

## Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee

April 29, 2024 • 1-3 pm

Meeting Minutes

### **IBAM Members Present:**

Jeff Broom, Chicago Public Schools

Dr. Daniel Krause, Illinois Principals Association

Cathy Mannen, Illinois Federation of Teachers (In Person – S)

Diana Zaleski, Illinois Education Association

Emily Warnecke, Illinois Association of School Administrators

Kimberly Small, Illinois Association of School Boards

Dr. Mark Klaisner, Illinois Association of Regional School Superintendents

Leonor Torres, Chicago Teachers Union

Erin Roche, Chicago Principals Association

### **IBAM Members Absent:**

Karl Goeke, Illinois Education Association

### **ISBE Staff Present:**

Rae Clementz, Executive Director of Data, Assessment and Accountability

Amy Hyde, Administrative Assistant, Data, Assessment and Accountability

Christine Paxson, Director of School / District Improvement

Nicholas Heckel, Principal Consultant to School / District Improvement

Nicole Combs, Principal Consultant to School / District Improvement

Tiffany Burnett, Director of Accountability

Dr. Tony Sanders, State Superintendent of Education

Dr. Kimako Patterson, Chief of Staff

Ms. Mannen welcomed members; Ms. Hyde called roll.

Ms. Mannen called for a motion to approve corrected February 4, 2024, minutes. The motion to approve was called by Mr. Broom and seconded by Dr. Klaisner. February minutes were approved.

Ms. Paxson provided an update on the listening tour on the Continuous School Improvement Model that the School/District Improvement Department has been conducting. This tour was like the listening tour that was part of the development of the Illinois Comprehensive Literacy Plan last year.

Ms. Paxson stated the purpose of the Continuous School Improvement Model is to effectively summarize the continuous school improvement process so that it can be utilized by all schools at the local level regardless of their designation.

Mr. Heckel and Ms. Combs gave a brief overview of the Continuous School Improvement Model and each of the model's components for both the planning year and implementation year.

- Identify local needs.
- Plan for school improvement.
- Select relevant evidence-based practices and interventions.
- Implement and monitor.
- Examine, reflect, and adjust course on an annual basis.

Mr. Roche stated that it would be helpful to have different models so that schools can see what it might look like and a corresponding rubric.

Ms. Clementz asked, how do you differentiate the role of the districts versus schools? How in the Continuous School Improvement Model do you envision that relationship between district and school?

Ms. Paxson stated the District/School Improvement Department has developed resources that allow districts to think about resources at the district level and where those funds need to be allocated at the school level. There are meetings at the district and building levels to ensure that stakeholders are all having the conversations together so that instead of running parallel, the conversations are collaborative, in efforts to improve our schools.

Ms. Mannen asked, what is the role the learning partners play throughout this process? What does that intersection look like?

Dr. Paxson stated if the discussion is about where they are inserted in this process, it would be under selecting evidence-based practices, because that's where they would enter in and provide the adequate professional development needs to support the goals that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART).

She stated if there will be an opportunity after today to provide feedback via a survey link through QR codes.

Dr. Sanders provided an overview of the assessment and accountability redesign and the direction the agency wants to take. He identified three key problems of practice within the ISBE accountability system:

- The current summative designations are a moving target. ISBE should not be ranking and sorting to the extent that it can get away without ranking and sorting and move toward a criterion-referenced system.
- The commendable designation does not provide clear signals of the need for continuous school improvement. There needs to be a better way to differentiate this category, ideally in ways that directly connect to the kinds of resources that those schools would benefit from as part of our continuous improvement process.
- Who does school Improvement? Who does this fit?

Dr. Sanders stated that effective accountability systems are tied to strong school support, and the new system should ensure that every school is effectively supported. A redesign of accountability should spend more time, energy, and thought on uncovering the root causes of low performance in schools and responding with a combination of evidence-based practices and strategies to direct change. The revision of the accountability system can assist the messaging to educators that systems of support are put in place to help all students receive the best educational environment, not to sanction schools. Every system must provide feedback directly about which pillars of support a school might benefit from or which should be the highest priority.

Dr. Sanders stated his non-negotiables for this work:

- ISBE must do better to differentiate the current commendable band.
- ISBE must transition to a true statewide system of support in which all schools are in a process of continuous improvement regardless of their designation.
- ISBE wants to make sure that whatever it does, it does not require significantly more work on the part of districts.

Dr. Klaisner stated, speaking on behalf of the IBAM Committee, that members have wanted to get away from ranking and punishing, but at the same time, he is excited about this idea of redefining designations, and the

committee would love to come alongside. What Dr. Sanders called non-negotiable have been things that the IBAM Committee would value or have discussed repeatedly. How we renegotiate those or recalculate those designations must be determined and then how that leads to a system of support where all schools are working to get better. Dr. Klaisner thanked Dr. Sanders for taking leadership in this way.

Dr. Sanders also addressed the timeline for doing this work. He is developing a theory of action around the purpose and reasons for having statewide assessments. He also stated ISBE is looking at the current standards that lead to the state having a higher cut score on the SAT than what the College Board currently has set. So ISBE has some assessment work that will likely go first and then on the back of that it will start building out this accountability system. Dr. Sanders is hopeful there can be some significant changes by 2026 working in tandem on assessment and accountability.

The committee and Dr. Sanders continued discussions around the assessment and accountability redesign and direction.

Ms. Mannen asked Dr. Sanders if there any indicators that he's given specific thought to as far as their effectiveness or how they're situated within the accountability plan that he thinks would be important for the committee to be giving consideration to.

Dr. Sanders stated he and Dr. Patterson have had conversations with Ms. Clementz on how growth is measured. ISBE has looked at a couple other states that have shifted a bit of how they do their growth measurement. Dr. Sanders stated he did not have anything firm on that yet, but it's one area to explore as a team. Dr. Sanders stated that there has been a struggle with the fine arts and music indicators and what percentage chronic absenteeism should play within any system of accountability. Those are conversations Dr. Sanders is open to having but does not have any firm direction right now.

Ms. Mannen stated a process she and Dr. Klaisner are undertaking is to identify what the IBAM Committee's priorities should be as it moves through the next couple of years. Knowing that would help the panel further refine where it wants to focus efforts on.

Dr. Sanders asked if there are other things that could be recognized that schools or districts do that are worthy of being on a report card, but there would be some criteria that a school or district might be able to meet to earn (e.g., a commendable designation). Could a school get points for earning a School Resiliency Certification or for having a literacy curriculum that aligns to the Illinois Comprehensive Literacy Plan?

Ms. Clementz stated ISBE is trying to build a different system, a system in which all schools are engaged in continuous improvement regardless of designation. They there would be different design decisions. She said there are absolutely ways that some of those things can be integrated. The first question that must be presented more broadly to all stakeholders is, what is it about the current system that is working and why? What isn't and why?

Dr. Klaisner asked how the IBAM Committee can best help Dr. Sanders and Ms. Clementz take some of these steps forward. Perhaps looking at research, looking at best practices. What kinds of things could help in making recommendations as a committee? He said the committee members would love to be putting their efforts into that rather than working in isolation or a silo and possibly even contradicting some of the work that is ahead. So, if the IBAM Committee can be of assistance or if members have some thoughts about how the committee can set its priorities for the next year so that it's working in concert, Dr. Klaisner said he thinks there's an awesome opportunity here to move forward.

Ms. Clementz stated that the committee needs to revisit the ESSA requirement of ambitious but achievable proficiency goals, and this is an opportunity to rethink what that might look like. She stated she would specifically ask the IBAM Committee to think about how it might consider proficiency indicators specifically in ways that incentivized all schools to be engaged in continuous improvement, regardless of their designation.

Dr. Sanders asked how does ISBE build an accountability system or the Report Card piece, especially if it has a value add. Yes, growth is going to be measured, as is proficiency. What are those things that schools are doing that the value adds that you can report publicly and get credit for?

Ms. Clementz stated there is not a specific timeline for these three phases. The assessment piece is driven by strict timelines to the extent these conversations will be happening in tandem. She asked if there are other important questions members should be asking during this initial listening period?

Ms. Mannen asked, how have historical inequities contributed to the current conditions and how do we ensure that we are addressing these issues from intentionally through a lens of equity to address all those inequities that have gotten the state to this point? There are things that have happened historically and intentionally along the way that have created the current conditions for a lot of schools.

Ms. Mannen and Mr. Broom stated it would be good idea to tie the State Assessment Review Committee (SARC), the IBAM Committee, and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) tighter more intentionally for this work.

Ms. Clementz stated she would like SARC and the IBAM Committee as stakeholders and practitioners to be articulating those values, goals, and solutions, then ISBE will use TAC to guide and advise the outcome that is desired. What is a technical solution to get to that?

Ms. Mannen thanked Dr. Sanders for the update and attending the meeting.

Ms. Clementz provided an update on assessment and accountability.

Dr. Klaisner stated that there needed to be discussion of the priorities of the IBAM Committee. With the discussion of new designations, new school improvement model, a new statewide system of support, what is the work going to look like next year?

Ms. Mannen and Dr. Klaisner discussed the June agenda items and moving to a monthly meeting cycle.

Ms. Mannen called for public comment. There was no public comment.

Mr. Roche made the motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Krause.

Meeting adjourned at 1:51 p.m.