

**Balanced Accountability Measure Committee  
Meeting Minutes**

Springfield - Illinois State Board of Education  
Alzina Building  
100 North First Street  
Videoconference Room, 3rd Floor  
Springfield, Illinois

Chicago - Illinois State Board of Education  
James R. Thompson Center  
100 West Randolph  
Videoconference Room, 14th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois

Tuesday, September 22, 2015  
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Katherine Galloway called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

**Present in Springfield**

Daniel Booth  
Sara Boucek, Chair  
Roger Eddy, Vice Chair  
Cathy Mannen  
Karl Goeke  
Mary Jane Morris

**Present in Chicago**

Kurt Hilgendorf

**Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) Staff**

Amy Jo Clemens (Springfield)  
Katherine Galloway (Springfield)  
Hannah Rosenthal (Chicago)

**Absent**

Mark Klasiner

**On the Phone**

Superintendent Tony Smith

**Opening Remarks and Introduction of Committee Members**

Dr. Smith greeted the Balanced Accountability Measure Committee (Committee) members and the members introduced themselves.

**Committee Procedural Issues: Open Meetings Act and Ethics Requirements**

Katherine Galloway thanked everyone who has turned in their OMA and Ethics training certificates. She will reach out by email to those who have not turned in their certificates.

### **Review and Adoption of Rules of Procedure**

Ms. Galloway asked if anyone had changes to the Rules of Procedure or if they would like to discuss the rules.

*Motion to accept the Rules of Procedure:* Moved by Sara Boucek and seconded by Mary Jane Morris Voice vote. **Motion carried.**

### **Selection of Committee Chairperson and Vice Chairperson**

Roger Eddy nominated Sara Boucek for Committee Chairperson. Sara Boucek accepted the nomination.

*Motion to consider Sara Boucek for Chairperson:* Moved by Roger Eddy and seconded by Mary Jane Morris. Roll call vote. **Motion carried.**

Sara Boucek nominated Roger Eddy for Committee Vice Chairperson. Roger Eddy accepted the nomination.

*Motion to consider Roger Eddy for Vice Chairperson:* Moved by Sara Boucek and seconded by Karl Goeke. Roll call vote. **Motion carried.**

### **Review and Discussion of Public Act 99-0193 and the Committee's Charge**

Amy Jo Clemens thanked the Committee members for their participation. She explained the background of the Committee and said that the Committee will be putting the substance behind the vision of the Balanced Accountability Measure legislation.

Amy Jo went on to explain that ISBE has an ESEA flexibility waiver which has to be approved by the U.S. Department of Education (USED) in order to keep title federal funds. Through that process over the last few years the waiver was approved and ISBE needed to make sure state laws and rules were in alignment with what was approved by USED. As of this past spring, many of the old provisions of No Child Left Behind that were waived were still in State law and rules, therefore there needed to be changes in the law. At the same time, the Illinois Statewide School Management Alliance had been working for over a year to talk about the change and vision of education in Illinois.

Chairwoman Boucek said that the Vision 20/20 group met for about 18 months with different stakeholders across the state and one of the group's subcommittees focused on a differentiated accountability model. The group agreed that it is not ideal to judge all students, teachers and administrators based on one test score from one day. Chairwoman Boucek explained that the Vision 20/20 subcommittee developed a two-tiered system which they then put into legislative form. The result was House Bill 2683, which includes two components: student performance and professional practice.

The components of the legislation are broken down as follows:

Component 1: 30% student performance

## Component 2: 70% professional practice

The professional practice piece will be broken down into 3 parts:

10% ROE compliance with state standards;

30% evidence-based best practices for school districts and individual schools, and;

30% contextual improvement for school district and individual schools to demonstrate improved outcomes through local data

Chairwoman Boucek said that all of this information would come together in a report card form. The Balanced Accountability Measure will be phased-in over 5 years. In the meantime, districts will stick with the one test score, one day model. As the professional practice piece picks up, the school report card will show a snapshot of where the district is meeting or exceeding expectations and where it needs improvement. Component 2 is similar to what teachers, principals and administrators do through their own evaluative work.

Kurt Hilgendorf noted that a lot of the ways for coming up with 70% were tied to some other form of standardized test that was not PARCC, such as MAP. He asked what the vision was for doing something that may be locally-developed that is portfolio-based or is much more of a performance measure than a standardized test that just happens to be given on a different day. Chairwoman Boucek responded that the beauty of the law as it was drafted is that a school's administration can draft whatever AMO it believes is best for that individual school as long as the administration does it in consultation with its collective bargaining unit. It does not have to be based on assessment data. Examples of this were given, including a school in Robinson, IL which has a welding program and is in close proximity of a Marathon plant. The company and the school district have collaborated to create a welding program for students that can lead to employment. The school district in conjunction with local entities is making sure that kids are meeting the need in the community. Chairwoman Boucek also mentioned CPS schools through the work of CTU, as well as Barrington SD 220's business model as examples of great work at the local level. Mr. Booth asked if the local level component has to have a measurement tied to it. Can it be what schools are offering their students? Vice Chairman Eddy responded that he measures a couple things in Crawford County. There is a dual credit program that includes the local community colleges and all four county high schools, and he believes there is a component where students can earn their union card. Students are tracked, so schools can see if they are truant or destined to drop out. The students in the Marathon program have to maintain satisfactory grades in their other courses and good attendance in order to maintain eligible for employment. Mr. Booth emphasized that dual credit opportunities, AP opportunities, attendance rate, and graduation rates are measures.

Chairwoman Boucek broke the work of the Committee down into 3 buckets:

- 1) process
- 2) standards
- 3) tracking

She noted that ISBE will need to determine a funding mechanism in order for the law to be implemented.

Ms. Clemens pointed out that the professional practice component is a great combination of state laws and rules. She highlighted the process where districts look at and report on evidence-based best practices. She also mentioned the importance of determining the local need and having conversations about what needs to be reported. Ms. Clemens added that the last Board meeting was significant in that it changed ISBE's first goal. Superintendent Smith pointed to the different kinds of assessments, portfolios, and projects as a huge opportunity to expand notions of what good looks like, to bolster social-emotional learning standards and to look at the measures of a healthy community in a school (inclusivity, culture, climate, well-being of kids).

### **Determine Scope of Work and Establish Goals & Timelines**

The Committee agreed on the three buckets of work. Chairwoman Boucek would like to see the Committee focus on the standards first.

The next charge for the Committee will be to determine the process of pilot districts, implementation, incentives and a report mechanism among other things. Chairwoman Boucek suggested using a national accreditation program or using the preexisting teams within the ROEs. She said that Committee member Mark Klasiner will likely talk about streamlining some things that are happening in the ROE offices to help with this type of work.

The Committee will need to set resources into place, both monetary and manpower. Ms. Morris brought up data collection and how it will be collected and used. Chairwoman Boucek said that the Vision 20/20 group envisioned this to be a dashboard. The idea of component 1 is that those are the "sit and gets" and a dashboard can report that data. The professional practice data collection will be much different. The components the Committee will have to focus on are how to collect the data, how to look at it, and who will discern what is meeting and not meeting the objectives. In the past, national accreditation and partnering through an RFQ or RFP were considered. The Committee may be able to use suggestions from AdvanceEd and incorporate them into standards that would outline training and data collection.

Discussion ensued on what evaluation would look like. If districts would have individual terms or if teams were compiled from around the state to evaluate districts. Vice Chairman Eddy pointed out that outside teams are valuable because they provide a fresh set of eyes, but they are costly to implement. Immersing a team of 5-6 people in a district takes time. He thinks the value to this contextual piece is that school districts can be honored for what they are doing that benefits their community, children, and employers. As strapped as districts are, they may be very willing to help if they think the system represents their best interests. Release time may be something to think about.

Chairwoman Boucek said that another hurdle the Committee will need help addressing is the difference between Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and the rest of the State. CPS has been working on its own accountability system and the Committee should celebrate that. The Committee may be able to

incorporate the work of CPS and CTU. The Committee should also consider districts that are doing the work of AdvancED and other nationally accredited continuous growth models. Vice Chairman Eddy agreed that there is great potential for sharing best practices.

Chairwoman Boucek highlighted educating administrators. For school districts that have traditionally been high achieving, this kind of data collection could shine light on subgroups that may need more attention. Mr. Goeke recommended a review of what is already happening in districts as a way to make sure that the process the Committee puts in place does not create another layer of accountability but rather allows for identification of opportunities for growth within districts.

Ms. Clemens said the Committee will need to discuss how they are going to evaluate. In some areas there are standards for what teachers do in the classroom, but how they get there is based on best practices, working with peers, and looking at outcomes. If the districts have processes in place that are working for them or maybe need a tweak here and there, that is a much better place to go than trying to start from scratch. Mr. Goeke added that the implementation process is critical. The way this rolls out will affect the value it is given. He recommended presenting the entire vision to support the final product instead of upping the ante year after year.

The Committee may want to hear from Vision 20/20 about standards. Vision 20/20 developed a crosswalk of the best practices, what states are doing the most progressive and most aggressive work, and then wrote goals and indicators. Chairwoman Boucek said she would send the Vision 20/20 materials with the Committee.

Mr. Goeke emphasized the importance of sustainability. The idea of continuous growth is valuable. If the Committee is intentional about the idea of sustainability for their systems, it could lead to a culture of continuous growth. If it becomes sustainable and valuable they will not need incentives. Chairwoman Boucek agreed that continuous buy-in will be important. The report card will have to report, but not everyone is excited about labeling as meeting or exceeding because continuous growth should never happen in a vacuum. Vice Chairman Eddy said that that sustainability comes from existing resources and that getting schools to buy-in will be a key component. He would much rather use resources to assist in school governance than to defend school districts against a model that before would identify them as not performing well based on an assessment. Ms. Mannen said that in discussions about resources, Committee members also need to be mindful of the time commitment for teachers.

Mr. Goeke asked if the review has to be yearly or if it can be multiyear. He thinks this is another way to be aware of resources, especially if looking at long term growth. Chairwoman Boucek said that is the idea behind incentive work. If a school district that is able to show growth, this may be once every 3-5 years. She said the Committee will also have to look at what happens to those school districts that are not buying-in or are not showing continued growth. She does not recommend that the Committee build a system that is harmful to and shames districts. Vice Chairman Eddy suggested that from a sustainability standpoint, the Committee should look at East St. Louis and North Chicago. He said there

has not been real demonstration that the takeover method works. Ms. Mannen agreed that “incentive” raises red flags because the way it actually ends up playing out is not always productive or positive.

Mr. Goeke recommended that the Committee think about reporting out. They are coming out of “test and punish” for so many year. It is common to use labels as opposed to simply stating what is happening in districts. He said he can see this work starting to combat the negative narrative in the media about public schools. He suggested that Committee members think about a “report” as opposed to a “report card.”

Chairwoman Boucek added that the committee will have to be careful because the law was based on the waiver – component 1 – and if ESEA is reauthorized in November, there could be no state assessment. Every district could do something different. She said that to make the work sustainable, they may have to go for legislative change.

There is a huge movement for component 2 in Vision 20/20 and people believe in the continuous improvement work. Committee members will have to be mindful of ESEA. She said that the Committee wants to look at best practices and bring them to Illinois. Mr. Booth said he does not want their work to magnify the haves and have-nots. He agreed that taking the sting out of the report card is a way of just saying this is where a district is. There should always be a goal of growth, of reaching students and moving them forward. The Committee will have to capture that and make sure that districts are not punished for what is happening in other districts. Ms. Clemens agreed that this is a difference between the old-fashioned ABCDF report card and a standards-based report card, which districts are moving to in an effort to show a better picture of what kids know and are able to do. The standards-based report card will give districts better understanding of what they need to do locally.

Mr. Goeke said that whatever they put in place, they have to be mindful that it needs to work for a district of 12 people and a very large district. It has to be transparent and the process needs to be able to be differentiated. Ms. Clemens reiterated the idea of holding tight the standards and best practices. If teachers are expected to differentiate as much as possible, the idea should be applied to the system as well. Chairwoman Boucek suggested the Committee think about PERA, as some of the best rulemaking done in the last 10 years. Vice Chairman Eddy emphasized that how one district achieves success may not be the same as how another does. The flexibility likely to come with reauthorization can allow districts to employ their best practices. He hopes for a model that has a measure of accountability but takes into account differences across districts.

Vice Chairman Eddy said that there is a requirement that sixth month prior to the beginning of the school year objectives must be developed. Chairwoman Boucek said that 2016-17 should be the first pilot and it can be a phase-in. The Committee discussed that they will need to determine the specifics of the phase-in and how to coordinate timing of the rules with the Board.

Chairwoman Boucek reminded Committee members that they will have to think about the legal aspect of giving rules to schools that are piloting. Vice Chairman Eddy suggested that they have preliminary

standards based on evidence and presentations, and during the pilot year they may learn something they want to add. Ms. Clemens said she would like clarification on whether their discussion refers to contextual improvement or whether it applies to all rules. She returned to the discussion of PERA as the best rulemaking, as it was a phase-in process and allowed local decision-making. She supported Vice Chairman Eddy's idea that Committee members have a clear understanding of what they want in the rules by August 2016. She suggested that the pilot groups have a lot of flexibility so they can learn from the process. Chairwoman Boucek emphasized that teachers want their voice to come in strongly when drafting AMOs.

Chairwoman Boucek asked if the Committee has an appointment from CPS. The Committee will need to be mindful that CPS, under the old administration, was working on a comprehensive accountability system, maybe with collective bargaining. They were very progressive and aggressive and may even do an ROE compliance visit. The Committee will need to think about the building level and the district level.

The Committee meeting schedule will be posted online at [isbe.net/bamc](http://isbe.net/bamc)

Chairwoman Boucek said she would like to invite Lori James-Gross on October 13 to speak to standards work. She said she would email the crosswalk as well as the framework Vision 20/20 to the Committee members. Ms. Clemens said they will want to incentivize districts to go beyond the requirements without an incentive. She emphasized district and local choice and said that the crosswalk will show the breadth of what is available for districts to choose from.

Chairwoman Boucek listed some of the best states that are doing this work: New York commissioned with Harvard; West Virginia has had standards for high quality in place since 2011; Massachusetts has essential conditions for school effectiveness; Arizona has standards of systematic school wide improvement; and the Chicago Consortium has essentials for school improvement. All of these standards are evidence-based.

ISBE has draft rules for component 1 which she will send out to the Committee. Chairwoman Boucek reminded Committee members that the Committee was built to have people come in in an advisory capacity, so they can bring people in to speak at meetings. The Committee is subject to OMA so they have to be mindful that they cannot reply-all or have a conversation via email.

Chairwoman Boucek asked if there was a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:14 a.m.

*Motion:* Moved by Vice Chairman Eddy and seconded by Daniel Booth. Voice vote. **Motion carried.**