Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12-200.24 and section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

4.1 Accountability System

~~As mentioned previously, s~~School accountability in ESSA requires that a state consider more than academic achievement in grades 3 through 12. Also, while ESSA requires that the accountability system of a state include academic proficiency, it also requires the following:

- Academic growth (Grades 3 through 8);
- Graduation rate (High School);
- EL proficiency (Grades 3 through 12); and
- One or more student quality or student success indicator.

Together, these elements ensure that accountability systems reflect not only how well students perform academically, but also how effectively schools support overall student development and long-term outcomes.

Illinois' original accountability system was a multi-measure, weighted index focused on identifying the schools and student groups most urgently in need of support. The system did so effectively, but created four problems of practice:

1. The system was based on rank, with the top tier arbitrarily limited to 10% of schools.
2. Performance expectations were a moving target. No one could specify what performance would qualify a school for a particular designation.
3. The Commendable band was overly large, hiding important difference in performance.
4. The system gave the impression that school improvement was something only necessary or expected for schools with Targeted or Comprehensive designations.
5. The system was overly complex, making it difficult for practitioners to understand, explain, or use to drive school improvement.

ISBE embarked on a two-year long process to redesign its accountability system. The first task was to identify what about the system was and was not working for various stakeholders. Three working aspects identified were the:

- inclusion of growth as an indicator.
- compensatory nature of the different indicators, and how that allowed a school's strengths to compensate for areas in need of support and improvement.
- "schoolhouse" data visualization of the indicators and how they contributed to a school's designation.

Feedback on the aspects not working confirmed the problems of practice identified but also brought to light the role that the chronic absenteeism and English Learner Progress to Proficiency (ELPtP) indicators played in a school's final designation, and the way the performance of the high school system differed from that of the K-8 system. ISBE also heard feedback on aspects of the system that could not be changed, such as the requirement to identify a lowest performing five percent, the requirement to identify schools that have student groups whose performance is on par with that of the lowest performing five percent of schools, and the inability to set performance expectations that differ by student group. Thus, the objective of the redesign was to develop a system that addressed the identified problems of practice in ways that recognize school strengths and support improvement in every school.

~~The area that received the greatest attention during the listening tours and via public comments on drafts of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois was the development of an educative, equitable, and non-punitive accountability system. Common values held by ISBE and stakeholders also include high expectations for student achievement (i.e., the required academic indicators) and a system that captures the complexity of the work that occurs in schools. ISBE asserted that growth and achievement should be weighted equally in the first two drafts of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois. However, public comment and comments received from the Governor during the required 30-day review provided a strong argument that growth was of greater importance than that of proficiency. Rationale for this claim was premised upon the former accountability system in NCLB insofar as there were a number of schools whose students were showing growth. Neither the accountability system nor the Illinois School Report Card reflected this growth. Additionally, the ability for stakeholders to identify accountability indicators that extended beyond achievement and growth provide an opportunity to develop a system in which multiple measures indicative of the work that occurs in schools could be factored into a final summative designation for each school. The system outlined below contains both of the aforementioned -- growth weighted significantly higher than proficiency and school quality and school success indicators that look at aspects of schooling that were previously unavailable to the Illinois accountability system under NCLB.~~

~~ISBE is currently engaged in a comprehensive alignment of its assessments, accountability system and statewide system of support . Currently underway is a unified academic achievement standard setting, to be completed in July of 2025. The system of indicators and weights described in section 4.1 will be in effect through SY2024-25 and will be used to produce the annual summative designations published on the state's report card in October 2025. The accountability redesign work currently underway is projected for completion in 2026.~~

A. Weighting

~~The accountability system for Illinois as well as the weights within and between the required academic category and schools quality/student success indicator are as follows:[1]~~

The new accountability model is a profile of performance that combines core indicators of proficiency, growth, and graduation rate with elevating indicators English Learner progress (ELP), consistent attendance, and climate survey.

The designation first considers core performance, then the influence of elevating indicators, and finally the performance of individual student groups to arrive at the final designation.

Each indicator has five performance levels as defined in Section 4.1.F. Annual Meaningful Differentiation, with graduation rate, proficiency and growth having performance thresholds that automatically identify a school as Comprehensive.

The required academic indicators carry more weight that the state-selected School Quality and Student Success (SQSS) indicators by virtue of their role as core indicators in the case of proficiency, growth, and graduation rate. There are also a total of four academic indicators, and only two state-selected indicators, consistent attendance and climate survey.

Indicator	Role in System	Federal Classification
Proficiency	Core	Academic
Growth	Core	Academic

~~[1] Appendix E: Accountability System Comparisons provide information on the different recommendations from IBAMC, ISBE, and the Governor's Office.~~

Graduation Rate	Core	Academic
English Learner Progress	Elevating	Academic
Consistent Attendance	Elevating	School Quality and Student Success
Climate Survey	Elevating	School Quality and Student Success

~~INDICATOR WEIGHTING~~				
~~Elementary/Middle~~		~~Report Card 2018 SY 2018-2019~~	~~Report Card 2019-2025~~	~~Future Weights[2]~~
~~Academic Indicators~~	~~ELA Proficiency~~	~~10%~~	~~7.5%~~	~~7.5%~~
	~~Math Proficiency~~	~~10%~~	~~7.5%~~	~~7.5%~~
	~~ELA and Math Growth (Student Growth Percentile)~~	~~50%~~	~~50%~~	~~50%~~
	~~English Learner Progress to Proficiency~~	~~5%~~	~~5%~~	~~5%~~
	~~Science Proficiency[3]~~	~~0%~~	~~5%~~	~~5%~~
	~~Total Weight~~	~~75%~~	~~75%~~	~~75%~~
~~Student Success Indicators~~	~~Chronic Absenteeism~~	~~20%~~	~~20%~~	~~5-10%~~
	~~Climate Surveys~~	~~5%~~	~~5%~~	~~5%~~
	~~Elementary/Middle Grade Indicator~~	~~0%~~	~~0%~~	~~5%~~
	~~P-2 Indicator~~	~~0%~~	~~0%~~	~~5%~~
	~~Fine Arts Indicator~~	~~0%~~	~~0%~~	~~0-5%~~
	~~Total Weight~~	~~25%~~	~~25%~~	~~25%~~

~~High School~~		~~Report Card 2018 SY 2018-2019~~	~~Report Card 2019-2025~~	~~Future Weights~~
~~Academic Indicators~~	~~ELA Proficiency~~	~~10%~~	~~7.5%~~	~~7.5%~~
	~~Math Proficiency~~	~~10%~~	~~7.5%~~	~~7.5%~~
	~~Graduation (4, 5, 6 year)~~	~~50%~~	~~50%~~	~~50%~~
	~~English Learner Progress to Proficiency~~	~~5%~~	~~5%~~	~~5%~~
	~~Science Proficiency[53]~~	~~0%~~	~~5%~~	~~5%~~
	~~Total Weight~~	~~75%~~	~~75%~~	~~75%~~
~~Student Success Indicators~~	~~Chronic Absenteeism 7.5%~~	~~7.5%~~	~~10%~~	~~2.5-7.5%~~
	~~Climate Surveys – 5%~~	~~5%~~	~~6.67%~~	~~5%~~
	~~9th Grade On-Track 6.25%~~	~~6.25%~~	~~8.33%~~	~~6.25%~~
	~~College and Career Readiness – 6.25%~~	~~6.25%~~	~~0%~~	~~6.25%~~
	~~Fine Arts Indicator~~	~~0%~~	~~0%~~	~~0-5%~~

[2] All information about future weights is presented consistent with the approved Illinois Plan effective August 29, 2017. Changes, if any, to the accountability system for Report Card 2020 and beyond would be reflected in a future amendment.
[3] Illinois stakeholders spent considerable time debating the weights of the various academic and student success indicators and in those debates science proficiency was always an academic indicator. ED however, considers science proficiency within Illinois' system a school quality and student success indicator.

	~~**Total Weight**~~	~~**25%**~~	~~**25%**~~	~~**25%**~~

~~It is important to note that:~~

- ~~Implementation of the accountability system will begin in 2017-18, with first designations published in June of 2018. These designations will be preliminary, for purposes of funding. The first official designations will be published in October of 2018, in school year 2018-2019 on Report Card 2018. Subsequent designations will be issued and reported each October, in conjunction with the release of the Illinois Report Card.~~
- ~~The n-size for the purpose of accountability will be 20.~~
- ~~Based upon feedback from stakeholders and the Governor, growth received over two times as much weight as proficiency in the accountability system.~~
- ~~The Governor, stakeholders and ISBE value having an accountability system that recognizes academic growth in high school. Illinois recognizes an emphasis on student growth as a primary driver to close equity gaps. As a result, student growth will represent 50% of the accountability framework for Illinois. EL proficiency will be measured by a progress to proficiency measure, based upon the recommendation of stakeholders.~~
- ~~English Learners will be assessed annually for English proficiency and for English language arts and mathematics. Illinois will assess newly arrived ELs, enrolled in their first year in U.S. schools, in grades 3-11 in academic content areas: English language arts, mathematics, and science. Data from the first-year assessments will not be included in accountability determination, but serve solely for baseline purposes.~~
- ~~The Fine Arts have been included as a school quality/student success indicator. This indicator will consider the percentage of students enrolled in a fine arts course during the school year. It will receive 0% until such time as it has been validated for use in the accountability system . During that time a workgroup will analyze available data to ascertain if/how the indicator can be further refined.~~
- ~~ISBE's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides guidance on technical assessment and accountability issues in an effort to create a single summative designation that meaningfully differentiates schools. TAC members help ensure alignment of accountability system to core values and assure the statistical validity and reliability, accuracy, and fairness of individual assessments or indicators and the accountability system as a whole. TAC will be convened in collaboration with the National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment and composed of national and local researchers and other practitioners, particularly those practitioners who specialize in assessment and school accountability research and data analysis for Illinois school districts.~~
- ~~Public Act 100-0465 or the Evidence-Based Funding for Student Success Act was signed into law on August 31, 2017. This law enacts evidence-based funding (EBF) and comprehensively changes the way that school districts receive the bulk of state funds. EBF sends more resources to Illinois' most under-resourced students. EBF takes the necessary first steps toward ensuring all schools have the resources they need to provide a safe, rigorous, and well-rounded learning environment for all students. EBF demonstrates new mindsets for understanding the relationship between equity, adequacy, and student outcomes. In addition, the state accountability system recommended through ESSA will be used to determine whether or not increased funding leads to improved student outcomes, specifically in terms of students' academic growth. ISBE will, when sufficient valid data are available, investigate any district~~

~~that is receiving increased investment with no improvement or a decline in outcomes. Depending on the results of the inquiry, the State Board may intervene and support the district.~~ [4]

B. Indicators

i. **Describe the measure(s) included in each of the academic achievement, academic progress, graduation rate, progress in achieving English language proficiency, and school quality or student success indicators and how those measures meet the requirements described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)-(b) and section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the ESEA.**

- The description for each indicator should include how it is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the state, as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c).
- To meet the requirements described in 34 C.F.R.§ 200.14(d), for the measures included within the indicators of academic progress and school quality or student success measures, the description must also address how each measure within the indicators is supported by research that high performance or improvement on such measure is likely to increase student learning (e.g., grade point average, credit accumulation, performance in advanced coursework).
- For measures within indicators of school quality or student success that are unique to high school, the description must address how research shows that high performance or improvement on the indicator is likely to increase graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment, persistence, completion, or career readiness.
- To meet the requirement in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(e), the descriptions for the academic progress and school quality or student success indicators must include a demonstration of how each measure aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 by demonstrating varied results across schools in the state.

The following is a brief description of each indicator, the research that supports it, and how ISBE will continually verify that the indicator aids in meaningful differentiation of schools. Full business rules for the calculation of each indicator are published annually on the Report Card Metrics page at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Report-Card-Metrics.aspx. Please refer to the business rules for the most accurate description of how each indicator is calculated and scored.

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT	Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR – ELA & math) (3-8) Illinois Science Assessment (ISA - science) (5, 8) ACT Suite of Assessments	**Description:** The measures of academic achievement ~~for~~ grades 3-8 will be the Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) and Illinois Science Assessment (ISA). The measure of academic achievement for high school will be the ACT suite of assessments, including the PreACT 9 Secure at grade 9, PreACT Secure at grade 10, and the ACT with Writing and Science administered in grade 11. Additionally, the DLM-AA will be the measure of academic achievement for students with profound cognitive disabilities. This rate of proficiency will be a composite of ELA, math and science defined as the percentage of all ~~served~~ students meeting or exceeding standards on the required applicable assessments for each subject in each of the assessed grades served by the school. The annual measure of achievement will be calculated based upon the greater of the number of students assessed, or 95 percent of those who should have been~~95% of all such students or 95% of all such students in the subgroup, as the case may be, or the number of students participating in the assessments~~.

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
	(ELA, math & science) (9-11~~high school~~) Dynamic Learning Maps-Alternate Assessment (DLM-AA – ELA, math & science) (3-~~8,~~11)	**Definition:** ~~ELA and math p~~ Proficiency is the percentage of students who meet proficiency criteria on the state's ELA, math, and science accountability assessments, as unweighted student-level composite. ELA and math are inclusive of all grades 3-11,[5] and science results from grades 5, 8 and 11 are included in accountability calculations[6]. The federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires states to assess their learning standards for ELA and math annually in Grades 3-8 and at least once in high school and these assessments and grades included in the composite meet the requirements. Each state may also have a general assessment for the majority of its students and an alternate assessment for the 1 percent of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The proficiency rate ~~A~~ percentage is calculated by ~~subject~~ combining all tests for all subjects and grades served. ~~**Scoring:** A school or student group's proficiency percentage is divided by the applicable annual proficiency target. Baseline targets were set using the state proficiency rate for the applicable group, and targets grow annually until all groups have 90 percent proficiency (which is expected by 2033).~~ **Indicator ~~Points~~ Formula:** [(Students proficient in ELA +Students proficient in math + Students proficient in science) ÷ (Students assessed* in ELA + Students assessed* in math + Students assessed* in science)] x 100. *Or 95% of those who should have, whichever is larger. ~~[Group_Percent _Proficient ÷ Group_Annual_Proficiency_Target] * 100, scores capped at 100~~ **Research:** IAR is a custom assessment with its own blueprint, with items built to the specifications of ~~from~~ the PARCC assessment. ~~content.~~ It was designed to provide comparable results to ensure longitudinal trends, one of the few assessments to receive full approval. The technical reports for IAR document the evidence for its validity, reliability, and comparability[7]. ISA is a custom assessment, administered in an online format and is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards for Science incorporating the Next Generation Science

[5] To ensure all students are included in state accountability assessments, Illinois annually rosters a very small number of grade 12 students who failed to test in grade 11, but grade 12 is not considered an academically assessed grade for purposes of accountability.

[6] Due to the embedded nature of science in the ACT suite of assessments, science is administered at grades 9 and 10, but these grades are not included in accountability calculations for two reasons. First, 105 ILCS 5/27-605 requires only two years of "laboratory science," and the content of those two year is unspecified. Second, state course code usage reflects a biology-chemistry-physics orientation, while the assessments are aligned to Illinois Next Generation Science Standards, with their four disciplinary core idea domains, so it is difficult to determine precisely which content areas students have had an opportunity to learn.

[7] For research on IAR, please access https://www.isbe.net/Documents/New-Meridian-Tech-Rpt-2019.pdf

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
		Standards (NGSS), which were adopted in 2014. The technical reports for ISA document the evidence for its validity, reliability, and comparability[8]. ACT - ACT sustains a continuous program of research on the ACT suite of assessments, examining the validity, fairness, and effectiveness of the test nationally. Extensive research on the predictive validity of the ACT has established its use as a college entrance exam through studies on the relationship between ACT scores and performance in college. ACT has also studied the predictive validity of ACT scores post COVID, career choice, post-secondary persistence, and research into equity influences on performance outcomes.[9] DLM-AA: The DLM consortium has sustained a research agenda based on the validity, reliability, and technical soundness of the DLM-AA as an appropriate large-scale assessment for students with the most profound cognitive disabilities.[10] [11] **Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:** Academic achievement has been the historical method for differentiation of schools. In the past, academic achievement was the only indicator used to meaningfully differentiate schools in Illinois. ISBE will continue to convene a TAC to annually evaluate the extent to which indicators are performing as intended ~~make amendments as additional data is available~~. Please see Section 4.1(F) for data on the five performance levels associated with this indicator. ~~a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools.~~[12]
ACADEMIC PROGRESS	Student Growth Percentile (SGP – ELA & math) (4-8, 9-11)	**Description:** ISBE uses a cohort referenced SGP to compute student academic growth ~~in grades 3-8~~, at the final recommendation of the TAC. Beginning in 2022, Illinois began calculating ~~will calculate~~ both a cohort-referenced and a baseline-referenced SGP that used ~~baselines off of~~ 2019 as the baseline year ~~results~~ for students in grades 4-8. Beginning in 2025, Illinois began calculating a cohort-referenced SGP for students in grades 9-11, and will begin calculating a baseline-referenced SGP for these grades in 2027 using 2025 as the baseline year. For both grade spans, the cohort-referenced SGP is the default SGP used to determine the growth indicator performance level. However, in years where the state mean baseline-referenced SGP for a given grade span is higher than the state

[8] For research on ISA, please access https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Illinois-Science-Assessment.aspx

[9] For research on ACT, please access https://www.act.org/content/act/en/research/reports/act-publications.html

[10] For research on DLM, please access http://dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/publication/Validity_Evidence_AA_Score_Uses_NCME2016_Karvonen_Romine_Clark.pdf.

[11] For research on the validity and reliability of DLM, please access http://dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/publication/Technical_Manual_IM_2014-15.pdf.

[12] A Technical Advisory Council (TAC) provides guidance on technical assessment and accountability issues. TAC members help ensure alignment of accountability system to core values, and assure the statistical validity and reliability, accuracy, and fairness of individual assessments or indicators and the accountability system as a whole. The TAC will be convened in collaboration with the National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment and composed of national and local researchers and other practitioners, particularly those practitioners who specialize in assessment and school accountability research and data analysis for Illinois school districts.

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
		mean cohort-SGP, the baseline-referenced SGP will be used for that grade span to determine the growth indicator performance level. Such decisions will be made independently by subject and grade span, but consistently for all schools serving grades in that band. ~~If, for a majority of students, the cohort-referenced SGP calculation is higher than the baseline-referenced SGP, only the cohort-referenced data set will be used to calculate the growth indicator. However, if, for a majority of students, the baseline-referenced SGP calculation is higher than the cohort-referenced SGP, only the baseline-referenced set of data will be used..~~ **Definition:** Student growth percentile (SGP) is a measure of student growth that compares a student's performance over time to that of their academic peers (e.g., students in Illinois who have the same scale score in the prior year). It includes the current year score and up to two prior years' scores allowing the growth percentile calculation to represent a true growth trend and not just movement up and down from year to year. Individual student growth percentiles range from 1 to 99. A score of 50 represents average or expected growth each year. These scores are averaged to create a school or student group mean student growth percentile (MSGP). The methodology to calculate a cohort-referenced SGP and a baseline-referenced SGP are the same. The differences come in when (i.e., the academic year) the academic peers that make up the comparison group students are from. ~~**Scoring:**~~ ~~A school or student group's student growth is scored according to the formula below.~~ **Indicator ~~Points~~ Formula:** The sum of all ELA SGPs and math SGPs, divided by the count of all ELA SPGs plus the count of all math SGPs. Otherwise expressed as: SGP_i^{ELA} where $i = 1, \ldots, {}^{n}ELA$ SGP_j^{MAT} where $j = 1, \ldots, {}^{n}MAT$ $$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{{}^{n}ELA} SGP_i^{ELA} + \sum_{j=1}^{{}^{n}MAT} SGP_j^{MAT}}{{}^{n}ELA + {}^{n}MAT}$$ ~~[(Subject_MSGP * (20/9)) – 62.2222222221]~~ ~~An MSGP ≥ 73 earns 100 points and an MSGP ≥ 28 points earns 0 points.~~ **Research:** Illinois utilized the following resources on the appropriateness of various growth models for the purposes of accountability: The Practitioner's Guide to

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
		Growth Models[13] and Pathways to New Accountability Through the Every Student Succeeds Act[14]. These resources are grounded in research[15] and evaluation[16] on past implementation of growth models as a part of accountability under NCLB. Additional research was done and presented to the TAC validity and reliability of an SGP calculated for grades 9-11 using the ACT suite of assessments[17]. **Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:** ISBE will continue to convene a TAC to annually evaluate the extent to which indicators are performing as intended ~~make amendments as additional data is available~~. Please see Section 4.1(F) for data on the five performance levels associated with this indicator. ~~a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools.~~
GRADUATION RATE~~[18]~~	4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, 5-year adjusted graduation rate, and 6-year adjusted graduation rate.	**Description:** ISBE collects data regarding the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 5- and 6-year adjusted graduation rates. The Graduation Rate indicator will be the combined measure of the four year cohort data which will make up 30% of the indicators weight, the 5 year cohort will account for 15% of the indicator and the 6 year cohort will account for the remaining 5% of the accountability indicator. **Definition:** The 4-, 5-, and 6-year Composite Graduation Rate is a combination of those years' Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate. Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate is the rate of graduates compared to the total number of students in their 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year cohort for schools and student demographic groups. Graduation Rate is calculated based ESSA High School Graduation Rate guidance. Students are reported at the home school of last enrollment. The cohort is based on the number of students who enter Grade 9 for the first time, adjusted by adding into the cohort any student who transfers in later during Grade 9 or during the next three years and subtracting any student from the cohort who transfers out, emigrates to another country, transfers to a prison or juvenile facility, or dies during that same period. ~~**Scoring:** A school or student group's composite 4-, 5-, and 6-year Graduation Rate is calculated by weighting the 4-year Graduation Rate by 60 percent, the 5-year~~

[13] This document can be accessed at: www.ccsso.org/documents/2013growthmodels.pdf
[14] https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Pathways_New-Accountability_Through_Every_Student_Succeeds_Act_04202016.pdf
[15] Beimers, Jennifer Nicole. The effects of model choice and subgroup on decisions in accountability systems based on student growth. ProQuest, 2008.
Council of Chief State School Officers. Understanding and Using Achievement Growth Data. Growth Model Brochure Series. (June 2011): http://www.wera-web.org/links/Journal/June_Journal_2012/CC6_CCSSO_Growth_Brochures_jan2012.pdf
Tekwe, Carmen D., Randy L. Carter, Chang-Xing Ma, James Algina, Maurice E. Lucas, Jeffrey Roth, Mario Ariet, Thomas Fisher, and Michael B. Resnick. 2004. "An Empirical Comparison of Statistical Models for Value-Added Assessment of School Performance." Journal Of Educational And Behavioral Statistics 29, no. 1: 11-36. ERIC, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2017).
[16] U.S. Department of Education. Evaluation of the 2005–06 Growth Model Pilot Program. (January 2009): https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/growthmodel/gmeval0109.doc.
[17] Betebenner, D., & VanIwaarden, A. (2025, June 17). *Illinois high school SGP calculation: Implications of the transition from SAT to ACT* [TAC presentation]. Center for Assessment.
~~[18] ESSA does not require that growth is measured in grades 9 – 12. However, Illinois stakeholders have made it clear that a way of measuring growth is important and P20 recommended that the administration of a second high school assessment is the most accurate way to achieve this. Moreover, the Governor's proposal places the greatest value on student growth. In order to measure this, the state must invest in a yearly high school assessment. Governor Rauner will commit to finding the funds to pay for this assessment.~~

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
		~~Graduation Rate by 30 percent, and the 6-year Graduation Rate by 10 percent and summing the three together. This composite weighted Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate is then scored using the indicator points formula(s) below.~~ **Indicator ~~Points~~ Formula:** [(Cohort_Year_4 x .60) + (Cohort_Year_5 * .30) + (Cohort_Year_6 * .1)] * 100 ~~[Composite weighted adjusted cohort graduation rate * 3.7975) – 253.16456~~ ~~A weighted composite graduation rate ≥ 93 is 100 points and a weighted composite graduation rate ≤ 66.667 is 0 points.~~ **Research:** This data is stable and collected consistently across all LEAs serving high school grades, as can be seen in the School Report Card: 15-Year Statewide Trend Data[19]. The definition and criteria for high school graduation are set in School Code[20], and the data collected statewide is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the state, as evidenced in the Illinois State Report Card. **Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:** Graduation rate is a required metric of student achievement. The maximum high school adjusted cohort graduation rate is 100%. The all students graduation rate in 2016 is 85.5% for 4-year, 87.7% for 5-year, and 88.2% for 6-year adjusted rates. ISBE will continue to convene a TAC to annually evaluate the extent to which indicators are performing as intended ~~make amendments as additional data is available~~. Please see Section 4.1(F) for data on the five performance levels associated with this indicator. ~~a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools.~~
PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY	~~WIDA ACCESS ACCESS 2.0~~ composite proficiency level of 4.8	**Description**: The Illinois Administrative Code[21] identifies the state's English Language Development Standards as those developed by the WIDA Consortium[22] and the state's English Language Proficiency Assessment as the ACCESS for ELLs® . **Definition:** English Learner Progress ~~to Proficiency~~ (ELP~~t~~P) is a measure of the extent to which a multilingual student is on track to reach proficiency within five years. ~~This is the only indicator that is scored at the student level and then aggregated to a group or school indicator score. All other indicators aggregate group performance first and score that aggregate performance for the indicator.~~ ELP~~t~~P incorporates both the starting point (grade and level of proficiency) of the student and their unique annual progress. All students have both a static timeline target and a revised annual target, and progress is measured ~~are scored~~ using the smaller of the two targets while within their five-year timeline. If a student has not yet reached proficiency at the conclusion of their timeline, the target becomes the difference from where they

[19] Information retrieved from: https://www.isbe.net/_layouts/Download.aspx?SourceUrl=/Documents/rc-trend-data-02-16.xlsx
[20] For required high school graduation criteria, please see the Illinois School Code 105 ILCS 5/27-22, 27-22.05, 27-22.10
[21] To see the English Language Development please see 23 Illinois Administrative Code 228 Subtitle A, 228.10, Definitions
[22] WIDA Consortium. "Amplification of the English language development standards, kindergarten-grade 12." Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, Madison, WI Google Scholar (2012).

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
		are (their most recent scale score) to where they need to be (proficiency scale score equivalent in the applicable grade). ~~**Scoring:** See formula. Scores cannot be lower than 0 and cannot be higher than 100.~~ **Indicator** ~~Points~~ **Formula:** Calculate the following for all EL students: • **Timeline Target** (Applicable if student is within their five-year timeline.) ○ (Proficiency Grade Scale Score – Initial Score) / 5 ○ Identify expected grade of proficiency (Baseline grade + 5) ○ Find composite scale score equal to 4.8 proficiency level at that grade ○ Does not change for five years • **Revised Target** (Applicable if student is within their five-year timeline, calculated annually beginning in the year after a student's baseline year. Note: The timeline target and the revised target will be the same in the year after a student's baseline year.) ○ (Proficiency Grade Scale Score – Prior Scale Score) / Years left to grow • **Past Timeline Target** (Applicable if student is past their five-year timeline.) ○ (Proficiency Grade Scale Score – Prior Scale Score) • Student **ELP**~~tP score~~**:** ○ [(Current_Scale_Score – Prior_Scale_Score) ÷ Applicable Gain Target]*100 ▪ Max ELP value is 100 ~~If ELPtP score ≥ 1 give 100 points~~ ▪ ~~If ELPtP score < 1 > 0 give ratio * 100 = points~~ ▪ Min ELP value is 0 ~~If ELPtP score >0 give 0 points.~~ ○ Always use the smaller of Revised or Timeline Target as Gain Target unless student has 0 years left to grow; then use the Past Timeline Target. • **School or Group ELP** ~~Indicator Score~~**:** ○ Sum of all associated ELP values ~~tP scores~~ ÷ Number of Students **Research**: The adherence of WIDA ACCESS ~~ACCESS for ELs~~ to the English Language Development Standards is documented by Cook (2007). [23] The technical properties of the ACCESS for ELs, including its validity, reliability, and operational performance, are published in annually updated reports by WIDA.[24]

[23] Cook, H. Gary. "Alignment Study Report: The WIDA Consortium's English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners in Kindergarten through Grade 12 to ACCESS for ELLs® Assessment." Madison, WI: WIDA Consortium (2007).

[24] Center for Applied Linguistics (2016). "Annual Technical Report for ACCESS for ELLs® English Language Proficiency Test, Series 303, 2014–2015 Administration." *WIDA Consortium Annual Technical Report No. 11* (2016).

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
		Pending data and research that WIDA will provide after their standard setting for the Alternate ACCESS in 2024, ISBE will set a new reclassification criteria for those EL students who qualify to take the Alternate ACCESS test. Similarly, pending data and research that WIDA will provide after their standard setting for the ACCESS test in 2026, ISBE will ~~may~~ set new reclassification criteria for all English Learners. **Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:** ISBE will continue to convene a TAC to annually evaluate the extent to which indicators are performing as intended ~~make amendments as additional data is available~~. Please see Section 4.1(F) for data on the five performance levels associated with this indicator. ~~a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools. 25~~
~~**SCIENCE**~~	~~Administered at the conclusion of grades 5, 8, and 11~~	~~**Description:** The measure of academic achievement for science is the Illinois Science Assessment (ISA) in grades 5 and 8, and the science portion of the ACT at grade 11, along with the DLM-AA – Science Assessment for students with profound cognitive disabilities. The assessment is administered in an online format and is aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards for Science incorporating the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)[26], which were adopted in 2014.~~ ~~**Definition:** The science proficiency indicator is the percentage of students who meet proficiency criteria on the state's science accountability assessments. ESSA requires states to assess their learning standards for science at least once in Grades K-5, 6-9, and 10-12. Each state may also have a general assessment for the majority of its students, and an alternate assessment for the 1 percent of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. A percentage is calculated by subject combining all tests.~~ ~~**Scoring:** A school or student group's proficiency percentage is divided by the applicable annual proficiency target. Baseline targets were set using the state proficiency rate for the applicable group, and targets grow annually until all groups have 90 percent proficiency (which is expected by 2033).~~ ~~**Indicator Points Formula (Standard):**~~ ~~[Group_Percent_Proficient ÷ Group_Annual_Proficiency_Target] * 100, scores capped at 100. = Indicator Points~~ ~~**Research:** Science literacy is a necessary component to success and a key driver of the "nation's capacity to innovate for economic growth and the ability of American~~

~~[25] Stakeholder will provide a recommendation to ISBE on or before June 30, 2017.~~

~~[26] NGSS Lead States. *Next generation science standards: For states, by states*. National Academies Press, 2013.~~

ACADEMIC INDICATORS	MEASURE(S)	DESCRIPTION
		~~workers to thrive in the global economy.[27]" Science is also a recognized indicator of college and career readiness.[28]~~ ~~Technical reports for the 2016 and 2017 administrations will be provided to document validity, reliability, and comparability of the ISA. The DLM Consortium is currently writing the 2016 technical manual for DLM Science.~~ ~~**Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:** ISBE will continue to convene a TAC to make amendments as additional data is available. Please see Section 4.1(F) for a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools.~~

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
~~**CONSISTENT ATTENDANCE**~~ ~~CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM~~ (K-12)	**Description:** Consistent attendance is the percentage of students who have been present for at least 90% of the school year. Illinois school code 105 ILCS 5/26-18) defines chronic absence as "absences that total 10% or more of school days of the most recent academic school year, including absences with and without valid cause, as defined in Section 26-2a of this Code, and out-of-school suspensions for an enrolled student. 'Sstudent' as means any enrolled student that is subject to compulsory attendance under Section 26-1 of this Code but does not mean a student for whom a documented homebound or hospital record is on file during the student's absence from school."[30] **Definition:** Consistent Attendance ~~Chronic Absentee R~~rate is the percentage of students that are identified as consistently present ~~chronically absent. Students are considered chronically absent as defined in Section 26-18 of the School Code.~~ Medically homebound and hospitalized students are excluded from this calculation.

~~[27] Commission on Mathematics and Science Education (US). Opportunity Equation: Transforming Mathematics and Science Education for Citizenship and the Global Economy. Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2009.~~

~~[28] Mattern, Krista, Jeremy Burrus, Wayne Camara, Ryan O'Connor, Mary Ann Hansen, James Gambrell, Alex Casillas, and Becky Bobek. "Broadening the Definition of College and Career Readiness: A Holistic Approach. ACT Research Report Series, 2014 (5)." ACT, Inc. (2014). Dounay, Jennifer. "Embedding College Readiness Indicators in High School Curriculum and Assessments. Policy Brief." Education Commission of the States (NJ1) (2006).~~

[29] IBAMC also recommended that the Quality Framework: Assessment Tool for Support and Continuous Improvement developed by the committee be considered. Due to the requirements for school quality/school success indicators in ESSA, ISBE is committed to utilizing the quality framework within School/District Improvement. Additionally, IBAMC also recommended that ISBE consider additional indicators to be reported upon but outside of the accountability system. There was also interest in considering an indicator focusing upon access to a broader curriculum (arts, world languages, science, social sciences, vocational education, physical education, and enrichment and advanced learning opportunities). This indicator was not included in the current due to the lack of a specific definition.

[30] "Chronic absenteeism report and support," P.A. 100-156, 100th Illinois General Assembly. (2018)

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
	A student is "Consistently present" "~~chronically absent~~" if they were present for 90 ~~missed 10~~ percent or more of the school year ~~regardless of excuse~~. The combined total number of "days absent – unexcused" and "days absent – excused" per student is subtracted from the student's length of enrollment and then divided by that student's length of enrollment. The length of enrollment is calculated by counting the number of "days present" + "ELearning" + "Remote Learning" + "Blended Remote Learning" + "days absent – unexcused" + "days absent – excused" + "medically homebound." Days hospitalized are excluded by how state law defines students. If the length of enrollment minus the sum of absences divided by the length of enrollment is greater than or equal to 0.9~~10~~ then the student is considered consistently present ~~chronically absent~~. Percent Consistent Attendance ~~Chronically Absent~~ is (~~Chronically Absent~~ Consistently Present Students ÷ Total Students) * 100 ~~Scoring: A school or student group's percent chronically absent is scored according to the formula below.~~ **Indicator ~~Points~~ Formula:** Percent Consistent Attendance is (Consistently Present Students ÷ Total Students) * 100 ~~[(100 – (Chronic Absenteeism Rate *2)]~~ ~~Note: Chronic Absenteeism Rate >= 50% = 0 points~~ **Research:** Illinois currently collects attendance.[31] This data is stable and collected consistently across all LEAs serving high school grades, as can be seen in the School Report Card: 15-Year Statewide Trend Data[32]. **Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:** ISBE will continue to convene a TAC to annually evaluate the extent to which indicators are performing as intended make amendments as additional data is available. Please see Section 4.1(F) for data on the five performance levels associated with this indicator. ~~a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools.~~
~~**9TH ON-TRACK (HS)**~~	~~**Description:** The on-track indicator identifies students as on-track if they earn at least five full-year course credits and no more than one semester F in a core course in their first year of high school.~~ ~~**Definition:** This metric is the percentage of first-time ninth-grade students who have earned at least five course credits without failing more than 0.5 course credits in~~

[31] U.S. Department of Education. "Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools. An Unprecedented Look at an Educational Crisis." (2016): https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/chronicabsenteeism.html.
[32] Center, Utah Education Policy. "Research brief: Chronic absenteeism." Research Brief, University of Utah, College of Education (2012).

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
	~~their core subjects. For the purpose of this metric, core subjects include reading, math, science, and social studies. For more details on the specifics of how 9th Grade on Track is calculated, please see the Public Report Card Business Rules.~~ ~~**Scoring:** A school or student group's 9th Grade On Track rate is scored according to the formula below.~~ ~~**Indicator Points Formula:**~~ ~~[(Percent On Track – 66.6) * 3], with negative values rounded to 0, and a maximum score of 100~~ ~~On-Track rates ≤ 66.6% are 0 points.~~ ~~**Research:** Research on the on-track indicator suggests that students are more than three and one-half times more likely to graduate from high school in four years than off-track students[33]. The indicator is valuable because it is a more accurate predictor of graduation than students' previous achievement test scores or their background characteristics. Research has been conducted on its validity and predictive quality.[34]~~ ~~Support for on-track as a metric came from many stakeholders outside of Chicago Public Schools (CPS); however, evidence that the indicator aids in meaningful differentiation of schools can be seen in its inclusion in the district's own School Quality Rating system[35].~~ ~~**Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:** ISBE will continue to convene a TAC to make amendments as additional data is available. Please see Section 4.1(F) for a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools.~~
~~COLLEGE CAREER READY INDICATOR (HS)[36]~~	~~**Description:** This indicator identifies those areas of college and career readiness which research has suggested are important to postsecondary success. Below is a brief description of the components of this meta-indicator. For a full description, please see https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Accountability-Indicators.aspx.~~ ~~**Research**: This work is drawn from a research base[37] that suggests a number of indicators of readiness that can support the assertion that a child is ready academically and capable of entering the workforce.~~

~~[33] Additional information on 9th grade on-track may be accessed at: http://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/p78.pdf~~
~~[34] Research on validity of the 9th grade on-track may be accessed at: https://www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/REL_2012134.pdf~~
~~[35] Data from CPS may be accessed at: http://cps.edu/Performance/Documents/SQRPHandbook.pdf~~
~~[36] ISBE is grateful for the assistance for numerous stakeholders and the Governor's Office in the development of the college and career indicator and ensuring the representatives from P-12, higher education, and the business sector were included in its development. ISBE will continue to partner with stakeholders and other state agencies in the ensuing months to further define the career ready indicators for the purposes of data collection. Recommendations will be provided to ISBE no later than December 31, 2017. ISBE will share the ongoing work for public comment.~~
~~[37] Research by Redefining Ready can be accessed at: https://www.redefiningready.org/research-college-ready/ and research by Advance CTE can be accessed at: https://www.careertech.org/resources/data-and-accountability.~~

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
	~~Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:~~ ~~ISBE will continue to convene a TAC to make amendments as additional data is available. Please see Section 4.1(F) for a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools. .~~ **~~Distinguished Scholar~~** ~~1. GPA: 3.75 or higher based on the 4.0 scale~~ ~~2. 95% Attendance junior and senior year (average of the two years must be 95% or better)~~ ~~3. ACT: 30 or SAT: 1400[38]~~ ~~4. At least one academic indicator in each ELA and Math during or before high school Junior/Senior year except where otherwise specified~~ ~~5. Three career ready indicators during or before high school Junior/Senior Year except where otherwise specified~~ **~~College and Career Ready~~** ~~1. GPA: 2.8 or higher based on the 4.0 scale~~ ~~2. 95% Attendance in high school junior and senior year (average of the two years must be 95% or better)~~ ~~3. EITHER~~ ~~A. College and Career Pathway Endorsement under Postsecondary Workforce Readiness Act~~ ~~OR~~ ~~B. All of the following:~~ ~~• One Academic Indicator in each of ELA and Math during or before high school Junior/Senior Year except where otherwise specified~~ ~~• Identify a Career Area of Interest by the end of the Sophomore Year~~ ~~• Three Career Ready Indicators during or before high school Junior/Senior Year except where otherwise specified~~ **~~Academic Indicators~~** ~~ELA~~ / ~~Math~~ ~~ELA Advanced Placement Exam (Score of 3 or higher)~~ / ~~Math AP Exam (Score of 3 or higher)~~ ~~ELA AP Course (Grade of A, B, or C)~~ / ~~Math AP Course (Grade of A, B, or C)~~ ~~Dual Credit English Course (Grade of A, B, or C)~~ / ~~Dual Credit Math Course (Grade of A, B, or C)~~

[38] This benchmark number will continue to be monitored based on ongoing conversations between ISBE and the College Board around level setting/cut scores.

<table>
<tr><th>SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]</th><th>DESCRIPTION</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>~~International Baccalaureate (IB) ELA course (Grade of A, B, or C)~~</td><td>~~IB Math course (Grade of A, B, or C)~~</td></tr>
<tr><td>~~IB Exam (Score of 4 or higher)~~</td><td>~~IB Exam (Score of 4 or higher)~~</td></tr>
<tr><td>~~Transitional English (Grade of A, B, or C)~~</td><td>~~Transitional English Grade of (A, B, or C)~~</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>~~Algebra II (Grade of A, B, or C)~~</td></tr>
<tr><td>~~Minimum ACT Subject Scores of English 18 and Reading 22~~</td><td>~~Minimum ACT Subject Score of Math 22 and Math in Senior Year~~</td></tr>
<tr><td>~~Minimum SAT Subject Score of Evidence-Based Reading and Writing: 480~~</td><td>~~Minimum SAT Subject Score of Math: 530 and Math in Senior Year~~</td></tr>
</table>
~~**Career Ready Indicators [Minimum of 3]**~~
• ~~Career Development Experience during high school career~~
• ~~Industry Credential at any point in time before graduation~~
• ~~Military Service or an ASVAB Score of 31 or Higher during high school career~~
• ~~Dual Credit Career Pathway Course (College Credit Earned)~~
• ~~Completion of a Program of Study before graduation~~
• ~~Attaining and maintaining consistent employment for a minimum of 12 months during high school~~
• ~~Consecutive summer employment during high school career~~
• ~~25 hours of community service during high school career~~
• ~~Two or more organized co-curricular activities during high school career~~
</td></tr>
<tr><td>CLIMATE SURVEY (5ESSENTIALS)</td><td>Description: Description: In order to capture student (4-12), parent, teacher, and administration voice, ISBE will utilize the 5 Essentials Survey or an approved alternate survey.[39]

Definition: Climate Survey is a survey taken by all Grade PK-12 teachers and all Grade 4-12 students as required by the ESSA State Plan. The State Board of Education shall administer a Climate Survey, identified by and paid for by the State Board of Education, to provide feedback from, at a minimum, students in Grades 4 through 12 and teachers on the instructional environment within a school, according to 105 ILCS 5/2-3.153. In addition, the state superintendent must administer an approval process in consultation with teachers, principals, superintendents, and other appropriate stakeholders, to approve at least two (and not more than three) alternate survey of learning condition instruments that districts may elect to use in lieu of the state-adopted climate survey. Climate Survey Student Response Rate is</td></tr>
</table>

[39] Further, IBAMC unanimously supported the development of a suite of surveys that meet both statutory and regulatory requirements to collect required data. Also, The Early Learning Council recommends, and ISBE agrees, that the use of climate survey in the early grades warrants further consideration of how information gleaned from a climate survey is most appropriately used within the boundaries of ESSA.

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
	the total number of individual students responding to the Climate Survey, divided by the total number of eligible students. Students are eligible to participate if they are enrolled in a school and are cognitively able to participate in the survey. ~~**Scoring:** A school or student group's Climate Survey Student Response Rate is scored according to the formula below.~~ **Indicator** ~~Points~~ **Formula:** (Number Participated ÷ Total Students Rostered[40]) x 100 ~~[(Survey Participation Rate* (20/9)) – 111.11]~~ ~~Participation rates ≥ 95% are 100 point and participation rates ≤ 50% are 0 points.~~ **Research:** There is evidence that school culture and climate has an impact on student achievement.[41] Illinois currently requires districts to use the 5Essentials Survey or an alternate survey selected from a list approved by the State Superintendent. ISBE will ensure that our school climate surveys meet the standards set forth in ESEA statutory requirements and are valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools on an annual basis, and can be disaggregated by student demographic groups. **Aids in Meaningful Differentiation of Schools:** Support for climate and culture as a metric came from many stakeholders and was not exclusive to the 5Essentials Survey, as the requirement for state approved alternate surveys is protected in 105 ILCS 5/2-3.153(b)-(c). See also 23 Ill. Admin. Code 1.97(g). The culture and climate indicator has proven useful in supporting meaningful differentiation of schools. ~~For the 2024-25 school year, ISBE will use the 5Essentials climate survey (5E).~~ 5E was first administered ~~administrated~~ in the 2013-2014 school year. Additionally, in all years a small number of districts use approved alternate surveys. For this reason, the focus of the metric is on the student participation rate. Student participation rate is collected and calculated consistently statewide annually in all grades 4-12. This indicator meets all requirements for ESSA indicators and will be disaggregated for all required student groups. Evidence presented at our most recent TAC meeting[42] shows that the climate survey indicator accounts for a degree of differentiation[43] ~~equal to or greater than its policy weight44 of 5 percent in the elementary/middle school band and 6.67 percent at~~

[40] Students are rostered at their public serving school. Students who are cognitively or linguistically unable to access the survey and have a corresponding valid IEP or EL record may be coded thusly and excluded from the calculation.
[41] Bryk, Anthony S., Penny Bender Sebring, Elaine Allensworth, John Q. Easton, and Stuart Luppescu. Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 2010.
[42] Technical Advisory Committee Meeting. January 22, 2025. Agenda Item 3. Accountability Review. https://www.isbe.net/Pages/AccountabilityTechnicalAdvisoryCommittee.aspx
[43] Semi-partial correlations measure the unique contribution of independent variable to a dependent variable, after accounting for the effectives of other independent variables.
~~[44] Each indicator is assigned a policy weight as noted on page 44, that is the weight of the indicator when all other indicators in the grade band are present.~~

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
	~~the high school band, meaning it aids in meaningful differentiation to the degree it was intended to. The~~ with a semi-partial correlation range at the elementary level ~~is~~ from 0.05 to 0.08 (i.e., 5 to eight percent) ~~at the elementary level,~~ and at the high school from ~~is~~ 0.07 to 0.09. While the range of student participation rates is wider at the high school level than the elementary and middle school level, in both grade bands there is a distinct positive relationship between designation and climate survey participation rates, meaning that schools with lower designations are likely to have lower climate survey participation rates. Discussions with schools during scheduled accountability data reviews suggest that climate survey participation is functioning as a proxy measure for the degree to which effective organization and management systems and structures are in place. For example, in schools and districts that are well organized, reaching high levels of participation is achievable through clear administration processes with defined roles and responsibilities that include tracking participation and offering make-up opportunities. In schools and districts with less effective systems and structures, participation rates are lower. Please see Section 4.1(F) for data on the five performance levels associated with this indicator. ~~a simulation of all indicators used in the meaningful differentiation of schools.~~
~~[FINE ARTS INDICATOR]~~	~~ISBE recognizes the importance of the arts. Initially this importance is demonstrated by adding a fine arts indicator in the accountability system and weighting it at 0%.~~ ~~**Student Participation – 3%**~~ ~~Student participation is the sum from the total number of students enrolled in one or more arts courses at a school divided by the total number of students at the school.~~ ~~**Teacher Qualifications – 2%**~~ ~~Teacher qualifications is the sum from the total number of students enrolled in one or more arts courses taught by arts-endorsed teacher divided by school's total number of students enrolled in one or more arts courses.~~ ~~**Student Voice – 0%**~~ ~~Student voice is currently weighted at 0 percent to reflect the need to address the challenges of a student survey.~~ ~~A minimum of three years of valid, reliable data for the fine arts will serve as the foundation for exploring how a more nuanced indicator can be developed for inclusion in future iterations of the accountability system. While this indicator and its components has been added to the state's public report card, implementation of this indicator has been delayed to permit its incorporation into the full accountability system redesign.~~
~~[P-2]~~	~~As identified by stakeholders, ESSA, because of its accountability requirements, appears to focus on students in grades 3 through 12. ISBE agrees with stakeholders that early learning is critical to long-term success and including an indicator as part of the accountability system will ensure recognition of its importance.~~

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
	~~**Chronic Absenteeism** – 1.5% or 3% if insufficient Dual Language Programs~~ ~~Research shows that reducing chronic absenteeism in the early grades is correlated with improving numerous longer-term outcomes valued in the ESSA State Plan. Strategies for reducing chronic absenteeism include activities that are consistent with key values identified by the P-2 Indicator Working Group (such as wrap-around services and family engagement). Overweighting K-2 chronic absenteeism places an additional focus on the K-2 years, which is particularly important given the absence of other indicators for those years. The working group acknowledged that there are challenges with chronic absenteeism as a metric. ISBE will continue to study the impact of its inclusion in the accountability formula and make any necessary adjustments in the future.~~ ~~**Dual Language Programs** (DLPs) – 1.5%~~ ~~The K-2 years are an extremely important developmental period for multilingual students, and data shows that these students are disproportionately represented in early childhood and the younger grades. Districts and schools are already required to provide specialized services to multilingual students meeting certain established criteria and to track data about that service provision. Including the indicator in the accountability formula will create added incentive for districts and schools to meet their obligations.[45]~~ ~~**Participation in Enrichment and Acceleration** – 0%~~ ~~Stakeholders recommend that participation in enrichment and acceleration be added to the plan as a 3-8 indicator worth 0% of the school's overall score. ISBE should formally revisit this indicator after the 2019–20 school year and after implementation of new state laws requiring the collection of data related to access to enrichment and accelerated placements to determine whether this indicator should be given greater weight.~~ ~~**3rd Grade Literacy[46],[47] – 2%**~~ ~~The percentage of students receiving an A, B or C (or commensurate standards) in grade 3 English Language Arts.~~ ~~A minimum of three years of valid, reliable data for the fine arts will serve as the foundation for exploring how a more nuanced indicator can be developed for inclusion in future iterations of the accountability system. While this indicator and its components has been added to the state's public report card, implementation of this indicator has been delayed to permit its incorporation into the full accountability~~

~~[45] Collier, V. and W.P. Thomas (2004), "The Astounding Effectiveness of Dual Language Education for All," NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2:1. Accessed on February 18, 2018: http://hillcrest.wacoisd.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_345/File/Publications/ELL/Dual%20language%20survey.pdf Steele, J., Slater, R., Zamarro, G., et al (2015). Effects of dual language immersion on students' academic performance. Accessed on February 24, 2018, at http://www.solc-jolc.org/16111.pdf .~~

~~[46] Hernandez, D. (2011). Double Jeopardy: How third-grade reading skills and poverty influence high school graduation. The Annie E. Casey Foundation.~~

~~[47] Center for Public Education. (2015). Why third grade is a pivotal year for mastering literacy.~~

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
	~~system redesign.~~
~~[Elementary/Middle Grade]~~	~~Stakeholders expressed interest in the development of a school quality/student success indicator for the elementary and middle grades. The desire was for this indicator to be modeled after the idea of a college and career readiness indicator for high school.~~ ~~**Research**: Some research suggests that performance at particular points in middle school is suggestive of a student succeeding in high school.[48],[49],[50],[51] The Middle School Success indicator assumes grades 6-8 and the importance of connectivity between middle school and high school. Ensuring this connection is paramount for those students near or outside of the boundaries of the sphere of success. Using grades in core courses is helpful in ensuring each and every child receives the supports she or he requires in order to be successful.[52] The Middle School Success indicator includes grades or commensurate standards in the core content areas in grades 6 through 8 (e.g., ELA, math, science, and social studies). Specifically, it considers the percentage of students in grades 6, 7, and 8 who have received at least one A or B or commensurate standards-based grading[53] and no grade of D and F or commensurate standards[54] in core content courses. Additionally, this indicator will include discipline data on students in grades 6, 7, and 8 who have experienced a suspension or expulsion. The score that the school receives on the Middle School Success indicator will be determined by equally weighting each part of the indicator (e.g., course grades or commensurate standards and discipline data).~~ ~~Research suggests that chronic absenteeism, participation in enrichment and acceleration[55],[56] academic performance, and student discipline are important in~~

~~[48] Balfanz, R. (2009). Putting Middle Grades Students on the Graduation Path. National Middle School Association. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.~~

~~[49] Allensworth, E., Gwynne, J., Moore, P., and de la Torre, m. (20014). Middle Grade Indicators of Readiness in Chicago Public Schools. University of Chicago Consortium of Chicago School Research. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.~~

~~[50] Kieffer, M.J., and Marinell, W.H. (2012). Navigating the Middle Grades: Evidence from New York City. New York, NY: Research Alliance for New York City Schools.~~

~~[51] Kurlaender, M., Reardon, S.F., and Jackson, J. (2008). Middle School Predictors of High School Achievement in Three California School Districts. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, California Dropout Research Project.~~

~~[52] Balfanz, R. (2009). Putting Middle Grades Students on the Graduation Path. National Middle School Association. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.~~

~~[53] For instance, the commensurate standards for a student receiving an "A" or "B" include "Exceptional" and "Meets Standard."~~

~~[54] For example, the commensurate standard for a "D" or "F" is "Below Standard."~~

~~[55] Kim, M., (2016). A meta-analysis of the effects of enrichment programs on gifted students. Gifted Child Quarterly 60(2).~~

~~[56] Cho, S., Lee, M. S. (2006). Effects of the enrichment program for the economically disadvantaged gifted on their aspirations and satisfaction with the program. KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 3(2), 81-97.~~

SCHOOL QUALITY/STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS[29]	DESCRIPTION
	~~supporting a young person as she or he transitions from middle school to high school. These indicators are, in effect, inputs as a student transitions into high school. The inclusion of the Middle School Success metric provides an indication of how these inputs provide information for the types of support a child may need while transitioning from middle school to high school.~~ ~~**5th Grade Math – 2%**~~ ~~The percentage of students receiving an A, B or C (or commensurate standards) in grade 5 mathematics.~~ ~~**Middle School Success – 3%**~~ ~~The score a school receives on this portion of the meta-indicator will be equal parts determined by two components, academic success and student discipline. Academic success is defined as the percentage of students in grades 6, 7, and 8 who have received at least one A or B or commensurate standards and no grade of D and F or commensurate standards in core content courses. Student discipline is defined as the percentage of students in grades 6, 7, and 8 who have experienced a suspension or expulsion.~~ ~~**Participation in Enrichment and Acceleration** – 0%~~ ~~Stakeholders recommend that participation in enrichment and acceleration be added to the plan as a 3-8 indicator worth 0% of the school's overall score. ISBE should formally revisit this indicator after the 2019–20 school year and after implementation of new state laws requiring the collection of data related to access to enrichment and accelerated placements to determine whether this indicator should be given greater weight.~~ ~~A minimum of three years of valid, reliable data for the fine arts will serve as the foundation for exploring how a more nuanced indicator can be developed for inclusion in future iterations of the accountability system. While this indicator and its components has been added to the state's public report card, implementation of this indicator has been delayed to permit its incorporation into the full accountability system redesign.~~

ISBE's accountability system will assign the Academic Achievement and School Quality School Quality Success Indicator weights as noted in Section 4.1A.

In considering which state-selected indicators to retain in the profiles of performance accountability model, ISBE elected to retain those that fully met the five criteria for SQSS indicators in ESSA, namely, that the indicator be:

- valid and reliable,
- consistent within a grade span (i.e., 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12),
- comparable and collected statewide,
- measured annually for all students, disaggregated by student group, and
- allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

Ultimately, these criteria impacted the college and career readiness indicator, which was determined not to be validly measuring the construct it was intended to measure[57]. The elementary-middle indicator was found to be neither consistent within a grade span nor comparable statewide, due to the diverse range of school and district configurations in Illinois. The P-2 indicator and 9th Grade on Track indicators were both removed because they were redundant. The only contributing element of the P-2 indicator was chronic absenteeism, which was and is still measured through consistent attendance in the new system. When debating the inclusion of the 9th Grade on Track metric, advocates point to the deep research base supporting the extent to which rates of 9th Grade on Track are predictive of persistence to graduation. It is an excellent leading indicator. However, precisely because of that strong correlation and predictive validity, it replicates performance on the graduation rate indicator, which makes it redundant to the required indicator. The fine arts indicator met all other indicator requirements but had such a narrow and skewed band of performance that it did not allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance. Additional information can be found in Appendix D.

~~Accountability as a transition toward the identification of schools for support and a single summative designation~~

~~The accountability system provides information for schools and communities on academic achievement for all students, student growth, EL growth (to proficiency), and multiple school quality/student success indicators. In ESSA, two other purposes of the system are to identify schools that may require support as well as provide a single summative designation for each school. Each will be described in turn, although they are interdependent.~~

All Schools Engaged in Continuous School Improvement, Regardless of Designation

Illinois' previous accountability system was effective at identifying those schools most urgently in need of support, however, in doing so, it was incorrectly signaling that school improvement was not necessary for all other districts and schools. The proposed system is designed to support school improvement in every school. The most effective schools continuously engage in iterative cycles of inquiry wherein data is used to identify areas of need and plan interventions that are implemented and monitored regularly so that district and school leaders can intentionally examine and reflect on the impact of their efforts.

Central to the redesign are clear, objective criteria that define each performance level, a simplified structure that makes the system easier to understand, and enhanced customized reporting to support the inquiry process. The profile of performance model shows strengths and areas for growth side by side, providing a richer picture of how schools serve their students. It sets clear expectations that all schools can use to set goals, track progress and inform strategic alignment of resources and effort.

~~Identification of Schools for Support~~

~~ISBE has been clear from the outset of the development of the ESSA State Plan for Illinois~~ The redesign of the accountability system does not change ISBE's position that all students must achieve at the highest levels possible. ~~If this is true, it is incumbent upon ISBE and LEAs to provide support to buttress the academic achievement of those groups of students that are struggling. The determinations resulting from the accountability system should~~ A school's profile of performance will both highlight areas in which one or more student groups subgroups may be excelling, as well as identify equity gaps between those groups that are excelling and those

[57] The college and career readiness indicator was intended to measure the many ways student demonstrated college and career readiness other than academic proficiency. As such, if the measure were valid, it would have rates of readiness higher than state rates of academic proficiency. However, as defined, the indicator consistently displayed rates less than half that of state proficiency rates.

that are not. ~~Again, if the latter is the case, schools must receive assistance to provide the supports and resources necessary to help each and every child be academically successful. Put differently, the accountability system in ESSA serves as the means through which schools are both identified for support and the creation of a summative designation in order to meaningfully differentiate schools.~~

ISBE is committed to continuing to identify those schools most urgently in need of support for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), and to identify those schools with students groups whose profile of performance are Comprehensive for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and providing these schools with a framework, resources and guidance to improve student outcomes. ~~There are two categories of schools in ESSA – comprehensive schools and targeted schools.~~ Schools with a Comprehensive profile of performance, which will identify, at minimum, ~~that are in~~ the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools statewide ~~or~~ and any ~~a~~ high school that has a graduation rate below 66.67 percent and will be placed in CSI status ~~are identified in the former category~~[58]. Schools in which one or more subgroup is performing at or below the level of the "all students" group in the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools are identified for TSI status ~~as targeted schools~~.[59] ~~Both of these schools~~ Schools in both these categories are required to receive support in order to improve student performance. Schools identified for intensive or comprehensive supports ~~must~~ use ~~School/District Improvement~~ a learning partner and have a ~~work~~ school improvement plan with targets and timelines approved by ISBE. Schools identified for targeted support must develop a plan that is approved by ~~its~~ their district and *may* use a learning partner. All schools, regardless of school improvement status, can access supports through the School/District Improvement department. ~~This support is delivered through School/District Improvement.~~

C. Meaningful Differentiation of Schools

~~The comprehensive school and targeted school designations matter for the purpose of identifying schools for the appropriate services.~~ ISBE will use a system with five tiers consistent with its five performance levels to meaningfully differentiate schools. ~~Put differently:~~

These five levels are:

- Exemplary
- Approaching Exemplary
- Commendable
- Developing
- Comprehensive

A school's profile of performance is composed of three elements:

1. Core performance
2. Elevating performance
3. Student group performance profiles

[58] A school that has completed a full Comprehensive Support school improvement cycle, but whose performance remains in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I eligible schools in Illinois or is a high school that has a graduation rate of less than 67 percent or less at the end of the four-year improvement cycle will retain the Comprehensive profile and designation, but will be placed in Intensive School Improvement (ISI) status ~~, is then designated as Intensive Support~~ and is subject to the more rigorous state-determined action identified in Section 4.3.C.

[59] Those schools that receive targeted services but that are unable to increase academic achievement/growth within a four-year period of time would then be identified as a chronically underperforming subgroup and required to receive comprehensive services.

Core Performance

Each core indicator will have a performance level. Broadly, the indicator with the strongest performance level defines core performance. There are three exceptions to this principle.

The first pertains to high schools, which have the graduation rate core indicator in addition to proficiency and growth. Exemplary core performance for a high school can be achieved either by having proficiency or growth in the Exemplary performance level, or by pairing Exemplary performance on the graduation rate indicator with Exemplary or Approaching Exemplary performance on either proficiency, growth or both. If graduation rates are Exemplary but neither proficiency nor growth are Exemplary or Approaching Exemplary, core performance is defined by the strongest performing non-graduation rate indicator.

The second exception is when one or more of the core indicators is in the Comprehensive performance range. In these cases, core performance is one level below the strongest core indicator.

Last, if the "all students" group's performance falls in the applicable ranges noted as Automatic Comprehensive, the school's profile of performance is Comprehensive. The Automatic Comprehensive ranges of the proficiency and growth indicators apply to elementary and middle schools, while the Automatic Comprehensive performance range of the graduation rate indicator applies to high schools.

If at any time less than five percent of Title I eligible schools are identified using the performance criteria associated with the Comprehensive performance level, the following adjustments to the Comprehensive performance level thresholds will occur, in order of priority:

- For high schools
    - The proficiency indicator Automatic Comprehensive range will be applied to high schools.
    - The growth indicator Automatic Comprehensive range will be applied to high schools.
    - The Comprehensive performance threshold of the graduation rate indicator will be raised such that a minimum of 5% of high schools are identified as Comprehensive.
    - If the graduation rate indicator needs to be raised to 75% or higher in order to identify at least 5% of high schools, the Comprehensive performance threshold of the proficiency indicator will be raised such that a minimum of 5% of schools are identified as Comprehensive. Note, such automatic raises will apply only to the grade band that fails to identify at least 5% of schools using the published criteria.
- For elementary and middle schools
    - The Comprehensive performance threshold of the proficiency indicator will be raised such that a minimum of 5% of schools are identified as Comprehensive. Note, such automatic raises will apply only to the grade band that fails to identify at least five percent of schools using the published criteria.

The Automatic Comprehensive performance ranges apply only to the "all students" group.

Every three years, as required in ESSA, ISBE will evaluate if adjustments are needed to the thresholds of the Comprehensive or Automatic Comprehensive performance levels to maintain the requirement to identify for each grade band (K-8 and 9-12) a minimum of five percent of Title I eligible schools with Comprehensive profiles of performance.

Elevating Performance

Next the performance on elevating indicators is factored into the designation.

A school whose "all students" core performance is Exemplary moves directly on to consideration of student group profiles of performance.

A school whose "all students" core performance is Approaching Exemplary or Commendable can be elevated one level if it has two elevating indicators (of two or three) in the Exemplary performance range for those indicators. Schools with only one elevating indicator may elevate if their one elevating indicator is in the Exemplary performance range for that indicator.

A school whose "all students" core performance is Developing or Comprehensive can be elevated one performance level with either two elevating indicators in the Exemplary performance range, or one indicator in the Exemplary range and another in the Approaching Exemplary performance range. Schools with only one elevating indicator and core performance in the Developing or Comprehensive ranges can elevate one level if that indicator is either in the Exemplary or Approaching Exemplary performance range.

A school whose "all students" group has one or more indicators in an applicable Automatic Comprehensive range has a Comprehensive profile of performance, regardless of performance on the elevating indicators.

Student Group Performance Profiles

A school cannot be considered to have an Exemplary or Approaching Exemplary profile of performance if one or more student demographic groups has a Comprehensive profile of performance. A school whose performance would otherwise be Exemplary or Approaching Exemplary would instead have a Commendable profile of performance.

Each student demographic group that meets the criteria specified in sections 4.1.D. and 4.1.E. will receive its own profile of performance, using the same five performance levels and defined indicator performance ranges applicable to the "all students" group. The Automatic Comprehensive performance criteria will not apply to student demographic groups.

Student demographic groups with Exemplary core performance have an Exemplary profile of performance.

Student demographic groups whose core performance is Approaching Exemplary, Commendable, Developing or Comprehensive may be elevated by the performance of the elevating indicators as described for the "all students" group.

Student demographic groups do not factor the performance profiles of other student groups in their profile, so their performance profile is complete after considering core performance and elevating performance.

Supporting Continuous Improvement for All Schools

The three elements that define the profile of performance - core performance, elevating performance, and student group performance profiles – result in the five performance profiles. However, within each profile there are some common patterns of performance that will form the foundation of the custom school profile report each district and school will receive to support their continuous improvement. This includes noting whether the profile was fulfilled through core performance alone or if it was elevated, as well as whether or not there is a student demographic group with a Comprehensive performance profile. This will allow schools and districts an even more granular analysis of their data, as the supports and goals for an Exemplary school with strong core performance are different than an Exemplary school that also had one Comprehensive core indicator that was then elevated back to Exemplary through strong elevating indicator performance.

~~**Exemplary School:** A school that has no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate of greater than 67 percent, and whose performance is in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.~~

~~**Commendable School:** A school that has no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate above 67 percent, and whose performance is not in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.~~

~~**Comprehensive Support School:** A school that is in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I eligible schools in Illinois, those high schools that have a graduation rate of less than 67 percent or less, and those schools that have completed a full Targeted Support school improvement cycle, where the performance of one or more of the originally Targeted student groups remains at or below the level of the "all students" group in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I eligible schools at the end of the four-year improvement cycle. Schools in Comprehensive Support shall receive comprehensive services.~~

~~**Intensive Support School:** A school that has completed a full Comprehensive Support school improvement cycle, but whose performance remains in the lowest-performing 5 percent Title I eligible schools in Illinois or is a high school that has a graduation rate of less than 67 percent or less at the end of the four-year improvement cycle. Schools in Intensive Support shall be subject to the more rigorous state-determined action identified in Section 4.3.C.~~

~~ESSA also requires that ISBE provide this information in an easily accessible and understandable way to parents, caregivers, and community members through the Illinois State Report Card. Thus, in addition to identifying schools for services and meaningfully differentiating schools from one another through a summative designation, ISBE must also provide additional representations of the data for the purposes of identifying subgroup performance within a school and, if applicable, showing equity gaps. These visualizations will be displayed on the state Report Card when they are available.~~

School-based expenditure reporting:

Parents and other stakeholders have access to school-based expenditure information as required by Section 1111(h)(C)(1) of ESSA. Prior to implementation, ISBE in consultation with LEAs:

- Finalized the collection tool for reporting local, state and federal fiscal data
- Amended the Rules (6-month process)
- Trained district staff
- Had districts set up their accounts on a school level basis
- Collected the FY 2018 financial data on a school level basis by February 2019 (as per statute)

ISBE believes the reporting of financial data is a critical component of the accountability system and in providing equity information to parents and communities.

D. Subgroups

i. **List the subgroups of students from each major and racial ethnic group in the state, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2), and, as applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students used in the accountability system.**

- Economically disadvantaged students
- Children with disabilities
- English Learners
- Former English Learners
- Students from each major racial and ethnic group:
    - Hispanic or Latino
    - American Indian or Alaska Native
    - Asian
    - Black or African American
    - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

- White
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Two or More Races

ii. **If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedure for including former children with disabilities in the children with disabilities subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data based on state assessment results under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of the ESEA and as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(b), including the number of years the state includes the results of former children with disabilities.**

Not applicable. Students formerly with disabilities will not be included in the subgroup of children with disabilities for the purposes of accountability. The definitions for students with disabilities is as follows:

- **Students with disabilities** includes students who were identified as having a disability through formal evaluations and met specific criteria as stated under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to be eligible for special education and related services by a team of individuals who developed an Individualized Education Program (IEP). Students with a 504 Plan are also identified as students with a disability who have met specific criteria as stated under the Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and are eligible to receive accommodations and related services in a general education setting. Both of these groups -- students with disabilities and students with a 504 Plan -- can include English Learners with a disability or English Learners with a 504 Plan. These students would be eligible for services that are inclusive of language assistance and disability-related services.

iii. **If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedure for including former English Learners in the English Learner subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data based on state assessment results under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of the ESEA and as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(1), including the number of years the state includes the results of former English Learners.**

Former English Learners will not be included in the subgroup of English Learners for the purposes of accountability, as they are now being treated as their own subgroup. The definitions for English Learners and former English Learners are as follows:

- **English Learners** are students whose home language survey indicates that a language other than English is spoken at home or by the student, and have not reached minimum English proficiency as established by the state superintendent.
- **Former English Learners** are students who met the English proficiency exit criteria established by the state superintendent and are considered to be a part of this student demographic group through high school graduation.

iv. **If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English Learners in the state:**

☐ Exception under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3)(i) or
☐ Exception under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3)(ii) or
☒ Exception under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(4)(i)(B). If selected, provide a description of the uniform procedure in the box below.

Illinois implements the following exception, as permitted under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESSA: ‘‘(ii)(I) assess, and report the performance of, such an English learner on the reading or language arts and mathematics assessments required under paragraph (2)(B)(v)(I) in each year of the student’s enrollment in such a school; and (II) for the

purposes of the State-determined accountability system— (aa) for the first year of the student's enrollment in such a school, exclude the results on the assessments described in subclause (I); (bb) include a measure of student growth on the assessments described in subclause (I) in the second year of the student's enrollment in such a school; and (cc) include proficiency on the assessments described in subclause (I) in the third year of the student's enrollment in such a school, and each succeeding year of such enrollment."

Colloquially, students are assessed in all years, even the year in which they are a newly arrived students, however, their results from that year are not used for accountability purposes. In the second year with a valid enrollment in an Illinois public school, their growth scores are used for accountability purposes, and in their third year with a valid enrollment in an Illinois public school, their proficiency scores are included.

E. Minimum Number of Students

i. **Provide the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability that the state determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a).**

All student demographic groups have a minimum size, referred to as n-size, of 20. It is worth noting that this represents 20 students worth of data per indicator~~, where a school must meet this threshold for a majority of the scored indicators in the system~~. This distinction is important, as some indicators are limited to a subset of grades, such as, but not limited to, growth, ~~9th graders on track,~~ graduation rate, climate survey, etc.

In the original development of the plan, the IBAMC reached majority consensus to recommend an n-size for subgroups of 30. The rationale for the committee's recommendation stemmed from the fact that the current subgroup n-size used by ISBE for accountability purposes is 30. Members came to consensus that lowering the existing n-size may result in too much weight on small subsets of students, as well as cause unintended statistical consequences. The Illinois Education Association (IEA) recommended n-size of 25, believing it was an appropriate compromise between educational stakeholders that supported 30 and those, such as the Illinois Latino Policy Forum, which supported 20. ISBE ultimately selected the n-size of 20 to ensure as many schools and student groups were included in the accountability system as possible. Currently, 22 states have n-sizes lower than 20. Eighteen, including Illinois, have an n-size of 20, and 10 have an n-size of 30.

ii. **Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.**

There are thirteen states who had an n-size of ten or less prior to the passage of ESSA. These include California's CORE Districts plus nine other states have n-sizes greater than ten but less than 20[60]. The National Center for Educational Statistics released a report 2011 detailing that states can set n-sizes of ten or five and still provide reliable data and protect student information[61].

Using data suppression techniques, top and bottom coding of values in a distribution, and reducing details reported out are all statistically reliable and valid ways to ensure a reduced n-size[62]. An example of these methods producing reliable data that protects student information can be seen in the CORE Districts in California.

[60] Cardichon and Bradley, *Ensuring Equity in ESSA: The Role of N-Size in Subgroup Accountability*, Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education, (2016).
[61] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting*, NCES 2011-603, Accessed January 5, 2017 at https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf.
[62] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting, NCES 2011-603, Accessed January 5, 2017 at https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf.

They lowered their n-size from 50 to 20 which resulted in an additional 150,000 students being identified in their accountability system for intervention and support[63].

iii. **Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.**

ISBE released multiple drafts of its state plan and invited public comment after each draft, particularly on the topic of n-size[64]. In previous drafts of the plan, ISBE had proposed that all subgroups should have a minimum size, referred to as n-size, of 20. EL subgroups, both the traditional subgroups and a newly created "former EL subgroup," would also have an n-size of 20, which is consistent with past practice. IBAMC reached majority consensus to recommend an n-size for subgroups of 30. The Illinois Education Association (IEA) recommended n-size of 25, believing it was an appropriate compromise between educational stakeholders that supported 30 and those stakeholders that suggested a lower n-size. The Governor's office as well as other commenters proposed an n-size of 10. Commenters suggested it is too easy for schools in their efforts to balance the needs of the majority of the student population to lose sight of the unique needs of smaller populations of students. After much debate, ISBE determined that an n-size of 20 is appropriate insofar as it is large enough to maintain statistical validity and reliability, while respecting the desire of stakeholders to see as many schools and students represented in the accountability system as possible.

iv. **If the state's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability, provide that number consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(2)(iv).**

The minimum number of students for reporting purposes will continue to be 10.

v. **Describe how the state's minimum number of students meets the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1)-(2);**

Illinois is following the process recommended in Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information[65], a congressionally mandated report compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics. Illinois convened multiple teams[66] "with sufficient statistical and data expertise to lead the effort to establish a minimum n-size." Next, as sufficient baseline data is available for all indicators, Illinois with the assistance of TAC will begin to verify that the resulting estimates will be statistically valid and reliable.

vi. **Describe how other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the state's uniform procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), interact with the minimum number of**

---

[63] Cardichon and Bradley, *Ensuring Equity in ESSA: The Role of N-Size in Subgroup Accountability*, Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education, (2016).
[64] See section on stakeholder engagement for full description of all stakeholder engagement activities.
[65] Seastrom, Marilyn. Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information. (IES 2017-147). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Washington, DC., 2017. Retrieved March 3, 2017 from http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch.
[66] The Illinois Balanced Assessment Measures Committee, the P-20 Council Data, Assessment and Accountability Sub-committee, and the ISBE Accountability Working Group Technical Sub-committee.

students to affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and to ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each subgroup of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2);

~~Once three years of valid, reliable data is available for a majority of indicators, Illinois will consider implementing a uniform procedure for averaging data. However, in 2018 and 2019, only one or two years of data were available per indicator for the majority of indicators in the system, therefore no averaging was possible.~~ The state's ~~s~~ began using its uniform procedure for averaging data in 2024 when three years of full data for each indicator were available. ~~, when implemented, would be to~~ The procedure combines individual student-level data for each indicator across three school years to create a composite indicator value ~~score that can then be divided by the actual number of students represented in the indicator pool~~ to determine the profile of performance ~~an average score~~ for the school and the relevant student demographic groups. The state consulted its TAC before implementing a shift from a single year of data to a three-year composite average ~~before implementing such a change~~.

~~A secondary analysis would be run such that the reported score, for the purposes of accountability and identification, is the composite average of three years of data or the individual year composite score, whichever is higher, provided that selecting the higher score for student demographic groups does not result in a non-reportable score. This is done to ensure that schools that have been identified as needing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement and that are making improvements are not negatively affected by past performance.~~ This procedure, which is applied to those schools who would otherwise have a non-reportable profile of performance, functionally triples the sample size available for making calculations for the purposes of accountability, which increases statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data[67] while further protecting the identity of individual student data[68].

vii. **Describe the strategies the state uses to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data is required, including reporting under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and the statewide accountability system under section 1111(c) of the ESEA;**

The strategy that Illinois utilizes to protect the privacy of individual students is to suppress data for demographic groups that are below a minimum size of 10, pursuant to both the Family Educational Right to Privacy Act (FERPA), as well as the Illinois School Student Records Act (ISSRA), 5 ILCS 140/7 (1) (a).[69] FERPA and ISSRA require that personally identifiable information be protected from disclosure, but do not provide exact parameters for some situations. Therefore, industry best practices have evolved in response, and ED, through the Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC), has taken the lead on identifying and encouraging some of these best practices. PTAC suggests use of cell size suppression as an appropriate method of privacy protection. ISBE applies a minimum cell size of 10 as its minimum group size reporting rule in cases where other information, such as student outcomes or scores, could be combined with small subgroup data to deduce the identity of particular

[67] American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational, and Psychological Testing (US). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Amer Educational Research Assn, 1999.

[68] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting (NCES 2011-603), https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf.

[69] From the Illinois School Student Records Act: "Personal information contained within public records, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, unless the disclosure is consented to in writing by the individual subjects of the information. 'Unwarranted invasion of personal privacy' means the disclosure of information that is highly personal or objectionable to a reasonable person and in which the subject's right to privacy outweighs any legitimate public interest in obtaining the information."

students. ISBE is among a majority of states using 10 as its minimum group size.[70]

viii. **Provide information regarding the number and percentage of all students and students in each subgroup described in 4.B.i above for whose results schools would not be held accountable under the state's system for annual meaningful differentiation of schools required by 34 C.F.R. § 200.18;**

Data is provided below on the number and percentage of students whose student groups are excluded from accountability at their school due to n-size limitations from the most recent accountability calculations. The higher percentage of students excluded in the elementary/middle band can be attributed to the intersectionality of n-size limitations and minimum indicator requirements, as well as the way in which not all indicators are applicable to or collected at all grades. While Illinois has large and small schools serving all grade levels, the average enrollment of schools serving elementary grades is lower than that of those serving middle school grades, which is significantly smaller than that of high schools. Please note that all students were included in accountability via the "all students" student group.

2025 Accountability Calculations	**Elementary/Middle**		**High School**	
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,322	0.22%	1,304	0.23%
Asian	15,194	1.43%	4,682	0.81%
Black or African American	22,491	2.12%	6,116	1.06%
Hispanic or Latino	23,530	2.22%	6,830	1.18%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	811	0.08%	566	0.10%
Two or More Races	31,790	3.00%	9,415	1.62%
White	9,339	0.88%	2,321	0.40%
Total	**105,477**	**9.95%**	**31,234**	**5.39%**
Program				
Children With Disabilities	30,881	2.91%	13,657	2.36%
English Learners	20,649	1.95%	7,029	1.21%
Former English Learners	13,763	1.30%	4,258	0.73%
Low Income	10,726	1.01%	7,793	1.34%

~~Data on the number and percentage of all students and students in each student demographic group included in the accountability system that would fall under the n-size determined by the State Board will be provided after three years of baseline data is available to be used in accountability calculations.~~

ix. **If an SEA proposes a minimum number of students that exceeds 30, provide a justification that explains how a minimum number of students provided in 4.C above promotes sound, reliable accountability determinations, including data on the number and percentage of schools in the state that would not be held accountable in the system of annual meaningful differentiation under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 for the results of students in each subgroup in 4.B.i above using the minimum number proposed by the state**

[70] The U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics notes: "Individual states have adopted minimum group size reporting rules, with the minimum number of students ranging from 5 to 30 and a modal category of 10 (used by 39 states in the most recent results available on state websites in late winter of 2010). Each state has adopted additional practices to protect personally identifiable information about its students in reported results. These practices include various forms of suppression, top and bottom coding of values at the ends of a distribution, and limiting the amount of detail reported for the underlying counts." (NCES 2011-603, available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf)

compared to the data on the number and percentage of schools in the state that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup if the minimum number of students is 30.

Not applicable

F. Annual Meaningful Differentiation

i. **Describe the state's system for annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the state, including public charter schools, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12 and 200.18. Describe the following information with respect to the state's system of annual meaningful differentiation:**

1. **The distinct and discrete levels of school performance, and how they are calculated, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(2) on each indicator in the statewide accountability system;**

Below are the specific performance ranges for each indicator associated with the five performance levels.

	CORE INDICATORS				ELEVATING INDICATORS				
	Composite Proficiency	Composite Growth Student Growth Percentile (SGP)		Graduation Rate	EL Progress (ELP)		Consistent Attendance		Climate Survey
	All schools	Baseline SGP	Cohort SGP	High schools	K-8 schools	High schools	K-8 schools	High schools	All schools
Exemplary	≥ 75	≥ 67.5	≥ 60	≥ 93	≥ 75	≥ 50	≥ 88	≥85	≥ 95
Approaching Exemplary	≥ 52 < 75	≥ 60 < 67.5	≥ 52.5 < 60	≥ 88 < 93	≥ 50 < 75	≥ 40 < 50	≥ 80 < 88	≥70 < 85	≥90 < 95
Commendable	≥ 48 < 52	≥ 48 < 60	≥ 43 < 52.5	≥80 < 88	≥ 32.5 < 50	≥ 25 < 40	≥ 65 < 80	≥ 55 < 70	≥ 85 < 90
Developing	≥ 35 < 48	≥ 35 < 48	≥ 32.5 < 43	≥67 < 80	≥ 15 < 32.5	≥ 15 < 25	≥ 50 < 65	≥ 40 < 55	≥ 65 < 85
Comprehensive	< 35	< 35	< 32.5	< 67	< 15	< 15	< 50	< 40	< 65
Automatic Comprehensive	<13.75* OR <30		<30 OR <66.67**		Core indicators have criteria that automatically designate a school as Comprehensive. These criteria represent the lowest levels of performance in the state, and apply to school-level profiles, not student group profiles.				

*Automatic Comprehensive thresholds can increase as described in section 4.2.(C) Annual Meaningful Differentiation to meet federal requirements for identification of schools.

**Graduation rate is the only Automatic Comprehensive indicator for high schools.

The indicator thresholds associated with the proposed accountability profiles of performance were developed through a structured, data-informed process that combined Illinois school performance data, the design goals of the new accountability system, values articulated by stakeholders, and relevant benchmarks embedded in the prior accountability framework. Thresholds were refined across multiple rounds of modeling to ensure they functioned appropriately at both the indicator level and within the system as a whole.

The primary data source was Illinois school-level performance data analyzed at the "All Students" level. Statewide performance distributions, including typical performance (such as averages and medians), overall spread, and the upper and lower tails were examined for each indicator. Initial modeling relied on 2024 data, which were the most complete data available at the time. The previous system was a multi-measures weighted index system that scored indicator performance in ways specific to each indicator before weighting and aggregating those scores into an index. Schools with very similar ranks frequently had very different performance on any given indicator. Further, the scoring rules associated with some indicators collapsed raw performance differences in ways that made these differences even more pronounced[71]. Thus, while informative, pure statistical analysis was simply a foundation for deep stakeholder engagement.

Thresholds were set through an iterative process that began at the ends of the performance spectrum and worked inward, from clarity to complexity. Where appropriate or required, existing thresholds from the prior accountability system were used as anchor points, particularly where those thresholds reflected long-standing policy judgments or statutory requirements. Performance at the tails, where patterns are most distinct, informed the placement of Exemplary and Comprehensive thresholds, with existing benchmarks used as anchors where appropriate or required. Automatic Comprehensive thresholds were added to ensure consistent identification of extremely low performance and to meet minimum federal requirements.

Middle thresholds required greater judgment, including decisions about how many performance levels were warranted and where typical or average performance should fall. Here, ISBE relied heavily on the expertise and input of stakeholders on how the system as a whole should function. In particular, ISBE was advised to:

- Ensure that schools with low rates of proficiency, growth, or graduation would receive accurate signals about the need for school improvement while still recognizing the unique strengths of each school.
- Set performance ranges in ways that maintained rates of identification for CSI and TSI status to historic rates, as increases would spread limited 1003(a) funds over a larger pool of schools:
- Anchor typical or average performance in the middle range.
- Structure indicators in ways that mitigated external influences on outcomes.
- Structure the system in ways that were easy to understand and communicate.

Throughout the process, proposed thresholds were tested together under the full system rules using student-level data and refined as indicators, definitions, and available data evolved. Initial modeling relied on 2024 data, followed by interim analyses using a hybrid of 2024 and 2025 data, and final confirmation using full 2025 data.

~~The majority of the indicators included in the accountability system have student-level data, with the exception of the school culture and climate indicator. A majority of the indicators have different scales and measures. These~~

[71] This feature of the former accountability system was frequently analyzed and discussed by the TAC, noting that the difference between scored and raw performance could be considered either a feature or bug, depending on the types of ways one intended to use the data.

~~multiple scales and measures cannot be easily compared and are not always meaningful in a school-level accountability system. Each indicator will be standardized to a common 100 point scale to resolve these differences and create a system that is consistent, comparable, and simple for all stakeholders to understand[72].~~

~~Scoring rules were developed to measure the progress schools are making toward the identified interim and long-term goals for the individual indicators. To ensure meaningful differentiation of schools, unique scoring rules have been established for each indicator. This development followed a process founded on the principles of transparency, stakeholder engagement, and external validation[73]. The nuance of these scoring rules and their reasonable limits are particularly important to reflect known evidence on school improvement[74] and to avoid the regressive qualities (e.g., Pass/Fail) of Annual Yearly Progress under No Child Left Behind. The specific scoring rules were developed in consultation with stakeholders and reviewed by the Illinois TAC, drawing upon the professional and technical expertise of practitioners and is informed by analyses of past performance distribution[75].~~

~~Applying a uniform scoring methodology to each indicator would fail to meaningfully differentiate school performance. Indicators with greater differences in performance (e.g., wider distributions and larger standard deviations) will need to distribute the available points over the full range of performance . Indicators with narrow distributions of performance will need to distribute points over a much narrower range of performance in order to have validity to stakeholders. For example, student achievement has a wide distribution ranging from 98 percent to 2 percent of students meeting or exceeding standards and would require a wider scoring range to meaningfully capture progress of schools across the spectrum. Stakeholders understand there are meaningful differences between the experience of students in schools where 85 percent of students meet or exceed standards and those that have only 35 percent of students meeting or exceeding standards. The four-year graduation rate has a much narrower distribution, and applying an equal number of performance levels could result in a school with an 86 percent graduation rate and a school with an 88 percent graduation rate in different performance levels. When levels are too narrow, they hold less validity and meaning for stakeholders. The creation of scoring rules is a socially constructed process of informed meaning-making, but the results can be externally informed and validated by comparing the determinations against research, past performance data, and ongoing stakeholder engagement.~~

~~In the past, Illinois used a Technical Advisory Council to set local performance levels. It will reconvene this group again to offer guidance on the development of scoring rules for each indicator, such that they can coherently be combined into a single accountability system, as well as to inform the development and integration of additional indicators as new instruments are developed and validated. Illinois will also work collaboratively with the staff of the National Center for Improvement in Educational Assessment in validate the system as a whole.~~

~~For a full description of the scoring rules associated with each indicator, please see the annual business rules posted on the Report Card Metrics page at https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Report-Card-Metrics.aspx.~~

ii. **The weighting of each indicator, including how certain indicators receive substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(b) and (c)(1)-(2).**

---

[72] Reyna, Ryan, *Key Issues in Aggregating Indicators for Accountability Determinations under ESSA*, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington D.C., 2016. Accessed March 1, 2017 athttp://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/KeyIssuesinAggregatingIndicators.pdf

[73] Blank, Rolf K. "Developing a system of education indicators: Selecting, implementing, and reporting indicators." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 15, no. 1 (1993): 65-80.

[74] Evidence from the prior School Improvement Grant 1003(g) program in Illinois under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 indicates schools experience spurts of rapid improvement that are then sustained or even regress slightly, which then become the foundation for additional periods of more noticeable improvement. Improvement does not occur in constant, equal intervals.

[75] American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education. Standards for educational and psychological testing. American Educational Research Association, 2014.

As described in section 4.1.A. Weighting, the profile of performance model is unweighted. Indicators serve as either core or elevating indicators. Core indicators are

Indicator	Role in System	Federal Classification
Proficiency	Core	Academic
Growth	Core	Academic
Graduation Rate	Core	Academic
English Learner Progress	Elevating	Academic
Consistent Attendance	Elevating	School Quality and Student Success
Climate Survey	Elevating	School Quality and Student Success

ISBE received consistent feedback across a wide range of stakeholders that the reliance of the previous system on an index that was ranked and normative designation boundaries such as lowest five percent and highest ten percent were direct barriers to effective use of the data to drive school improvement. Moreover, stakeholders wanted a system in which only their own performance determined which designation they received. The proposed profile of performance model achieves this goal, while still keeping a central focus on core academic outcomes.

~~After deep engagement with stakeholders[76], ISBE is proposing a weighting of 75 percent for academic indicators and 25 percent school quality and student success indicators. Public comment has largely supported growth as the predominant measure. IBAMC members had varied opinions as to the specific weights of the academic indicators, but generally it was suggested that growth be weighted more than proficiency and that the EL proficiency indicator should be weighted less than either the proficiency or growth metric.~~

~~ISBE's accountability system will assign the Academic Achievement and School Quality School Quality Success Indicator weights as noted in Section 4.1A.~~

~~IBAMC members raised the idea of incorporating "some type of student growth measure" at the high school level as part of the academic indicators. In this scenario, members were in favor of weighting growth equal to or as much as double that of proficiency.[77] However, there was ample acknowledgement that the present assessment system at the high school level does not permit a growth measure at this time. The Governor, in his recommendations, acknowledged the importance of growth at the high school level and made a commitment to finding the resources so that this data can be collected in grades 9 through 12.~~

~~With the acknowledgement that the quality of the assessment and data systems is in the process of becoming more stable, ISBE will conduct additional modeling and simulation of accountability system data and ongoing~~

~~[76] IBAMC recommended 51%/49%, the Governor's Office supported 80%/20%. The IASB, IASA, IPA, and IARSS support the notion that student growth should be weighted more than proficiency, with English proficiency receiving the least weight. CPS indicated that student growth should be weighted twice that of proficiency and no more than 5-10% to English proficiency.~~

~~[77] The IEA supports equal weight to be afforded to proficiency and student growth, with no more than 15% to English proficiency. IASB, IASA, IPA, and IARSS support the notion that student growth should be weighted more than proficiency, with English proficiency receiving the least weight. CPS indicated that student growth should be weighted twice that of proficiency and no more than 5-10% to English proficiency.~~

~~engagement of stakeholders to ensure that a substantial body of evidence supports the validity and reliability of the system.~~

iii. **The summative determinations, including how they are calculated, that are provided to schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(4).**

~~Stakeholders provided a great deal of input regarding both the number and naming of the summative determinations. There was support for not creating a summative determination of any kind[78], particularly for schools serving high-poverty communities. However, a summative determination is required in the final regulations and potentially disadvantages those same high-poverty schools by restricting their identification to a single summative assessment, rather than the full range of indicators in the accountability system. Support for a four- or five-tier system was offered by the Management Alliance, Advance Illinois, Chicago Public Schools, and other stakeholder groups. There was similar support for a simple to understand, three-tier summative system[79]. In balancing the tension between simplicity and the need to reflect complex contextual factors, as well as the need to meaningfully differentiate schools, a system with four or more tiers addressed more of the expressed concerns and aspirations of the majority of stakeholders.~~

Illinois has maintained a five-tiered system of summative designations of its schools, but revised the process of identification in ways that set clear, objective criteria that define each performance level while also providing more meaningful differentiation and accurate signals about the need for continuous school improvement in all schools, not just those in school improvement status.

Exemplary School:
A school that has core performance that is either Exemplary, or Approaching Exemplary performance paired with Exemplary performance on at least two of the elevating indicators. These schools have no student groups with Comprehensive performance profiles. ~~no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate of greater than 67 percent, and whose performance is in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.~~

Approaching Exemplary School:

A school that has core performance that is either Approaching Exemplary, or Commendable performance paired with Exemplary performance on at least two of the elevating indicators. These schools also have no student groups with Comprehensive performance profiles.

Commendable School:
A school that has core performance that is either Commendable, or Developing performance paired with at least one Exemplary elevating indicator and one Approaching Exemplary indicator80. This category also includes those schools whose "all students" performance profile might otherwise qualify as Exemplary, Approaching Exemplary or Commendable, but in which one or more student groups has a Comprehensive profile of performance. ~~A school that has no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate above 67 percent, and whose performance is not in the top 10 percent of schools statewide.~~

~~[78] Many comments to this effect were submitted by Illinois Federation of Teachers members.~~

~~[79] Comments submitted by Stand for Children and Consortium for Educational Change.~~

[80] Note: Schools with only one elevating indicator due to their grades-served configuration can elevate with only one Exemplary or Approaching Exemplary indicator.

Developing School:

A school that has core performance that is either Developing, or Comprehensive (but not Automatic Comprehensive) performance paired with at least one Exemplary elevating indicator and one Approaching Exemplary indicator. Schools in this category may have one or more student group with a Comprehensive profile of performance.

~~**Targeted Support School:** A school in which one or more subgroup is performing at or below the level of the "all students" group in the lowest 5 percent of Title I eligible schools.~~

Comprehensive Support School:
A school that has one or more core indicators in the Comprehensive performance range, or any applicable indicator in the Automatic Comprehensive range. Schools with an applicable core indicator in the Automatic Comprehensive range may still have Exemplary or Approaching Exemplary performance on the elevating indicators but that performance is superseded by their low core performance.

~~A school that is in the lowest-performing 5 percent Title I eligible schools in Illinois, those high schools that have a graduation rate of less than 67 percent or less, and those schools that have completed a full Targeted Support school improvement cycle, where the performance of one or more of the originally Targeted student groups remains at or below the level of the "all students" group in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I eligible schools at the end of the four-year improvement cycle. Schools in Comprehensive Support shall receive comprehensive services.~~

~~**Intensive Support School:** A school that has completed a full Comprehensive Support school improvement cycle, but whose performance remains in the lowest-performing 5 percent Title I eligible schools in Illinois or is a high school that has a graduation rate of less than 67 percent or less at the end of the four-year improvement cycle.~~

~~It is Illinois' belief that all schools have something to learn from and share with their colleagues in a supportive community of practice. Stakeholders have been very clear that the accountability system should be educative, equitable, and non-punitive. It makes sense that the meaningful differentiation of schools and summative designation exemplify these values, too. Thus, a summative determination should assist in both the required differentiation within the final ESSA rules as well as creating a connection between schools and districts throughout the state.~~

~~What follows are a set of examples from the 2019 summative designation calculations that demonstrate the methodology articulated in the business rules for summative designations. For a complete description of the system process, please see the Summative Designation Deep Dive Presentation available on the summative designation website at http://www.isbe.net/summative.~~

Provided in the plan are modeled calculations using data from School Year 2024-25

NOTE: The former examples were embedded images and thus have been removed for ease of review. They can still be seen in the prior approved plan.

iv. **How the system for meaningful differentiation and the methodology for identifying schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19 will ensure that schools with low performance on substantially weighted indicators are more likely to be identified for comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(c)(3) and (d)(1)(ii).**

Title I eligible schools where one or more student groups has a Comprehensive profile of performance are eligible for and will be placed in TSI status. If, after one year of planning and three years of implementation, the performance of these same ~~subgroups~~ student groups remains Comprehensive, ~~on par with that of group (A),~~ they would then be identified for comprehensive supports and services as defined below.

Schools that are eligible for and will be placed in ~~comprehensive~~ CSI status ~~supports and services shall~~ include:

A. ~~The lowest-performing 5 percent of all s~~ Schools with a Comprehensive profile of performance on the state accountability system receiving Title I funds,

B. **All** public high schools in the state failing to graduate one-third or more of their students, regardless of whether or not they receive Title I funds, and

C. Title I schools that have been notified that they have one or more student demographic groups that has a Comprehensive profile of performance ~~is performing on par with the "all students" group in schools in group (A) of school~~, and for whom, after one year of planning and three years of implementing targeted supports and improvement, the performance of those subgroups has not improved beyond Comprehensive ~~that of group (A)~~.

~~By default, LEAs with schools that would meet the definition for group (C) but who have not otherwise been identified, are eligible for targeted supports and services. That is,~~

~~Schools that have one or more student demographic groups that are performing at or below the level of the "all students" group in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools must be identified and notified that they are eligible for targeted supports and services beginning in 2018-19.~~

G. Participation Rate

i. **Describe how the state is factoring the requirement for 95 percent student participation in assessments into its system of annual meaningful differentiation of schools consistent with the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 200.15.**

A school's ELA, math and science proficiency rates are calculated out of either the number of students who tested, or 95 percent of those who should have. Illinois consistently has rates of participation on its assessments that are at or above 95 percent, and has a system of both proactive monitoring and responsive support for those districts with schools that do not reach the 95 percent testing requirement. Additionally, Illinois publishes assessment participation data prominently on the achievement profile of each school. ~~A determination will be made by assigning a preliminary summative rating for each metric in the accountability system, for both the all student group and for all identified demographic subgroups. Once ratings on the individual indicators have been calculated, and a preliminary summative rating determined, the school or districts participation rate will be considered. If a school does not have 95 percent participation rate, in total and for each student demographic group, it cannot receive the highest summative rating. For example, a school cannot be rated at Exemplary if they do not have a 95 percent participation rate in all student subgroups.~~

H. Data Procedures

i. **Describe the state's uniform procedure for averaging data, including combining data across school years, combining data across grades, or both, in a school as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable.**

The state's uniform procedure for averaging data is to combine individual student-level data for each indicator across grades served in a single academic year first. If, using only a single academic year's worth of data, a school would have a non-reportable profile of performance, then ISBE would average across three school years ~~if a sufficient~~ to create a composite score that can then be divided by the actual number of students represented in the indicator pool to determine an average score for the school and the relevant student demographic groups. This is performed only for schools that are currently too small to meet the stated data thresholds to generate a profile of performance ~~n index score~~, after an analysis for the TAC found that such calculations would only be necessary for a small number of schools.

I. Including All Public Schools in a state's Accountability System

i. **If the state uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in D above for any of the following specific types of schools, describe how they are included, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii):**

1. **Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the state's academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools), although the state is not required to administer a standardized assessment to meet this requirement;**

ISBE has historically used a technique called back mapping for schools in which no grade level is assessed under the state's academic assessment system. That is, the closest assessed grade(s) in a school that the attending students feed into (e.g., grades 3 and 4 for K-2 building~~; grade 11 for grade 9 building~~) was identified and those results applied to the building. Alternately, district aggregate results can be used to provide proxy academic indicators in schools that potentially draw from multiple districts. Illinois has 122 configurations of schools. The many configurations of schools, such as those listed below and more, as well as transitions through new and different assessment structures (e.g., course-based versus grade level) has prompted ISBE to convene its Technical Advisory Council to review historical and contemporary practices and determine specific techniques for implementation, which will remain the use of back-mapped data.

2. **Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., P-12 schools);**

Schools with variant grade configurations ~~will be reported for purposes of accountability at the highest complete grade band configuration, although a school~~ would receive two designations using the data elements and thresholds applicable to the grade band, so that supports can be provided as appropriate given the applicable designations. ~~Thus, a P-12 school would be held accountable under the structure of the high school grade band accountability system.~~ All grade level results for all indicators would be reported for these schools.

3. **Small schools in which the total number of students who can be included in any indicator under 34 C.F.R. § 200.14 is less than the minimum number of students established by the State under 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1), consistent with a state's uniform procedures for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable;**

Schools that fail to meet the student count in a sufficient number of indicators using only one year of data trigger the use of the state's uniform procedure for averaging data, as described in section H.i.

4. **Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings; students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, including juvenile justice facilities; students enrolled in state public schools for the deaf or blind; and recently arrived English Learners enrolled in public schools for newcomer students); and**

Illinois ties all students to their home school, the school that they would otherwise attend based on the location of residence of their family or guardian. This is necessary and appropriate given that the home school, and subsequently the home district is the entity legally responsible for ensuring all students receive the free appropriate public education to which they are entitled. Schools that do not serve as the home school for any student, such as state public schools for the deaf or blind, are already well integrated into existing state reporting and data systems. Historically, many students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings fell outside the administration of the ISBE and these students were either represented within the system or not based on their specific placement at the time assessments were administered. ISBE is in ongoing dialogue with the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) to more fully integrate these students into the accountability system. As appropriate, this section of the application will be amended to reflect changes in practice.

5. **Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a state's uniform procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable, for at least one indicator (e.g., a newly opened high school that has not yet graduated its first cohort for students).**

Schools that are newly opened are rarely excluded from calculation for reasons related to failure to meet the minimum n-size or number of indicators for inclusion, or other reasons related to student inclusion in calculations. Schools are accountable for all students they have instructed for at least half a school year. School openings and closures are generally limited to the start of a new school year, so schools are typically accountable for the majority of their enrollments. All data for newly opened schools, including those who fail to meet the minimum n-size or number of indicators for inclusion, are publicly reported through the Illinois School Report Card.

4.2 Identification of Schools

A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools

Describe:

i. **The methodologies, including the timeline, by which the state identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a) and (d), including: 1) lowest-performing schools; 2) schools with low high school graduation rates; and 3) schools with chronically low-performing subgroups.**

Schools eligible to receive comprehensive supports and services were identified prior to the start of the 2018-2019 school year and annually thereafter upon the release of the Illinois Report Card each October[81], and include the following categories of schools:

[81] Federal accountability waivers granted to Illinois in connection with the COVID-19 pandemic specified that the 2019 designation be reissued in 2020; no designations were calculated in 2021.

1. ~~The lowest-performing 5 percent of~~ Title I-eligible schools with a Comprehensive profile of performance, as determined by the state accountability system.
2. High schools with a four-year graduation rate of less than 66.67 percent, including those high schools that are not Title I eligible, that have not already been identified as being within the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools.
3. Schools with ~~chronically low-performing~~ one or more student demographic groups with a Comprehensive profile of performance that have implemented targeted support and improvement plans, where, at the end of ~~for more than~~ one planning year and three years of implementation, those same demographic groups that resulted in identification still have a Comprehensive profile of performance ~~remain in the bottom 5 percent of performance compared of the all students demographic group for comprehensive schools~~.

Schools are identified using data from the full range of the accountability system~~,~~ and are notified that they are required to partner with a~~n approved~~ learning partner(s) for comprehensive supports and services in developing and implementing improvement plans.[82] School identification and notification occurs annually. In general, schools must take one planning year and up to three years of full implementation before needing to meet the statewide exit criteria. Schools identified prior to 2018-2019 with data from 2017-2018 (i.e., cohort 2018) and schools identified with data from 2018-2019 (i.e., cohort 2019) had one additional year before needing to meet statewide exit criteria, as requested in the 2021 accountability waiver[83].

ii. **The uniform statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement established by the state, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, under section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(1).**

The following exit criteria are proposed:

~~1.~~ That a school no longer meets the eligibility criteria for comprehensive support and improvement, with improvement ~~specific~~ in one or more of the core indicators of proficiency, growth, and or graduation rate. ~~,~~ ~~including demonstrated measurable improvement in indicators with a majority of weight in the system (i.e., the sum of the weights of the indicators showing measurable improvement must be greater than or equal to 50 percent).~~

Schools will have one planning year and up to three years of full implementation of Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plans before being expected to meet these exit criteria. As approved[84] in the waiver of accountability requested for school year 2020-21, schools that were identified in 2018-19 and 2019-20 (i.e.

[82] Districts, especially those with schools identified for comprehensive and targeted services, will be provided access to professional learning opportunities that include organizational, leadership, and capacity-building strategies regarding reflective supervision; job-embedded professional development; learning communities; data literacy; resource allocation; instructional technology and data; information literacy; implementation of Universal Design for Learning; recruitment and retention of teachers in high-poverty and/or high-minority districts; parent family and community engagement; restorative practices; addressing issues related to school environment and school climate; and the development of school-community partnerships. Title I, School Improvement, Title II, IDEA, Title IV Part A and B, and State Longitudinal Data Systems dollars will be used for funding.

[83] Illinois State Board of Education. "Request for a waiver of accountability requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act." (2021). https://www.isbe.net/Documents/IL20-21-Accountability-Waiver-Template.pdf.

[84] Rosenblum, Ian. "Letter of Approval of Illinois' 2021 Accountability Waiver Request." (April 6, 2021). https://www.isbe.net/Documents/il-acct-waiver-response.pdf

cohorts 2018 and 2019) would need to meet these criteria by 2023-24 (based on data from SY2022-23) and 2024-25 (based on data from SY2023-24) respectively.

B. Targeted Support and Improvement Schools

Describe:

i. **The state's methodology for identifying any school with a "consistently underperforming" subgroup of students, including the definition and time period used by the state to determine consistent underperformance, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(1) and (c).**

Schools with consistently underperforming student demographics groups will be identified through the following methodology, which is the same methodology used to identify schools who require additional targeted support and improvement:

1. Based on all indicators within the accountability system, the overall performance of each student demographic group within a school will be calculated to determine a summative rating comparable to that of the school's all-student group.
2. Schools with one or more student demographic group[85] whose profile of performance is Comprehensive ~~(i.e., index score) is at or below that of the "all students group" of the lowest performing five percent of schools in the state[86], regardless of the schools summative rating,~~ will be identified as eligible for Targeted support and improvement.
3. ~~Additionally, any school that has failed to meet the 95 percent assessment threshold for all students or for one or more student demographic groups for three consecutive years in a row will be identified and notified of their eligibility.~~

Schools identified under this definition will have an LEA-determined number of years, not to exceed four, to implement targeted supports and improvement. Schools identified for targeted supports and services *may* utilize ~~approved~~ learning partners ~~through School/District Improvement~~.[87] Schools have been annually[88] identified for Targeted support and improvement under this definition since 2018.

ii. **The state's methodology, including the timeline, for identifying schools with low-performing subgroups of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(2) and (d) that must receive additional targeted support in accordance with section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA.**

1. The proposed accountability system sets clear criteria in section 4.1(H) to define a Comprehensive profile of performance. First, ISBE will identify schools eligible for Comprehensive supports and improvement. ~~The performance level of the highest performing school eligible for Comprehensive supports and improvements will determine the upper threshold of performance of the "all student group" of the lowest performing 5% of schools.~~

---

[85] As defined by Section 1111(c)(2) in addition includes former English Learners and Former Students with Disabilities subgroups

[86] ~~In other words, the "all students" index score of the school right below the line for Commendable status.~~

[87] Districts, especially those with schools identified for comprehensive and targeted services, will be provided access to professional learning opportunities that include organizational, leadership, and capacity-building strategies regarding reflective supervision; job-embedded professional development; learning communities; data literacy; resource allocation; instructional technology and data; information literacy; implementation of Universal Design for Learning; recruitment and retention of teachers in high-poverty and/or high-minority districts; parent family and community engagement; restorative practices; addressing issues related to school environment and school climate; and the development of school-community partnerships. Title I, School Improvement, Title II, IDEA, Title IV Part A and B, and State Longitudinal Data Systems dollars will be used for funding.

[88] Except in 2020, and in 2021 as permitted under the applicable federal waivers.

2. Next, from the remaining pool of all public schools in Illinois, including Title I and non-Title I schools, that have not already been identified as eligible for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, those schools that have one or more student demographic groups whose profile of performance is Comprehensive ~~on par with the performance of the "all students" group identified in step one~~ will be notified they are eligible for additional targeted supports and services and should implement targeted improvement plans.

Identification and notification is conducted annually with the release of the Illinois Report Card each October[129]. Schools that are identified in 2018-19 and all years after must take one planning year and up to three years of full implementation before needing to meet the statewide exit criteria. ISBE ~~will~~ monitors progress through the submission of triennial reports that provide data on progress in achieving identified targets. Schools identified for targeted services that do not make the required gains will then be identified as comprehensive schools and will be required to use learning partner ~~IL-EMPOWER~~ services.

iii. **The uniform exit criteria, established by the SEA, for schools participating under Title I, Part A with low-performing subgroups of students, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f).**

In response to the questions posed in the first draft, commenters offered suggestions for criteria for exiting status. ISBE concurs with several commenters that a strong plan for sustainability (such that, at a minimum, all students are on a trajectory to reach grade level and graduate college and career ready) is necessary to no longer require targeted support. Therefore, the following exit criteria are proposed:

~~1.~~ That a school no longer meets the eligibility criteria for targeted support and improvement, including demonstrated measurable improvement in one or more of the core indicators of proficiency, growth, and or graduation rate ~~indicators with a majority of weight in the system (i.e., the sum of the weights of the indicators showing measurable improvement must be greater than or equal to 50 percent).~~

As approved[89] in the waiver of accountability requested for school year 2020-21, schools that were identified in 2018-19 and 2019-20 (i.e. cohorts 2018 and 2019 had to meet these criteria by 2023-24 (based on data from SY2022-23) and 2024-25 (based on data from SY2023-24) respectively. ISBE will monitor progress through the submission of triennial reports that provide data on progress in achieving identified targets. Schools that are not making reasonable progress will work with ISBE to determine additional interventions.

[89] Rosenblum, Ian. "Letter of Approval of Illinois' 2021 Accountability Waiver Request." (April 6, 2021). https://www.isbe.net/Documents/il-acct-waiver-response.pdf

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools

A. School Improvement Resources

i. **Describe how the SEA will meet its responsibilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d) under section 1003 of the ESEA, including the process to award school improvement funds to LEAs and monitoring and evaluating the use of funds by LEAs.**

Meet Responsibilities

Illinois met its responsibilities by:

- Collecting and applying computational algorithms appropriate to identify schools that require comprehensive or targeted support and services.
- Notifying identified schools of their eligibility, responsibilities, and the available system of supports and services;
- Distributing funds to identified schools based on identified need that Illinois developed, in collaboration with stakeholders, during the available transition year.

Award Funds

Illinois used its transition year and some portion of the available funds to develop, in collaboration with stakeholders, the state formula for allotment of funds and services to LEAs that have schools identified for comprehensive and/or targeted supports[90]. ~~In addition, Illinois utilized some of its funds to design and implement a rigorous review and approval process for external providers to become part of the School/District Improvement network.~~

Monitor and Evaluate the Use of Funds

Illinois utilized the transition year to align its reporting structures and monitoring and evaluation processes to those of other federally funded programs to improve the effectiveness of the agency and reduce the burden of monitoring activities on schools and districts. In addition, ~~approved~~ learning partners are expected to contribute to research on the effectiveness of strategies implemented in schools in improvement status ~~responsible for comprehensive or targeted improvement~~, such that their work expands the available evidence base, particularly for diverse geographic and demographic contexts.

B. Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions

i. **Describe the technical assistance the SEA will provide to each LEA in the state serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, including how it will provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(b), and, if applicable, the list of state-**

[90] When asked how a formula could be used to distribute funds both equitably and effectively, stakeholders suggested the formula should incorporate the following elements: Status for comprehensive (Comprehensive Support School) or targeted (Targeted Support School) support, with schools requiring comprehensive supports receiving a larger allotment of funds and/or services than targeted; the number of staff and students in the school; the phase of the implementation timeline the school is in (e.g., year 1, year 2, or year 3); the number of schools in the LEA identified for comprehensive services and the number identified for targeted services; the concentration (i.e., percentage of schools in the LEA) identified for comprehensive or targeted services; the level of "need" of the school and district; and the quality of the plan itself and readiness of the schools and districts to implement the plan effectively. The rationale for the inclusion of aforementioned elements in the formula was that the statute requires that ISBE prioritize LEAs that "demonstrate the greatest need for such funds" and "demonstrate the strongest commitment to using funds."

approved, evidence-based interventions for use in schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans consistent with § 200.23(c)(2)-(3).

ISBE's School/District Improvement department oversees ~~is~~ the statewide system of success ~~support~~ designed to help all districts, particularly those with schools identified for intensive, comprehensive or targeted support, implement effective school improvement practices and subsequently improve student achievement and student outcomes. For schools in status, the statewide system of success ~~School/District Improvement~~ provides *structure* to the craft of continuous improvement by mobilizing evidence-based resources including systematic needs assessments, grant funding, expert consultations with ISBE personnel ~~School/District Improvement Coordinators~~, peer networks, professional learning opportunities, regular consultation and monitoring visits, program evaluation, online materials and information, and up to four years of time to turn around, improve, and exit status.

The statewide system of success ~~structure of School/District Improvement~~ is predicated on districts helping their schools develop effective school improvement plans by first identifying areas where support is needed and mobilizing resources to address the gaps. All newly identified ~~intensive and comprehensive~~ schools in status engage in an initial school-level needs assessment/equity audit to identify deficit areas and inform a responsive school improvement plan with supporting SMART goals. The initial school-level needs assessment is an in-depth audit of school conditions conducted during the planning phase of the grant. Starting in school year 2027-28, the initial school-level needs assessment for intensive and comprehensive schools will be conducted by a learning partner selected by the district and school. ~~by a state procured expert vendor. Subsequent year n~~Needs assessments after the planning year are conducted by the district and school as a routine element of the school improvement cycle. Progress is measured and reported locally and statewide by comparing ~~from~~ the ~~baseline, initiative~~ initial needs assessment data to annual performance over the course of the grant. Districts with schools identified for intensive or comprehensive support must select and enter into agreements with ~~pre-approved,~~ expert vendors, also known as ~~approved~~ learning partners, that possess the requisite content expertise, experience, and capacity to successfully support effective school improvement practices and deliver evidence-based services. ~~have been collectively chosen by ISBE through a procurement or other statutorily-defined process to serve as part of the statewide system of support and~~ The learning partner model provides a robust and diverse menu of evidence-based, professional services designed to meet school-level needs for turnaround intervention and improvement. ~~ISBE's role is to provide a diverse selection of highly-qualified vendors to meet the school-level needs for implementing effective continuous improvement processes and evidence-based practices.~~ The LEA and school's role within this model is to select the right provider that matches school-level needs to implement effectively the school improvement plan. The selection process is critical.

The results of the initial needs assessment inform continuous improvement and identify areas where expert vendors can serve as learning partners. ISBE personnel help LEAs facilitate appropriate learning partner matches. The matching process is a needs-based and fluid strategy of connecting appropriate interventions to districts and their schools to achieve their goals over the course of the four-year grant program. ~~The School/District Improvement Coordinators~~ ISBE personnel will ensure that school-level needs drive how the requirement of maintaining a~~n approved~~ learning partner is met.

The learning partners' work plans must specifically address the SMART goals included in the school improvement plan as well as the actions that will be taken to make improvements.

All intensive and comprehensive schools are required to use a~~n approved~~ learning partner; however, districts and schools have flexibility in ~~partnering with approved~~ selecting their partners. This flexibility allows for:

- Short-term partnerships;
- Long-term partnerships;
- Multiple partnerships; and/or
- Concurrent partnerships

There is no requirement on funding percentages to be spent on ~~approved~~ learning partners.

~~The approved learning partners are pre-approved by ISBE to offer evidence-based, professional services at guaranteed costs. ISBE contracts with selected learning partners to provide services at fixed costs so that schools and learning partners will not need to negotiate price . Schools will have four years[91] in which to demonstrate consistent improvement in identified areas (one year for planning and three years for implementation).[92]~~

~~To serve as an approved learning partner, applicants must possess the content expertise, relevant experience, and capacity to successfully support effective school improvement practices and deliver evidence-based services. Under the current process, vendors seeking pre-approval identify the specific content expertise and service types they offer to help schools implement effective continuous improvement practices and build capacity of school leaders to lead continuous improvement efforts after the partnership ends.~~

~~ISBE continues to evaluate whether pre-approval of third party vendors is the most efficient model for delivery of school improvement services from the state and may make changes to future iterations of the statewide system of support based on that evaluation.~~

Ninety-five percent of grant funds identified for school improvement must flow to the districts. ISBE monitors progress through the submission of triennial reports that provide data on progress in achieving identified targets as well as utilizing field-based staff who can, if necessary, provide technical assistance and monitor for compliance. Schools that are not making reasonable progress work directly with ISBE to determine additional interventions. ISBE monitors each ~~the~~ school's improvement plan~~s~~ to ensure that the school is ~~they are~~ on track to meet improvement targets or, if a school is not meeting performance targets, assist in amending the improvement plan~~s~~ to focus specifically on areas inhibiting improvement.

ISBE will support/interact with LEAs by:

1. Notifying LEA/schools of eligibility,
2. Notifying LEA/schools of responsibilities,
3. Supporting LEA/schools in the connection with ~~approved~~ learning partners, [93]
4. Utilizing ISBE Network (ISBE staff[94] and ~~approved~~ learning partners) in supporting LEA/schools in strong improvement plan development as well as connecting districts with each other in order to provide assistance and guidance.

~~Eligible~~ LEA/schools may access the differentiated supports and services of School/District Improvement organized by the following foundational drivers of improvement:

- **Governance and Management**: Systems change efforts (e.g., effective policy development and implementation, diagnostic supports and services, data literacy, continuous improvement processes, organizational leadership, resource management, capacity-building practices, communication planning);
- **Curriculum and Instruction**: Supports administrator and educator development (e.g., teaming processes, facilitation of continuous learning and development, instructional practices, resource allocation,

---

~~[91] Schools identified as a part of Illinois first and second cohorts of comprehensive and targeted schools (i.e. cohort 18 and cohort 19) had a total of five years, as approved in the Illinois 2021 accountability waiver, which can be viewed at https://www.isbe.net/Documents/IL20-21-Accountability-Waiver-Template.pdf.~~

[92] The determination for a four-year timeframe was recommended by stakeholders (one year of planning, three for implementation) and is the longest timeframe allowed for this work in ESSA.

[93] Completion of the IBAM Quality Framework, completed prior to the initiation of services, shall assist schools with selecting the most appropriate supports.

[94] ISBE staff will work with district personnel to identify schools/districts that can share their expertise with other schools/districts in order to take advantage of the wide range of expertise found in Illinois schools.

reflective supervision, instructional technology, data information literacy, recruitment and retention of teachers);

- **Culture and Climate**: Emphasizes environment and supports needed for the sustainability of a safe school where productive work can occur (e.g., data competency, resource management, building leadership capacity, cultural awareness, communication strategies, professional learning communities, Universal Design for Learning, social and emotional learning).

C. More Rigorous Interventions

i. **Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the state's exit criteria within a state-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii).**

ISBE requires Comprehensive schools to select "evidence-based practices" for the purposes of school improvement. Schools identified for Intensive Support because they do not meet the state-determined exit criteria after completing a full Comprehensive Support school improvement cycle will be supported in selecting contextually appropriate, evidence-based practices that have more rigorous levels of evidence supporting their effectiveness. The LEA will be supported in establishing a strong program monitoring system to ensure that the selected practices are implemented with high levels of fidelity.

A school ~~Schools~~ that has ~~have~~ completed a full Comprehensive school improvement cycle, but which still has a Comprehensive performance profile ~~whose performance is still in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools in the state~~ will ~~receive a designation of Intensive Support and~~ be subject to the more rigorous state-determined actions identified below.

Districts will complete a more rigorous needs assessment that was fully articulated in 2023 by the Illinois State Board of Education, in consultation with the Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee**.** Board members of districts with schools that do not exit status will complete training provided by the Illinois Association of School Boards and ISBE on effectively supporting school improvement.

Districts will follow a standard protocol of progress monitoring and regular reporting to their boards of education, to the public, and to ISBE about progress on leading performance indicators. Monitoring and reporting protocols were fully articulated in 2024 by the Illinois State Board of Education, in consultation with the Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee. Reporting will occur three times per year:

- Beginning of the school year (on or before September 30)
- Middle of the school year (on or before January 30)
- End of the school year (on or before May 30)

ISBE staff will present annually to its Board on the supports provided to schools in Intensive status**.**

A school that has completed a full Intensive school improvement cycle but whose performance is still in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools in the state or is a high school with a graduation rate of 67 percent or below at the end of the four-year improvement cycle will receive further differentiated supports and oversight from the School/District Improvement department and statewide system of success.

ii. **Periodic Resource Review. Describe how the SEA will periodically review, identify, and, to the extent practicable, address any identified inequities in resources to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA in the state serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(a).**

Summative accountability designations are released by ISBE each fall, timed with the release of the public report card. Newly designated schools engage in various planning-year activities, such as identifying school leadership teams and stakeholder advisory groups, conducting needs assessments and root cause analyses, and developing school improvement plans. ISBE's School and District Improvement department provides various forms of support along the way. The Resource Allocation Review (RAR) program is managed by staff in the Finance department and situated within the planning year as a form of additional support for school improvement activities.

States must identify districts that operate a "significant number" of schools identified for improvement. ISBE's weighted selection formula considers both the percentage and number of schools identified for improvement, as well as the number of schools that have not exited from improvement status after four years. Districts are eligible for RARs every four years, as aligned with the school improvement cycle.

RARs follow an inquiry-focused process that supports the district and schools in evaluating current practices and identifying and addressing resource inequities, as required by ESSA. During the RAR, ISBE and the LEA discuss evidence of resource allocation patterns using protocols, reports, and rubrics co-developed with the Region 9 Comprehensive Center. Reports include data disaggregated by student demographics, such as:

- LEA and school-level per-pupil expenditures as reported on school report cards
- School-Level Finance Survey expenditures at each school
- The distribution of experienced teachers
- Student achievement data, including measures of attainment and growth

ISBE's program also considers other dimensions of resource equity, such as equitable resource allocation methodologies, transparency in school funding, and evidence of stakeholder engagement in financial decision-making.

ISBE has a comprehensive approach to addressing resource equity gaps across districts. The state funding formula, known as Evidence-Based Funding, ranks each district by a percentage of adequacy and distributes the majority of new funding allocated by the General Assembly to districts with the greatest need. The state maintains other programs that address resource equity gaps, such as Early Childhood grant funding to add seats in pre-school deserts and a property tax relief grant. ISBE will monitor the results of the RAR program to consider additional resource equity gaps identified by LEAs.