

Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee

Via GoTo Meeting

March 21, 2022

1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Minutes

IBAM Members Present:

Thomas Bertrand, Illinois Association of School Boards

Jeff Broom, Chicago Public Schools

Karl Goeke, Illinois Education Association

Kurt Hilgendorf, Chicago Teachers Union

Mark Klaisner, Illinois Association of Regional School Superintendents

Daniel Krause, Illinois Principals Association

Cathy Mannen, Illinois Federation of Teachers

Mary Jane Morris, Illinois Education Association

Erin Roche, Chicago Principals Association

Chad Watkins, Illinois Association of School Administrators

IBAM Members Absent:

Alicia Geddis, Danville School District 118

ISBE staff present:

Rae Clementz, Director of Accountability

Dana Kinley, Executive Director, Center of Systems of Support

Christine Paxson, Director of ESSA/IL-EMPOWER

Pamela Krushall, Program Support Specialist, ESSA/IL-EMPOWER & Accountability

Nicholas Heckel, IL-EMPOWER Coordinator

I. Welcome/Roll Call

Ms. Clementz brought the meeting to order at 1:30p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was present.

Ms. Mannen asked that the approval of minutes be added to the next meeting.

II. Today's Focus: "Exit Criteria" & More Rigorous State-Determined Action

- a. Anticipated Outcomes: IBAM Committee Recommendations to State Board
 - i. To define state-determined exit criteria
 - ii. To identify more rigorous state-determined action for schools that do not exit status after four years
 - iii. To identify the types of support and resources needed by Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with schools in improvement status.
- b. Review of Relevant Information
 - i. Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee
 - ii. Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)
 - iii. Historical Perspective of Support from No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to ESSA
 - iv. ESSA Consolidated State-Approved Plan
 - v. State by State Exit Criteria Comparison Report
 - vi. State-by-State More Rigorous State-Determined Action Comparison Report
 - vii. IL-EMPOWER Year 3 Evaluation Report
 - viii. Overview of Statewide Student Data

Dr. Kinley started the presentation by introducing herself and the Center for Systems of Support, which includes Accountability, ESSA/IL-EMPOWER, and Family and Community Engagement.

Dr. Kinley talked about the two policy concepts that are embedded in the law regarding ESSA and asked for feedback from the IBAM Committee. (1) The anticipated outcome will be written recommendations from the IBAM Committee. This will go directly to Board members for consideration when they are ready to adopt state-determined exit criteria. (2) We will also determine what to do with the schools that do not exit status. (3) Identify the types of supports and resources needed, (This will be addressed in a future meeting.)

Dr. Kinley spoke about the intent of the IBAM Committee and the importance of feedback from all the entities and stakeholders.

Dr. Kinley talked about the evolution of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was enacted in 1965. No Child Left Behind followed in 2001; this legislation included accountability for the first time. The federal landmark grant was the School Improvement Grant. No Child Left Behind became the Every Student Succeeds Act in 2015. This reestablished more control at the local school district level. IL-EMPOWER, is the cornerstone grant program under ESSA.

Dr. Kinley spoke about the IL-EMPOWER organizational chart. She explained the funding cycle and how it relates to LEAs and approved learning partners. She would like the IBAM Committee to help determine the exit criteria at the LEA level.

Dr. Kinley talked briefly about the IL-EMPOWER Evaluation Report.

Dr. Kinley talked about the Title I, Section 1003 School Improvement. She discussed current

designations and eligibility criteria for exiting status. ESSA Title I, Section 111(d) School Improvement – the law requires up to four years of status and funding, -; however, with the U.S. Department of Education granted a waiver to Illinois due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which allowed the state to stretch the four years to five. Fall of 2022 will be the first cohort year exit criteria will apply to.

Dr. Kinley spoke briefly about the Illinois Consolidated ESSA State Plan. The plan includes a growth trajectory for students and a strong plan for sustainability.

Dr. Kinley paused for questions.

Ms. Mannen asked for clarification regarding the fall 2022 exit criteria. Ms. Clementz indicated that data would be used from fall 2023, not fall 2022.

Ms. Paxson presented the state demographics. She talked about three states that are comparable to Illinois -- Ohio, Michigan, and Oklahoma. She talked about State Size, Total Districts/Schools, Number of Students, Number of Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools, Number of Targeted Support and Improvement Schools, and Number of Statewide System of Support Staff.

Ms. Paxson paused for questions.

Mr. Klaisner asked about the number of districts and if co-ops were included in the count.

Ms. Clementz confirmed that 852 is the official number of districts.

Mr. Hilgendorf wanted to know if charter schools acted as their own LEA.

Ms. Clementz indicated that the charter schools were included in the 852 districts.

Ms. Paxson said she would look at the data and share her findings at the next meeting.

Dr. Kinley asked Ms. Paxson if the number of comprehensive and targeted schools were correct.

Ms. Paxson confirmed the numbers were correct.

Ms. Paxson talked about the Report of State-by-State Policies. She explained how our exemplary schools compare to other states. Their circumstances are very similar to that of Illinois.

Ms. Paxson paused for questions.

Ms. Clementz shared data on operationalizing exit criteria. She talked about Cohort 18 and the effects of the pandemic. She indicated data used will be from years 2022-23. Schools must be designated as targeted, commendable, or exemplary. She spoke about the Cohort 18 Schools at Risk by Indicator. Mr. Bertrand asked if the schools included were all remote. Ms. Clementz indicated that most were in-person and some remote.

Ms. Clementz talked about the Cohort 18 Schools by 2021 Indicator Rank Count. She shared that

some of the data was promising.

Ms. Clementz talked about ELA Proficiency 2019 to 2021 Difference. She used targeted and comprehensive elementary schools and high schools as examples.

Ms. Clementz talked about Math Proficiency 2021 to 2019 Difference. Again, she used targeted and comprehensive schools as examples.

Ms. Clementz talked about 2021 Elementary Proficiency Rank Frequency, using the same examples for ELA and math with both targeted and comprehensive schools combined.

Ms. Clementz talked about 2021 High School Proficiency Rank Frequency as well as ELA and Math Growth 2021 to 2019 Difference. She shared that there was positive news with both.

Ms. Clementz talked about the 2021 ELA and Math Growth Frequency and Composite 4-,5-, and 6-Year Graduation Rate and shared there were improvements in both comprehensive and targeted high schools. Composite Graduation Frequency – looks like the other data.

Ms. Clementz talked about the Elementary School Chronic Absenteeism. This shows data from 2019 to 2021 compared to 2019 to first semester 2022. This shows improvements as well as declines. High School Chronic Absenteeism, data shows significant improvement at this level. Chronic Absenteeism Rank Frequency, information is very similar to the other rank frequencies.

Ms. Clementz summarized the No Longer Comprehensive Challenges. (1) Indicators and targets used to identify for support are not necessarily the same as indicators used to exit from support, (2) raising the “floor”, - and (3) not a lot of wiggle room. She described the options for how we differentiate support in the second support cycle. On the trajectory of improvement, do we use:

- Raw performance for key indicators?
- Indicator score performance for key indicators?
- Rank?
- A combination of the above?

c. Discussion

Ms. Paxson gave an overview of what the outcomes might look like. More rigorous state-determined action. – might include (1) defining state-determined exit criteria, and (2) identifying more rigorous state-determined action for schools that do not exit status after four years.

Dr. Kinley added that the role of ISBE is to facilitate the discussion and the role of the IBAM Committee is to define the timeline.

Ms. Paxson shared the Google Jamboard, and Ms. Clementz gave a brief tutorial to the IBAM Committee. The Jamboard will be used to capture ideas from committee members for discussion.

Ms. Mannen asked about the additional requirements for exit criteria.

Mr. Broom asked about the number of years a school can be in status.

Ms. Clementz responded that one-third of schools improved status within a year.

Mr. Broom asked for additional clarification.

Ms. Clementz gave an example.

Mr. Roche talked about “raising the floor” and criteria supportive to continued improvement. He also talked about funding being a barrier to change. Mr. Bertrand made a comment and Mr. Krause agreed with Mr. Roche saying there is a link between performance and where a student lives.

Ms. Mannen suggested adding a header to the Jamboard to identify the state’s role.

Dr. Kinley responded to her suggestion.

Ms. Clementz shared Mr. Bertrand’s suggestion on using a peer network and Dr. Kinley agreed.

Mr. Krause shared the process for using peer support.

Ms. Mannen added the peer network should be based on assets not deficits, and not on the use of standardized testing. She said it should be supportive and not punitive. Dr. Kinley agreed.

Ms. Clementz asked about a post that suggested more resources are needed.

Ms. Mannen responded by saying that we must make sure the students have the supports needed to thrive.

Dr. Kinley asked for more feedback from Ms. Mannen.

Ms. Mannen responded she was thinking about what schools need that they may not have.

Mr. Klaisner made a comment regarding NCLB and punitive vs. supportive.

Ms. Clementz asked about new business. She indicated the minutes from our last meeting would be approved at this time.

Dr. Kinley asked what the next steps would be and what the timeline would be for the recommendations.

Ms. Mannen indicated the need for more time for the IBAM Committee to make recommendations to ISBE. She asked if there should be another meeting in April and about the lack of 2020-22 data.

Dr. Kinley suggested that meetings should be held in spring and summer rather than fall.

Ms. Clementz suggested taking a poll for the April meeting.

III. Public Comment

Ms. Clementz asked if there were any comments from the public or IBAM Committee members.

Mr. Hilgendorf asked Ms. Clementz for information in advance of the next meeting.

Ms. Clementz gave a brief update on College and Career Ready Indicators.

IV. Adjourn

Ms. Mannen made motion to adjourn. Mr. Klaisner moved, and Mr. Roche seconded.
The meeting adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

Dates, times, and locations are subject to change at the direction of the chair. Please check <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Balanced-Accountability-Measure-Committee.aspx> for official meeting postings.