

## **Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee**

February 23, 2023 • 2-4 pm

### **Meeting Minutes**

#### **IBAM Members Present:**

Jeff Broom, Chicago Public Schools  
Emily Warnecke, Illinois Association of School Administrators  
Cathy Mannen, Illinois Federation of Teachers  
Diana Zaleski, Illinois Education Association  
Daniel Krause, Illinois Principals Association  
Erin Roche, Chicago Principals Association  
Karl Goeke, Illinois Education Association  
Thomas Bertrand, Illinois Association of School Boards  
Kurt Hilgendorf, Chicago Teachers Union

#### **IBAM Members Absent:**

Mark Klaisner, Illinois Association of Regional School Superintendents  
Alicia Geddis, Danville School District 118

#### **ISBE Staff Present:**

Dana Kinley, Executive Director for Center of Systems of Support  
Christine Paxson, Director of ESSA/IL-EMPOWER  
Amy Hyde, Administrative Assistant for Systems of Support and Regulatory Services  
Rae Clementz, Director of Accountability  
Camilla Stewart, Principal Consultant, ESSA/IL-EMPOWER  
Kathy Moesch, Principal Consultant, ESSA/IL-EMPOWER  
Shante Shen, Principal Consultant, Accountability  
Carolina Fabian, Director of Family and Community Engagement

Welcome and roll call was at 2:05 p.m., and a quorum was present.

ISBE staff introduced themselves.

Mr. Bertrand made a motion to approve January 2023 minutes and was seconded by Mr. Broom.

Ms. Mannen framed the meeting direction:

- Continued discussion and development of recommendations pertaining to more rigorous needs assessment for schools in Intensive support.
- Introduction, discussion, and development of recommendations pertaining to standardized progress monitoring metrics and public reporting requirements on leading performance indicators.

Ms. Mannen asked the group to provide thoughts and questions on the data review that was sent to the committee from ISBE on demographics of the Comprehensive schools and what tiers they fell under in Evidence-Based Funding (EBF).

Mr. Bertrand suggested that the committee be mindful that many of the schools in status are in the same district. What does it look like for districts that have multiple schools that don't exit status?

Ms. Mannen stated that we don't want to do things that increase the burden through reporting or other requirements.

Ms. Warnecke stated that she echoes Mr. Bertrand's comment. If this information is going to be reported at a board meeting, then it has the potential to be reported on multiple schools within a district at the same board meeting. Ninety-three percent of the schools are designated as Comprehensive or Tier 1 and Tier 2. Ms. Warnecke looked at the data to see that all but two schools from cohort Report Card 2018 (RC18) are still Comprehensive or Tier 1 or Tier 2 in RC22.

Ms. Zaleski said there might be additional data to add that could be helpful. We could look at what goals and targets, per the accountability indicator, are schools not meeting to see if there are some patterns.

Ms. Clementz stated there will be a pattern of low performance indicators across all of the schools.

Ms. Zaleski asked if there was a way to drill down farther and find specific trends within.

Ms. Clementz stated yes.

Ms. Goecke stated he wondered if part of this should be prioritizing the indicators.

Mr. Kraus stated that was a great suggestion and wondered if the needs assessment could help to tease that out for each school so that the IBAM Committee could distinguish it from their data.

Ms. Mannen asked about the student demographics data for schools in Tiers 3 and 4 of funding and how that compares to their districts overall.

Ms. Clementz stated she was taking note of the data request. The question is, does ISBE have the capacity to accommodate custom analyses with the new administration at ISBE?

Ms. Mannen stated she recognized there was a lot of transition with ISBE and the new administration.

Mr. Roche stated he would be curious to see elementary school versus middle school versus high school. Break down those numbers to see if there any regional differences there or in terms of enrollment, as well to see if there is an over or under representation.

Ms. Mannen stated she was wondering the same with her question with the schools that are in Tiers 3 and 4. Is there an over-representational issue with which schools were in Comprehensive status versus the rest of the district.

Ms. Clementz asked the committee what data will genuinely help you make a decision about what should be in the needs assessment and the connection between the data request and the decision you are trying to make.

Ms. Mannen stated for her it was about equity. There could be some equity questions pertaining to resources and student population that could influence recommendations by the committee.

Ms. Zaleski stated that members have been asked how we might modify some the processes and that has to do with specific goals and targets the schools are trying to reach. So having some more information about that could be helpful as we think about modifying the processes.

Mr. Goecke stated he echoes Ms. Zaleski's and Ms. Mannen's comments about equity and modifying processes. Since we will always have a percentage of schools in these categories, how can we lift the schools out to let other schools in? How can we make the public schools more of an equalizing force in our society as opposed the having the same schools rotating in and out of status again and again? He wants to have a focus on continuous equity.

Mr. Roche stated the connection between elementary school, middle school, and high school might be worth figuring out as a pipeline. If you do a heavy investment at the elementary level, in a few years you should see a difference in that feeder middle school and a few more years in the that feeder high school. Where do we put the limited resources -- elementary, middle, or high school?

Ms. Mannen transitioned the conversation to the needs assessment and two questions that were asked at the end of the January 2023 meeting:

- What do we want the needs assessments for intervention schools to accomplish? If it works the way we would want it to work, what would that look like?
- What are the barriers that have kept schools at the Comprehensive support level with the Every Student Succeeds Act and No Child Left Behind? What way might we be able to make recommendations through the needs assessment that could help schools that don't exit status?

Mr. Goecke stated it would identify a school's strengths and weaknesses, and he would want to see it prioritize things that are most easily affected so it can turn areas of concern to opportunity. Identify the strengths the school has so it can continue to build on those.

Ms. Mannen stated she likes the idea of prioritizing and building on strengths.

Ms. Zaleski stated that requiring increased detail for data reporting requirements might make the progress monitoring process more rigorous and focused. Ms. Zaleski stated she was looking at ISBE on the continues school improvement process and there is an optional template that schools are using to identify their goals. She said she is thinking about how we could require additional details or have there be a required template instead of an optional template for documenting goals and thinking through that process.

Mr. Hilgendorf asked of the schools that have gone through the process, is there any feedback about what has been useful in the process with successful schools and things we would want to have other schools do?

Dr. Paxson stated that the IL-EMPOWER team meets with Comprehensive schools once a month. She then explained the optional template is for local autonomy, but it has all the requirements ISBE would want to see in a robust and very thorough School Improvement Plan. Dr. Paxson stated we have received very positive feedback, especially with the building of the guidance on the ISBE website. Dr.

Paxson stated we have practitioners review the guidance and webpage and give their feedback on unintended gaps and where we can continue to grow.

Ms. Warnecke stated Mr. Hilgendorf has a good point about feedback from the field and asked what the trends are with schools that exited a designation. That could be helpful for schools that don't.

Dr. Paxson stated no, she cannot put her finger on one area, but there has been recognition that some of the School Improvement Plans were a bit of a miss from the onset. The focus was not where it needed to be. Schools in the field are wanting to reset their School Improvement Plans because they feel their original plan was missing the target.

Mr. Goecke asked if that was information committee members could get? What are the commonalities? What are the success stories and is there a way to report where schools were successful? These could be informational as far as making decisions.

Mr. Krause stated that he stepped back as to what the IBAM Committee's role is. His school has been previously in status, so he welcomes the opportunity to do a needs assessment to identify areas of strength and opportunities. But from there, the reflective practice internally is what is going to cause substantial change within his specific building. What works for one school may not for another. Mr. Krause stated he would modify to fit his population, needs, etc. That's what we love about the individuality and local control of what we have within our schools. Mr. Krause stated he was all about best practices but is not sure that is a role for the IBAM Committee as much as it is for the committee to determine what is the process and procedures, we want each school to go through as they conduct their needs assessment. Trying to target where the needs are -- there are a couple of key indicators for elementary and middle schools and there is one key indicator for high schools. The component of internally reviewing your own data and owning it is in contrast to us wanting to apply universal practices to multiple populations. Where does the IBAM Committee step into that? How does IBAM best get a newly identified school started on its process. You own your data; you own what works best in your school. As the leader of that building, that is your responsibility. Some the suggestions and questions are the role of the principal and the school improvement team in that building to conduct that process, not for IBAM to universally apply measures. The EBF data is powerful to see, but that is a different conversation for the legislature so lawmakers can see the value and continue to fund that fully.

Dr. Kinley stated over the last 2.5 years IL-EMPOWER has shifted to focus on building the capacity of local school leaders to lead effective school improvement practices. IL-EMPOWER's mission has been to provide resources that are evidence-based practices for districts to use at the local level.

Ms. Mannen stated since the IBAM Committee was created in 2015 there is intersectionality. Do we have an opportunity in this next round to make recommendations pertaining to how we can get increased resources or how the state can go about getting increased resources to the schools that are in intervention status? Not a question we have to answer today, just a broad wondering to put in this space. We recognize that IBAM is in an advisory role, and we represent almost every practitioner in the state of Illinois. We might have an opportunity to make a statement to the state about what we would like to see lawmakers do to increase the resources going to schools that have been under-resourced for decades.

Mr. Bertrand stated we need shine the light on the fact that the schools remaining in status tend to be Tier 1 or Tier 2 for funding.

Ms. Mannen stated in listening to the conversations that a few things have risen to the top of moving IBAM toward making recommendations:

1. Prioritizing the needs assessment.
2. Where should schools be targeting those needs and how does that connect to the School Improvement Plan?
3. Frequency of when school are doing data reviews and what that means as far as action steps for them.

Dr. Paxson stated schools use the Illinois Quality Framework Supporting Rubric (IQFSR) and Chicago Public Schools (CPS) uses the School Excellence Framework (SEF) for their needs assessment process during the planning year only and do not go back and revisit each year. They then use other data sources as a part of the process to determine the priorities that then become part of the School Improvement Plan.

Ms. Warnecke asked a clarifying question pertaining to procurement.

Dr. Kinley stated procurement itself is about the service of facilitating around the instrument. Right now, the instruments that we recognize are the IQFSR and the SEF and we are not planning to change the actual instrument. Rather, we want to provide technical assistance to school leaders and their school improvement teams about how to conduct a quality needs assessment that will yield the type of reports and engagement with staff and community to truly inform the development the School Improvement Plan. The procurement is about service of helping school leaders implement a school-level needs assessment.

Dr. Kinley clarified the IQFSR, and the SEF should already incorporate those things in state statute, and this is an area we need to shore up so there is alignment between what the state language is requiring and the process that we fulfill. If there are any gaps in between, then those need to be fixed.

Dr. Kinley stated the IQFSR was not designed as a needs assessment. The IQFSR in its standard state doesn't fulfill the true need. Dr. Kinley stated she hopes that the IBAM Committee will look at those and make some recommendations on what we do as a state policy -- do we want to stick with the IQFSR as that foundation? Chicago has used the SEF in the past and Dr. Paxson learned recently that has changed. The SEF was not meeting the intended needs. She thinks there might be an opportunity to look statewide as to what is and is not an effective needs assessment?

Mr. Bertrand stated we may want to circle back to the IQFSR and have a conversation around the gaps and whether this is a suitable needs assessment or not.

Ms. Mannen agreed and stated that there was feedback from the field the first year, but nothing since.

Mr. Broom stated if we are trying to figure out what a more rigorous needs assessment looks like, does the baseline needs assessment need to be improved upon?

Mr. Bertrand stated that the process becomes more scripted the longer a school remains in status, but within that scripted process there still needs to be local control.

Mr. Krause stated the process to develop a plan can be prescriptive and can be directed in what area schools should emphasize and focus on, but what is the turnover in school leadership and what impact does that have? The analysis of the data is vital so whatever tool is utilized, it should be an ongoing reflection.

Mr. Bertrand stated schools end up with a School Improvement Plan that is focused on inputs and outputs as opposed to student outcomes.

Ms. Mannen asked if the plan were focused on student outcomes, wouldn't there need to be back-mapping as part of the process to influence that change in outcomes? The inputs are the resources, staffing, supports, curriculum, etc. Need to identify where to prioritize the resources.

Mr. Goecke stated that he understands what Ms. Mannen is saying.

Ms. Mannen stated we have some decision points around what our recommendations would be for what should be required in the needs assessment process and school improvement process. Where are the flexibilities within that process that still honors local control and capacity of the school and school improvement team?

Mr. Kraus stated Ms. Mannen captured it well and asked if the needs assessment is the analysis of the school's Report Card indicators. Good, bad, or indifferent -- that is what puts a school in status. EBF is linked to it, but it's not the cause. The indicators are the result of the school being in status. What indicators caused a school to be identified as Comprehensive or Targeted and what do you know about the practices in place during that time? What practices are you modifying/adjusting? What barriers do you see and what is your plan moving forward?

Mr. Bertrand clarified Mr. Krause's statements as developing a needs assessment around the school's Report Card.

Mr. Roche stated he would be encouraging a deep into the 5Essentials Survey as a needs assessment as well as the Report Card about what is working and not working.

Ms. Mannen stated there was lots of 5Essentials data to be used and asked Mr. Hilgendorf for his comments.

Mr. Hilgendorf stated that the flexibility of local context is important in terms of trying to do a needs assessment. What kinds of things have we seen in other parts of the state -- as guidance -- for schools to be better informed? Schools are being asked to exit a status without the entire suite of tools at their disposal. Having resources really matters, and one thing that really matters is stability in the schools. There is school that will go through the entire cycle and the name of the school being reported will remain the same, but the people inside will not. In addition to the 5Essentials conversation, we need to think about the stability of the school regarding change in administration, faculty, support staff, student body, etc. Are there questions on the needs assessment that address school stability?

Ms. Mannen stated the next meeting was in April and asked if anyone would be willing to be a part of a three-person team that would bring back to the committee a set of potential recommendations a few

weeks after the April meeting. Mr. Kraus, Mr. Roche, and Ms. Mannen volunteered to be on the team. Ms. Mannen then shifted the conversation to the work of Mr. Bertrand and Ms. Warnecke in December.

Mr. Bertrand and Ms. Warnecke provided a summary from their work on future recommendations to ISBE. The information would need to be consistent so ISBE would be able to collect the information.

- Board training that Illinois Association of School Business Officials could help provide to board members who are responsible for resource allocation and policy.
- Reporting and frequency to be delivered to the board members to see progress throughout the school improvement work.

Mr. Bertrand stated that we must keep in mind there will be multiple schools within each district and how that affects the cadence of accountability, the expectations, and keeping it simple reporting to the community and board.

Ms. Mannen brought up Mr. Goecke's concerns about how it looks like school and staff are blamed and shamed at board meetings.

Ms. Zaleski agreed that we must maintain the integrity of identity and support as opposed to rank and punish of the past.

Ms. Mannen stated we must be intentional about multiple schools within one district when making recommendations and asked if there were ideas of what this look like in practice.

Mr. Bertrand asked how do we better prepare boards to develop a cadence of accountability and a focus on student outcomes?

Ms. Zaleski stated there are multiple districts where there would be multiple schools. We don't want principals and teachers within those schools that are being reported on to feel they are being compared and pitted against each other.

Mr. Bertrand stated there is a training component for the boards for a better understanding of the Report Card and 5Essentials, so we are not misrepresenting outcomes when talking at the board level in a public forum.

Ms. Mannen stated there was some intersectionality with the board training.

Mr. Bertrand stated the key was boards of schools in status need to be focused on student outcomes.

Ms. Mannen asked, would a school be able to utilize local/classroom-based assessments as part of its ongoing reporting?

Mr. Bertrand stated yes if you are focusing on student academic outcomes.

Ms. Zaleski stated states that we feel like this has been discussed.

Dr. Kinley stated IL-EMPOWER requires schools in status to have a local benchmark assessment, and ISBE just started collecting that last year.

Dr. Paxson stated it was very diverse as far as what everyone uses.

Ms. Warnecke asked if schools could report whatever school assessment data they are using, understanding that every district might be using something different.

Dr. Kinley stated diversity of local assessments is so great we could not collect and analyze that data without hiring someone to do that work. ISBE would not collect any local assessment data, but IBAM can recommend that schools report that local assessment data to their boards in addition to their state assessment.

Ms. Mannen stated this was what the committee discussed -- report to the local board versus report to ISBE and the recommendations Mr. Broom and Mr. Roche brought forward for leading indicators.

Mr. Broom confirmed.

Ms. Mannen asked Ms. Hyde to share the documents from the December work with the committee again as a refresher.

Mr. Goecke asked if the reporting to the board could be part of the consent agenda, or does it have to be a monthly live presentation?

Mr. Bertrand stated that whole process would need to be developed, and that is not an area of expertise or interest to boards.

Mr. Kraus stated that reporting can be done to the board monthly but could be determined by the school or district how that happens.

Ms. Clementz asked about the monthly reporting and asked if it would be a quarterly reporting instead.

Mr. Bertrand stated there was going to be a lot of looking into what this training and reporting out will look like.

Ms. Mannen asked Mr. Bertrand and Ms. Warnecke if they would be willing to take their initial recommendations on reporting requirements to the next level for the April meeting and asked Mr. Goecke to assist.

Dr. Kinley asked a clarifying question regarding the amendment and the reporting requirement was for three times a year -- beginning, middle and end.

Dr. Paxson stated that that aligns better with local benchmark assessments.

Ms. Clementz stated the burden would be a bit easier to manage.

Ms. Mannen stated that burden was something discussed earlier. We have some next steps in place between now and the April meeting for more specific detailed recommendations. Ms. Mannen asked that those recommendations be available to the committee two weeks prior to the April meeting for review.



Ms. Mannen asked Ms. Hyde to read back the data request from the beginning of the meeting.

Ms. Hyde provided an overview about what the data requests were.

Ms. Mannen stated specific recommendations for needs assessment and what the process would look like. She asked that committee members start conversations on what we would want to see in the board training. That will be a focus in the April meeting.

Mr. Goecke stated he would like members to take unintended consequences from the field because of the accountability system to their respective groups and discuss.

Ms. Mannen asked the IBAM members to have discussions about unintended consequences around the accountability system and asked if there was an action attached to that for the committee.

Mr. Goecke stated he would just like to hear more before suggesting an action item and it is a concern he has.

Ms. Mannen made a note to discuss with Mr. Bertrand and work this into the group.

Ms. Mannen called for public comment; there was no public comment.

Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Mr. Bertrand and seconded by Mr. Goecke.

Meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

*Next meeting is from 2-4 p.m. on April 20, 2023, via GoTo Meeting or the Vcon room at ISBE Springfield/Chicago offices.*