

Balanced Accountability Measure Committee

Minutes

October 13, 2015

8:30 a.m.

Illinois Education Association-
Chicago
230 W. Monroe St.
Suite 2640
Chicago, IL 60606

Illinois Education Association-Springfield
Professional Development Center
3440 Liberty Drive
Springfield, IL 62704

Illinois Education Association-Carterville
500 E. Plaza Drive
Suite 5
Carterville, IL 62918

Vice Chairman Roger Eddy began the meeting at 8:57a.m. in the absence of Chairwoman Sara Boucek. He asked those in attendance to introduce themselves to everyone.

Attending in Springfield:

Robin Lisboa, ISBE

Donna Flowers, ISBE

Jennifer Garrison, Sandoval CUSD 501, Vision 20/20

Katherine Galloway, ISBE

Cathy Mannen, IBAM Member

Marci Johnson, ISBE

Mark Klaisner, IBAM Member

Amy Jo Clemens, ISBE

Karl Goeke, IBAM Member (arrived at 9:15 a.m.)

Attending in Carterville:

Mary Jane Morris, IBAM Member

Dr. Lori James-Gross, Unity Point CCSD 140, Vision 20/20

Daniel Booth, IBAM Member

Attending in Chicago:

Roger Eddy, Vice Chairman

Sara Boucek, Chairwoman (arrived at 9:27 a.m.)

Ava Harston, IEA

Katherine Galloway called roll. There were five members present constituting a quorum.

Mr. Eddy asked if there were any edits to the minutes from the Balanced Accountability Meeting on September 22, 2015. There were none.

Mary Jane Morris moved to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2015 meeting.

Daniel Booth seconded the motion and it carried with a unanimous voice vote.

Dr. Lori James-Gross began a presentation on the development of the standards by the Vision 20/20 Council. She walked the Committee through the process of developing the standards as well as the crosswalk comparing the standards for effectiveness.

Chairwoman Boucek opened the discussion to questions.

Ms. Harston asked if the indicators are from the Rising Star Standards or if the standards presented are imbedded in the Rising Star Standards.

Jennifer Garrison explained that the standards are a crosswalk with Rising Star in some ways. She explained that there are too many indicators in Rising Star with “busy work”. With the crosswalk they tried to bring out best practices based on the research behind Rising Star. She further explained that the new standards would replace Rising Star.

Roger Eddy asked if the new standards envelop Rising Star indicators in a more comprehensive way?

Jennifer Garrison explained that, yes, when looking at the standards they began with looking at Rising Star indicators and then narrowed it down to more specific indicators of learning. They also looked at other states’ activities. They tried to be consistent with Rising Star and Race to the Top in an effort to bring them together so that they could connect the dots for and around all the various initiatives asked of school personnel.

Roger Eddy wondered if school districts that are currently implementing Rising Star will be familiar with the new standards.

Jennifer Garrison and Dr. Lori James-Gross both answered that yes, it is a streamlined version of Rising Star. It is not a departure from Rising Star; they just condense the standards and make them less repetitive.

Roger Eddy shared that it is important for the group to be aware and sensitive to the fact that some school districts have already put in time and energy into the Rising Star standards.

Dr. Lori James-Gross said that as a superintendent at a Race to the Top school that has worked through Rising Star she feels confident that her team would appreciate the info in these new standards. The new standards are not just trying to check off indicators, but they are more focused on high-quality conversations. She believes it would be an easy transition for her school district to go from Rising Star to the new standards.

Roger Eddy said that it will be important to present the standards to the school districts so that they are not apprehensive of more standards placed on them.

Roger Eddy asked if Standard Three on the handout is red on purpose or if it was a typo.

Lori James-Gross explained that it was an edit to the standards after the July meeting as part of the conversation with ISBE. There were other changes as well, but they are not highlighted in red.

Roger Eddy suggested adding a governance piece specific to school boards because governance for school districts is broader when it starts to include boards. He asked how that is addressed in the standards. He also pointed out that family and community connections are included in the standards, but how are boards included specifically? He suggested that adding standards for school boards would be helpful. He noticed that boards are included in the accountability portion, but he suggested maybe a more direct indicator for boards.

Dr. Lori James-Gross liked Roger’s idea and said that Vision 20/20 did not converse about boards, but thought it was a good idea.

Roger Eddy will ask staff in his organization (IASB) to define what kind of indicators could include boards.

Robin Lisboa asked if there will be a focus on consolidating the indicators. She also wondered how this transition will happen for the field.

Jennifer Garrison explained that they hope to use foundational services through CIP. There have been some high-level conversations about what resources could be available including financial resources. Jennifer Garrison explained that school districts will report through the statewide assessment and dashboard. She further explained that how regional superintendents and review teams could work to review school districts and how some of the work could be done externally to diminish on-site review time.

Amy Jo Clemens explained that the Committee has identified three buckets of work and that this is just first the first step, focusing on how the standards will be built.

Sara Boucek echoed what Amy Jo Clemens said. She explained that the Committee decided to start with the end goal in mind and work from there.

Bethany Lyke explained that the Center for School Improvement (CSI) looked at Rising Star indicators, Race to the Top and the Five Essentials when creating their standards. They heavily focused their standards on turnaround principals and working with lowest performing districts in the state. As a result, they came up with Core Functions Indicators (CFI), which could be used in all districts—not just the lowest performing. She pointed out that the Committee should take into consideration that districts are working with all kinds of different standards. When CSI was developing their standards it was helpful to get feedback from the schools, which helped them to develop really good indicators. As the Committee talks about roll out—keep in consideration that there are 30 school districts that are heavily involved in the CFI and an additional 66 school districts that are involved with CFI.

Sara Boucek explained that the Committee was just made aware the work of CSI. When looking at the crosswalk she pointed out that there is not much of a difference, but this Committee needs to think about that the premise of the legislation was to start tearing down the silos. One of the areas with great success was PEAC group and the development of the rules at ISBE. The rules were a baseline—minimum for best practices. This group needs to make recommendations; will the Committee do something similar to PEAC? She continued that the group should be aware of school districts that are using an array of standards and the anticipation of CPS rolling out a new accountability system as well. The group should think of a way to crosswalk the work.

Amy Jo Clemens agreed with Sara. She brought up Superintendent Smith's relentless pursuit for high quality in order to produce really high outcomes as opposed to a set of standards and planning. We need standards in place to get high outcomes, but it is important to keep in mind as we go through to come up with a baseline, but a lot of school districts have done great work using other high quality frameworks that define a high quality system. Therefore, we need a process that doesn't stop that work, but instead create a default for school districts that need that conversation or need to start a different conversation than they were having before.

Roger Eddy added that it doesn't really matter how school districts get there, but that they are showing the improvement that is necessary and that they are meeting high standards. If it is owned and bought into on the local level, then that is much more important than dictating what must be used. The group should remember flexibility within a structure.

Sara Boucek suggested having conversations about the standards presented and to begin diving into the crosswalk at the Oct. 23 meeting.

Roger Eddy will have his governance staff look at board accountability piece and will have that ready for October 23 meeting and send directly to Sara Boucek and she will forward to others.

Amy Jo Clemens asked to clarify that the group will not be picking and choosing standards and that the standards presented are a suggested default of what the others will align to. She does not want the group to begin comparing standards.

Sara Boucek explained that the standards that were presented are baseline; if anyone has tweaks or additions to bring them forward.

Amy Jo Clemens asked Jennifer and Lora to explain how Vision 20/20 vetted their work.

Jennifer Garrison explained that they group was represented by IPA, IASB, IARSS and others.

Sara Boucek pointed out that the IEA, IFT, CPS and other groups were part of the process as well. They were presented crosswalks and asked for feedback, but have not given any yet.

Ava Harston pointed out that the IFT did provide feedback with the understanding that these are the standards. They aren't looking to change verbiage/actual language, but tweaks to add information regarding the school reports.

Sara Boucek explained that once the Committee recommends standards that they can provide a model and put it into rules. The process part is then to say how to hold groups accountable or how can other standards fit into this.

Jennifer Garrison pointed out that Vision 20/20 did have AvanceEd conduct a crosswalk and all 23 indicators align on the concept level and in the rubric. They did vetting within that process as well to ensure high quality standards.

Bethany Lyke offered her help from CSI to provide feedback and have conversations. Sara Boucek asked for any crosswalk that CSI has to please share.

Sara Boucek pointed out that they would like to continue to maintain local autonomy without adding more stressors at the district level, which is very important for the group to keep in mind. Karl Goeke and Cathy Mannen both agreed.

Jennifer Garrison pointed out that it is important how the standards are presented, that it doesn't seem like something else for the school districts to do, but that it is connected. Messaging and process is important.

Karl Goeke suggested that instead of thinking as the standards as foundational and CFI on top, help school districts understand that they are already doing this work. If school districts are doing this foundational work their CFI work will be great. If school districts are going beyond foundational work, then good for them.

Roger Eddy pointed out that the Advance Ed, CFI, and others have been developed largely because school districts have been identified as poor performing or needing oversight for some reason. There are a large number of school districts that have never been subject to this. As long as school districts can

identify their work within these standards they should be fine. It doesn't have to be a particular model, it just needs to contain the elements of the standards. Some school districts will benefit greatly from the models, but there are some that are already doing the work.

Sara Boucek pointed out that at the last meeting Karl added a 4th bucket—implementation and roll out. It will be important for all of the stakeholder organizations to come together at the time of roll out and support it together. In the past with other roll outs it has been successful when all the organizations come together.

Sara Boucek moved to the next item on the agenda, and she reviewed the meeting dates.

Sara Boucek asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Cathy Mannen inquired about the review of Part 1.

Amy Jo Clemens explained that ISBE staff is still working on the Part 1 rules because of the waiver. Also the Board changed Goal 1 at the September Board meeting, which will affect the rules. At the November or December meeting they would like to have Dr. Smith come and talk about how to have the strategic work align. The Committee will have a chance to review Part 1 before it is taken to the Board.

Sara explained that the work with Component 1 of the model will be put on hold for now based on ISBE's work with the US Department of Education on the ESEA reauthorization. She went on to point out that the Chicago Tribune had an article on the work of the Committee. The Associated Press and smaller news venues picked it up as well. She asked that the group funnel all communications through Amy Jo or herself in order to streamline communications.

The group discussed having talking points or a Frequently Asked Questions document to refer to and post online. Sara will work on compiling an FAQ.

Karl Goeke made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Cathy Mannen seconded the motion and it carried with a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.