Illinois Balanced Accountability Measure Committee

Via GoTo Meeting August 19, 2022 10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. Minutes

IBAM Members Present:

Thomas Bertrand, Illinois Association of School Boards Jeff Broom, Chicago Public Schools Daniel Krause, Illinois Principals Association Cathy Mannen, Illinois Federation of Teachers Chad Watkins, Illinois Association of School Administrators Diana Zaleski, Illinois Education Association

IBAM Members Absent:

Alicia Geddis, Danville School District 118 Karl Goeke, Illinois Education Association Kurt Hilgendorf, Chicago Teachers Union Mark Klaisner, Illinois Association of Regional School Superintendents Erin Roche, Chicago Principals Association

ISBE Staff Present:

Rae Clementz, Director, Accountability Dana Kinley, Executive Director, Center for Systems of Support Christine Paxson, Director, ESSA/IL-EMPOWER Pamela Krushall, Program Support Specialist, ESSA/IL-EMPOWER

ISBE Staff Absent:

Amy Hyde, Administrative Assistant, Systems of Support and Regulatory Services

The meeting started at 10:05 a.m. Ms. Clementz welcomed attendees and conducted Roll Call. A quorum was met.

Ms. Clementz moved forward with the approval of minutes for April, May, and June. She asked if there were any objections to the April minutes. There were no objections. Mr. Broom motioned, Mr. Krause seconded, and the April minutes were approved. Ms. Clementz asked if there were any objections to the May minutes. There were no objections. Mr. Bertrand motioned, Mr. Broom seconded, and the minutes were approved. Ms. Clementz asked if there were any objections to the objections. Mr. Broom seconded, and the minutes were approved. Ms. Clementz asked if there were any objections to the June minutes. There were no objections. Mr. Broom seconded, and the minutes were approved. Ms. Clementz asked if there were any objections to the June minutes. There were no objections. Mr. Watkins seconded, and the minutes were approved.

In the PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Clementz revisited the timeline to exit/intensity status and to recap the previous meeting. She talked about today's meeting agenda as well as the upcoming meetings which will occur on September 13, 2022, October 27, 2022, November 2022, and December 1, 2022. She stated that we must get to board approval by January. The amendments are due to the Department of Education by February 1, 2023. Ms. Clementz indicated the goal of today's meeting is to have something solid to post for public comment in October or early November.

Ms. Clementz asked who is monitoring the progress of these schools?

Ms. Clementz gave an overview of the IL-EMPOWER Theory of Action. She talked about the two intervention categories – actions required by all and, supports & resources offered to all. These are things we can "give" or things we can "require." The three levels of actors are – school, state, and district. She talked about making the needs assessment more rigorous and having common data for the schools. She mentioned safety and acknowledged that things need to change. She talked about the different kinds of financial incentives.

Ms. Clementz asked if there were any questions or comments.

Ms. Zaleski asked if there is documentation on the IBAM website?

Ms. Clementz stated she would post the jam board session on the IBAM website.

Ms. Clementz said the brainstorming has been done so how do we make the ideas work?

Ms. Clementz gave an overview of the Evaluation Framework Aligned to Values. She talked about the strategy. Does this more rigorous intervention address a great need? If not, what is the importance in doing it? Does the benefit outweigh the burden? Ms. Clementz asked what other things might be needed or were missing.

Ms. Mannen responded that some of the questions could be built upon further. Building local expertise and capacity. She wanted to know in what ways the burden could be mitigated and asked the committee for their reactions.

Ms. Clementz and Ms. Zaleski agreed with Ms. Mannen's comments.

Mr. Broom agreed, stating we may want to think holistically about the framework as an additional acceptance criterion for recommendations. Also, keeping an eye on sustainability once the intervention is completed.

Mr. Bertrand agreed, saying that capacity results in sustainability.

Dr. Kinley agreed that this is the mission of IL-EMPOWER, to build capacity of school leaders to implement effective continuous improvement practices.

Mr. Bertrand suggested the question be worded to say how do we build capacity to produce sustainability.

Mr. Krause commented that we look at the core components of the evidence-based funding model. Sustainability requires you to look at your fiscal resources and how you are allocating them.

Ms. Clementz responded that this sounds like something ISBE may require.

Mr. Broom circled back to Ms. Mannen's comment, asking does the strategy address a great need. He thought this question was a little broad because schools that have low performing schools may look the same regarding data but not in their root causes. He wanted to be careful with a one size fits all mentality.

Ms. Mannen asked if there were any additional comments before moving on with the discussion.

Ms. Clementz added a document to the chat for discussion on the topic, requiring an external entity conduct/participate in the "more rigorous" needs assessment.

Ms. Zaleski asked has there been additional discussion regarding the more rigorous needs assessment that would be more rigorous? What additional components would be included?

Ms. Clementz responded yes, the equity audit.

Ms. Clementz asked for feedback on whether a second opinion on the needs assessment is worth pursuing.

Ms. Mannen asked about schools using learning partners with their needs assessment.

Mr. Bertrand made a comment that it does make a difference if the local district has a choice of learning partners.

Mr. Broom asked how they were to use the jam board.

Ms. Clementz said she hoped it would initiate discussion.

Ms. Mannen suggested that there be a diversity of stakeholders represented to see how they are impacted by the policies and practices put into place. To get the perspective of others to include a range of groups such as students, parents, and teachers; by race and gender, which is an important piece of the whole picture.

Ms. Mannen asked that a PDF be made of the jam board and distributed to the committee so there is a record of the discussion. Ms. Clementz responded that it would be sent at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Zaleski asked who would be creating the more rigorous needs assessment?

Dr. Kinley responded by saying that the needs assessment is one example of the more rigorous state determined action. ESSA clearly states comprehensive schools must conduct an initial school level needs assessment and states can require targeted schools to base their school improvement plan on the school level needs assessment also. Based on the external evaluation, this is a point of struggle for some of lowest performing schools. Our external evaluation recommended that we as a state shore up how we do the needs assessment. The biggest gap is the use of data. The core of school improvement begins with the needs assessment. How do we provide a resource to schools that helps them? What is the best way that the Statewide Systems of Support can mobilize what we know is lacking, is support at the needs assessment level? We don't currently have a plan because we are conceptualizing what that would be for our new grantees this fall with the new summative designations. Think of this in terms of a policy and how the needs assessment is accomplished.

Ms. Mannen asked what are the recommendations from the external evaluator, and what is the agency considering as far as what data will be required or prioritized?

Dr. Kinley responded saying IL-EMPOWER currently has the school improvement report which incorporates the required school improvement plan that is approved by the state board of education. There is a process taking place of cleaning up the platform of those reporting protocols over the past year. The data that we currently collect would be in a different format were we take the burden off the school. The initial needs assessment is the Illinois Quality Framework (IQF) for all school districts in the state, except for Chicago Public Schools, which uses the School Excellence Framework. We would not be asking for anything different than we have asked for in the past. Dr. Kinley reiterated that this discussion is not about asking for additional information, but how do we provide the support to help build the capacity of the school leaders to do their own school needs assessment. She acknowledged that the schools are struggling to provide a quality needs assessment.

Mr. Broom asked for clarification of Dr. Kinley's comments.

Dr. Kinley responded to Mr. Broom's question saying that it is not about the content but the process.

Mr. Broom agreed with Dr. Kinley's response.

Dr. Kinley further explained Ms. Clementz question regarding the more rigorous needs assessment.

Ms. Clementz agreed with Dr. Kinley saying the discussion is around what the committee suggested.

Mr. Krause agreed with Ms. Clementz but suggested taking out the words "more rigorous".

Ms. Zaleski asked how the state would contract with the third-party external evaluator.

Dr. Kinley responded by saying the process must be based on the School Excellence Framework and the Illinois Quality Framework, which is recognized by the Illinois State Board of Education.

Mr. Broom asked what are the criteria for the evaluator to make the process more rigorous? Who should be doing the evaluation?

Mr. Bertrand suggested having an option to choose a partner.

Ms. Clementz talked about requiring an equity audit and evidence-based funding alignment audit as a part of the needs assessment.

Ms. Zaleski asked what are the factors that fall under equity?

Ms. Clementz responded.

Ms. Mannen commented that both ideas have value and said that schools could look at their data in different ways.

Ms. Clementz responded to Ms. Mannen's comments.

Mr. Watkins asked if there will be equity audits of the districts in need by ISBE.

Ms. Clementz responded this could be a requirement.

Ms. Mannen asked what kind of supports are provided to new teachers and administrators?

Dr. Kinley asked Ms. Mannen for clarification of her question.

Dr. Kinley explained what policies are currently in place.

Ms. Clementz expanded on Ms. Mannen's question and Dr. Kinley's response.

Dr. Kinley asked Mr. Bertrand to clarify his comment in the chat.

Mr. Bertrand stated policy alone would not solve the issue. He said there would need to be data collection, and asked if exit interviews were being conducted.

Mr. Broom shared his comments and suggestions with the committee regarding teacher retention.

Ms. Mannen agreed with Mr. Broom's comments.

Mr. Krause agreed and offered his comments and suggestions.

Ms. Mannen added to Mr. Krause's comments. She stated that it is important to identify the areas of progress and to continue to build on it.

Ms. Paxson added some points of clarity regarding the needs assessment, elaborating on how the process works.

Ms. Clementz made additional comments and suggestions.

Ms. Mannen offered comments and suggestions.

Mr. Bertrand asked how do you prescribe them until you have the results?

Ms. Clementz responded offering suggestions. Focus on the needs assessment first, look at evidence based funding, and professional development. She talked about categories and buckets for the recommendations.

Mr. Broom asked which are more universal and which are more targeted? Which bucket does each of these fit into?

Dr. Kinley commented saying that one of the requirements of ESSA is parent engagement.

Ms. Clementz suggested reframing it as more real time accountability. Who will the key audience be?

Ms. Clementz asked for feedback on the topic requiring "more rigorous" PD on implementation of IEPs or EL intervention as applicable.

Ms. Mannen commented and offered suggestions.

Mr. Krause suggested that the PD aligns with the needs assessment.

Ms. Mannen made additional comments and suggestions.

Ms. Clementz suggested there be a financial incentive to the peers. She mentioned superintendent coaching and asked for feedback from Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Watkins suggested using the word coaching and not the mentoring.

Dr. Kinley talked about the primary partner program and superintendent coaching offered at no cost to comprehensive schools. She asked the committee for feedback.

Ms. Clementz responded with her comments.

Mr. Watkins offered comments and suggestions.

Ms. Mannen introduced our new IBAMC member, Diana Zaleski, who is with the Illinois Education Association. She asked the committee to introduce themselves.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Bertrand made the motion to adjourn; it was seconded by Mr. Krause. The Meeting ended at 12:03 p.m.