure of the quality of a school's arts program. The application of this metric would assess a program input but not the output of the program. The IBAMC encourages ISBE to consider this question as it debates the effectiveness of the proposed sub-measure.

Further, current Illinois statute and regulation make the definition of a "qualified teacher of the arts" for the purposes of the proposed sub-measure calculation difficult and may allow for a disparate impact in the application of the sub-metric as written. Elementary, middle school, and high school PELs may include a content area endorsement for the arts. In middle schools and high schools, teachers must have this endorsement to teach arts courses. However, if the holder of an elementary grade PEL has taken, as part of their teacher preparation coursework, a techniques course for music, visual arts, dance, or the like, they may, as part of their job assignment, teach that arts course as long as they do so as part of an elementary teaching assignment. The elementary school must hire someone with a specific arts endorsement IF the full time job of that teacher is to teach, for example, visual arts. However, if a fifth grade teacher is required to teach 120 minutes per week of visual arts as part of the fifth grade assignment AND IF that teacher had, as part of their teacher preparation coursework, a visual arts teaching techniques course for the elementary grades, then the teacher is qualified, under the statutes and rules of Illinois, to teach that arts course for the district. This fact means that this sub-measure, as written, would require elementary schools in which a licensed teacher is fully qualified to teach an arts course, but does not have a content area endorsement for the visual arts, to count that fifth grade arts course as one that is not taught by a teacher with an arts endorsement, thereby losing the potential point allocation under the sub-measure. This tension in the existing licensure of Illinois teachers at the elementary level causes the IBAMC concern and pause as to the use of teacher licensure as a proxy for program quality is a wise one.

The vast majority of the IBAMC recommend that, if ISBE determines to use this sub-metric, the definition be changed so that it measure the percent of students whose arts course is taught by a qualified Illinois teacher. To do otherwise would treat properly licensed elementary teachers different than their middle school/high school counterparts. We encourage ISBE to consider this dilemma and to suggest that further data analysis be done before the State Board considers

recommending that the metric be implemented using teacher qualification as a proxy for program quality.

Additionally, the Fine Arts Work Group recommends hard “cut score” percentage rates as it did in the student participation in the arts sub-measure. We, again, submit the concerns and potential recommendations as stated above.

The IBAMC encourages and celebrates the push to bring and highlight a robust arts education within Illinois schools, but does not support an initiative that could result in unintended and punitive ramifications, especially when it could result in a disparate impact to a classification of teachers in an already fragile and concerning teacher shortage environment.

Student Voice

Third, the Fine Arts Work Group recommend that ISBE in consultation with the Fine Arts Work Group study and include a sub-measure of “student voice” through survey data. This recommendation is weighted at 0 points until which time the analysis is completed. At this time, members of the IBAMC shared concern with an additional survey requirement, but reserve their recommendation until which time ISBE and the Fine Arts Work Group make a more definitive recommendation.

Conclusion

Thank you for your review and consideration of the abovementioned recommendations by the IBAMC. If upon your review, questions and/or concerns should arise, please do not hesitate to contact us. We look forward to the opportunity to continue to collaborate with ISBE and the Fine Arts Work Group in this very important work.