

Balanced Accountability Measure Committee

**Illinois State Board of Education Videoconference Rooms
100 West Randolph, 14th Floor Chicago, IL
100 North First Street, 3rd Floor, Springfield, IL**

**January 7, 2020
9:00 – 12:00 p.m.
Minutes**

Attending in Springfield:

Thomas Bertrand, Illinois Association of School Boards
Karl Goeke, Illinois Education Association
Cathy Mannen, Illinois Federation of Teachers
Mary Jane Morris, Illinois Education Association

Attending in Chicago:

Sara Boucek, Illinois Association of School Administrators
Jeff Broom, Chicago Public Schools
Kurt Hilgendorf, Chicago Teachers Union
Mark Klaisner, Illinois Association of Regional School Superintendents
Erin Roche, Chicago Principals Association

Attending by Phone:

Daniel Booth, Illinois Principals Association

Members absent:

Matthew Rodriguez, Illinois Parent Teacher Association (non-voting member)

Guests attendees:

Rae Clementz, Illinois State Board of Education
Keri Garrett, Illinois State Board of Education
Jason Helfer, Illinois State Board of Education
Barbara Hobrock, Illinois State Board of Education
Jonathan VanderBrug, Illinois Arts Alliance

I. Welcome/Roll Call

Ms. Boucek brought the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes – December 3, 2019

Mr. Broom made motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Roche seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

III. Discuss Qualitative and Quantitative Data Regarding Continuous Improvement

Ms. Clementz stated we have two years of data in order to look at meaningful things. We would like this group to look into which ones we want to focus on. TAC focuses on English Learners (EL's) and Special Education groups. Are there places that have success with these groups? From there, we will use that information to drive the qualitative piece. What would you like to see me focus on? February/March will be the time to begin that work.

Ms. Boucek stated IBAM is in a lull as to what our charge is and what we do next. Everything is on hold and personnel changes have stalled things. We need clear direction of what needs to be done next. We got the Guidance Document and Quality Framework out to districts. What is next? Mr. Roche stated progress monitoring. We have the data; what has it led to? Outcomes and implementation.

Ms. Clementz agrees and would like a discussion on what exactly you would like to look at. We can try to do a crosswalk of schools that have quantitative gain with what their quality rubrics look like. How did they evaluate themselves? Ms. Boucek would be excited to see this. Carbondale significantly moved the mark over the past year. Looking at qualitative and quantitative data would be helpful. We need to learn from how they did it. This would be amazing to see. Mr. Broom stated it might help to get consensus as to what we are trying to do. What are the meta questions? What are the basic research questions and then develop a study from that. Ms. Boucek would like this and can be an agenda item in the future. Mr. Goeke reiterated the group needs short-term and long-term plans. Getting into the context and case study piece is where we need to go. Where do schools move? Are there reasons like a new Superintendent or population growth that affected data? Scandals can affect scores, too. That is where we need to look at. What are some things that may be useful? The most we can do to communicate to districts regarding effective practice, the better it will be. Mr. Broom stated we need to define value-based conversations on how to interrogate the system as to its usefulness. We would need to develop research questions that would identify potential uses of the information to inform best practices. There are stages and limits to the depth of interrogation as to what Ms. Clementz can do. Mr. Klaisner stated that IL-EMPOWER is requiring quarterly reports starting January 30, 2020, that could be informative. Do you anticipate the ability to consolidate data coming out of those reports as to progress? Dr. Helfer

stated these are coming from separate schools and we need to figure out the right process since it is qualitative in nature. Mr. Broom asked what the committee is interested in. Knowing that, how can we look at this with what data is available. Mr. Klaisner stated that it feels messy. Ms. Boucek stated that no one is at a place to start those purpose questions. We need authority to try and frame up questions for the February agenda to get better dialogue moving forward. The Committee concurs. Mr. Goeke related it to Paul Harvey; know you know the rest of the story. We need to frame it that way. We want to know all the other context. For schools showing marked improvement, there has to be a rest of the story. This will be unique to each situation and they will all be different.

Ms. Boucek summarized stating she will send an email to members with letters and information on the indicators to go into the February 5 meeting. Jeff Broom will bring forward the start of this conversation. Mr. Broom stated we are helping ISBE develop a theory of action on how to utilize their data. We need to spend time talking about this starting in February. Ms. Boucek stated we have to be ok being in the gray area for now. There is a vision and we need the time to frame it up.

Ms. Clementz asked to try to keep questions we are asking aligned with the Quality Framework and Rubric. This strengthens the framework. Let us not lose sight as to the work that has gone into that. Ms. Boucek agreed there has to be alignment. Ms. Mannen stated we also need to align with P20 research. Mr. Bertrand stated if you move with case studies, we will be aligned.

IV. Review Updates to Federal/State Plan

Dr. Helfer stated the State Board approved changing the last two designation names at the December Board meeting. There are four indicators in a holding pattern. The Board will need to take action on the Fine Arts Indicator and that could occur in March. At the February meeting, they will be reintroduced to the P2, Elementary/Middle, and college and career indicators again. There are many questions from stakeholders regarding P2 and Elementary/Middle. On October 24, the Department of Education gave deadline for changes to the accountability system that would change summative designations. If we are just changing names, we do not have to submit an amendment. They included information on indicators that are not yet finalized. In 3 or 4 cases, they indicator was not in existence in any

way. We are still getting clarity on if we need additional public comment. We will need to submit a formal amendment to what the final indicators will look like. Ms. Clementz is revisiting the meta indicators and what they will look like.

Mr. Broom asked what year the indicators would take effect. Ms. Clementz stated this will take effect 2022. Based on 2021-22 data but on report card 2022.

Ms. Boucek asked if the committee needs to resubmit a position letter in February. We had significant concerns regarding the indicators. Dr. Helfer stated the IBAM piece and letters from chairs would be important information for the Board to have. Ms. Boucek will go back to try and locate them and reach out to other organizations for their input.

Ms. Boucek asked if any group opinions changed on the P2 or Elementary/Middle indicators. What work has been done on those two indicators? Have we been collecting data on it? Dr. Helfer stated the Board does not want to ask districts to collect new information. The Board did not want to burden districts and wanted to look at existing data. Ms. Clementz stated the preliminary work has been done such as what kind of grading systems exist and how does the reporting line up in SIS. Trying to understand the nature of the data we have is as far as we have gotten in looking at the initial data.

Ms. Boucek asked where the percentages went for the three indicators since they were not included in the current report card. Ms. Clementz stated they were supposed to take on weight and they simply remained at 2018-2019 weights. Ms. Boucek asked if that is where we will stay and do the feds agree with that. Ms. Clementz concurred. These meta-indicators will be looked at through the TAC (Accountability Technical Advisory Committee). They are there to give technical advice, but IBAM leads the vision and values. Combining these two groups is imperative. If we are revisiting the meta indicators, we want to bring that to TAC. TAC has had one meeting in December and all last year around evaluating effectiveness. Did this do what we thought it would do? There were lots of good discussions.

Ms. Mannen asked what the drop-dead date for amendments was and what does a timeline look like. Ms. Clementz stated they have to be submitted by February with Board approval in January. Public comment happens months before. This begins in March or April a year prior.

This is due to the USDE timelines. They work at the speed of government. We can submit an amendment at any time, this timeline is to guarantee approval by the next school year. This is something we can project plan out and have a reasonable timeline.

Ms. Boucek stated the Fine Arts indicator is further along than the P2 and Elementary/Middle. In February, the Board will the Board be re-introduced to Fine Arts? Dr. Helfer stated they will be reintroduced to it, they will discuss it, but it is unknown what they will do with it. Nothing changes the areas of P2 and Elementary/Middle, and College Career. They have already been approved by the Board. They need to deliberate on Fine Arts and take action. They were not ready when they were newly seated, and they will be re-introduced to it. It is unknown what they will do with the three indicators for another Board approved them. Ms. Boucek asked if this group wants our letter to stand or does someone need to testify at the Board meeting. Normally we do not testify, but a letter goes forward. The Fine Arts letter is detailed; we do not know what the Board will do with the other three. Mr. Hilgendorf asked what the indicators consist of. Ms. Clementz stated it is in the April 2018 Board packet and it was forwarded to the group.

Ms. Boucek asked if the Board will look at this first in March. Dr. Helfer stated the Board will hear about them in February and it is unknown what they will do in March. Ms. Morris asked if they will take public comment again if it is opened again. Dr. Helfer needs clarification from Department of Education in order to answer that question.

Ms. Boucek stated that part of President Trump's directive to Betsy DeVos, United States Secretary of Education, is to pull back on Federal oversight to K-12 education and institute a study as to where that impacts. Do you see this going anywhere? Mr. Hilgendorf stated it depends on the elections this year. Dr. Helfer stated President Trump already took away rules relating to accountability. An August 28th letter regarding Perkins stated they will not be doing rule making for the Perkins law. It is really unknown.

It was asked what the leading indicators are. What are some things that might tell us a district or school is on the right path? Ms. Clementz stated the first step was to look at what schools have noticed a large change in an indicator or in their overall index score. TAC is helping with the analysis and they are trying to look at what is meaningful or not. The trend on leading is on bad behavior and grades. Mr. Hilgendorf asked if any of these indicators reference that.

Ms. Clementz stated it depends where you look. Those things contribute to what you finally see. Growth is showing up when there are significant changes in adult practice. We need more data to fully understand.

Mr. Roche asked what the timeline is regarding qualitative piece. Ms. Clementz stated she is currently serving a dual role as two directors, that is where time and effort will go there once time is freed up. There is not currently a specific timeline due to unknown capacity. Mr. Roche stated we are ultimately trying to see what is working and then see what is being done differently at the school level and apply it accordingly. Ms. Clementz agreed and understanding the context is important. Not everything can be scalable.

V. Discuss and Review Potential Additional Indicators

Ms. Boucek asked if IBAM would like to make a formal request to ISBE to open the indicators. With the Board meeting being February 18 and the next IBAM meeting on Feb. 5, let us reach out to our stakeholders and get feedback and regroup on the 5th. We need time to look it all over. On the 5th, we will talk about individual group positions on P2, Elementary/Middle indicators, and College and Career Readiness. We did not have significant issues regarding College and Career Readiness and the Fine Arts letter is already in place. Ms. Mannen stated that is a good plan. Are we responding to what was previously approved by the Board previously or what was recommended by the P2 and Elementary/Middle committees? Ms. Boucek stated it will be based on the Board's previous recommendation and the ultimate recommendation might be that it needs to be looked at again and go back to the committees to reconvene since it has been sitting there. The Board may just approve everything per the previous Board's actions. It is unknown. Ms. Boucek will compile email with all letters and documents for everyone to review.

VI. New Business

None.

VII. Public Comment

None.

VIII. Adjourn

Mr. Hilgendorf made motion. Mr. Klaisner seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:29 a.m.