

## Balanced Accountability Measure Committee

Minutes

November 23, 2015

1:00 p.m.

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

Chairwoman Boucek began the meeting at 1:03pm. She asked everyone to introduce themselves for the roll call.

Committee members attending in Chicago:

Sara Boucek  
Mark Klasiner  
Kurt Hilgendorf

Public attending in Chicago:

Ava Harston, Illinois Federation of Teachers  
Bethany Lyke, Illinois Center for School Improvement

Committee members attending in Springfield:

Daniel Booth  
Cathy Mannen  
Karl Goeke

ISBE staff in Springfield:

Angela Chamness  
Katherine Galloway

Committee members participating by phone:

Roger Eddy  
Mary Jane Morris

Kurt Hilgendorf moved that the minutes from the October 23, 2015 meeting be approved as corrected. Daniel Booth seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous voice vote.

Chairwoman Boucek walked the committee through each Standard and Indicator of the Quality Standards/Standards for Effectiveness. She reviewed each step with the committee for feedback.

Standard 1: Continuous Improvement

The Committee discussed the use of the phrase "Professional Learning Community" in Indicator C as one approach to professional development, but some school districts may have a professional learning community by another name. The Committee discussed removing part of Indicator C in order to allow more flexibility.

Daniel Booth pointed out that Indicators A and B should be explicit about whether the indicators are describing the district or the school. Districts typically have a vision and goals, but individual schools may not, but they have levels to reach the students. It may be appropriate to break down the indicators from district to schools.

Sara Boucek agreed with Daniel Booth and will take the question back to the drafters of the Standards to gain clarification.

Cathy Mannen shared her concern regarding Indicator B and how it could be interpreted to create cumbersome systems. In order to keep the big picture in mind to help districts/schools this should be a way for them to see what they are already doing within this process.

Sara Boucek took the opportunity to explain the next steps of the work of the Committee. She explained that during the development of the rubric and guiding document more direction will be given for the Standards and Indicators. She also explained that at this point, the reporting of the Standards will be through the Illinois Report Card.

Discussion ensued that the Committee will have the opportunity to recommend to ISBE that school districts no longer be compared to one another. Instead the Committee could recommend that the school districts are compared to themselves from different points in time.

Karl Goeke expressed that he would like to see collaboration encouraged through the Indicators. Discussion continued amongst members whether that is something to add into the Indicators or if it would be a part of the rubric or guiding documents. In the end, the members decided to keep it in mind throughout the process.

#### Standard II: Culture and Climate

Minor grammatical changes were made in Indicator A. The title of Indicator B was changed to Responsiveness and Supported Instruction. Discussion ensued regarding how in depth to go in the Indicators. The Committee decided that more information will be included the rubric.

#### Standard III: Shared Leadership

Roger Eddy suggested adding collaboration to Indicator B.

Kurt Hilgendorf mentioned that Indicator C only mentions students, but wondered if it should include staff throughout the district who impact students. Roger Eddy explained that the state and national Teacher of the Year groups are focusing on teacher leadership too. The Committee discussed what title to use for other staff, such as teachers or educators.

#### Standard IV: Governance

The Committee added “management and operations” to the title of Standard IV and “policies and administrative” to the Standard descriptor. Roger Eddy suggested the additions to further define the role of effective governance in order to be more specific in the Standard.

The Committee discussed additions to Indicators A, B and C in order to clearly define the roles of school boards and administrations. There was some concern that school boards and administrations don't always work collaboratively, but Roger Eddy pointed out that collaboration should be the standard.

#### Standard V: Educator and Employee Quality

The Committee discussed if “employee” is needed in the title of the Standard, it was decided that it is needed for the larger districts that have operations/maintenance staff that are working in schools.

The Committee discussed what to change the phrase “Professional Learning communities” to in order to include the professional development work that districts are already doing, but are not referred to as Professional Learning Communities. The Committee decided to rename Indicator B to Professional Collaboration.

#### Indicator C

Cathy Mannen raised the question of whether Indicator C is meant to be targeted toward districts as a whole or employees individually, which are two very different perspectives that need to be clarified. Sara Boucek said that she will take that to the drafters at Vision 20/20 to clarify the intent of Indicator C.

#### Standard VI: Family and Community Connections

The Committee discussed changing the title of Standard VI to Family and Community Engagement. Sara Boucek suggested to the Committee that the word “significant” be removed from Standard description in order to not exclude those school districts that are striving for family and community involvement, but aren’t able to get involvement.

Sara Boucek noted the in Indicator B the wording may be encouraging unfunded mandates at a time when proration is a tough reality. The Committee discussed how to define Indicator B differently. They decided to change the wording to, “the district leverages existing resources to [REDACTED] a system of support.

Karl Goeke pointed out that successful school districts meet the needs of the whole-child, they don’t just plan to address the needs of the whole-child.

Angela Chamness encouraged the Committee to notice that financial resources aren’t the only resources. She pointed out that some school districts can be very creative how to meet these needs through partnerships, creative use of staff, peer to peer reviews, etc. The Committee decided to shorten the description of Indicator B and not include the descriptors of a whole-child.

The Committee discussed condensing the description of Indicator C—leaving the specifics to the rubric.

#### Standard VII: Student and Learning Development

The Committee discussed how to change Indicator A so that school districts that don’t practice the New Illinois Learning Standards are still included. The wording was changed to read “established learning standards”.

Cathy Mannen noted how Standard VII aligns with Danielson framework. In the Standard it doesn’t mention teachers specifically, but each of the indicators only point to teachers as responsible for the learning environment. Karl Goeke suggested that the term educators be used to be more inclusive. Sara Boucek suggested speaking with the drafters of the Standards to gain clarification to Cathy Mannen’s point. How does Standard VII connect to Standard V, Indicator C, which is also about evaluation? The indicators in Standard VII are teacher-specific and aligned with the Danielson Framework the way that the others aren’t.

Karl Goeke pointed out that Standard VII is responsible for teacher development solely. He asked how can you hold teacher accountable for all of that.

Daniel Booth pointed out that district leadership are to assist teachers to be able to do these things outlined in Standard VII. There is a connection there in the definition, but successful districts understand it is their job to support teachers to provide teachers resources in order to do Indicators A-D in Standard VII.

The Committee decided to continue the conversation after hearing more from the Standards drafters.

Sara Boucek updated the Committee on the ESEA reauthorization and how it will impact the Committee's work. The federal ESEA reauthorization may be signed into law by the end of 2015, which will require Component 1 to be redrafted to align with new federal legislation.

The work of Component 2 is separate, but still connected to Component 1. The Committee will have to be mindful as the work goes to literature review and then the rubric development stages. Before the rubric is developed, Component 1 will need to be in place.

The Committee decided to move forward with a December meeting even with the changes to the ESEA reauthorization.

Mark Klasiner discussed a pilot program that Regional Offices of Education/Intermediate Service Centers are using for compliance probes for districts. The pilot program is collaborative, supportive and efficient for districts and reviewers, which can reduce the time it takes to review districts and reviewers will be able to review districts more often. Sara Boucek suggested that the Committee may be able to use a similar format for the Standards as the ROE/ISC are using for compliance probes. She also suggested to the Committee that they start thinking about what peer review teams will look like and where they will be housed. She reminded the Committee that there are two other sub-components that the Committee will have to address after the Standards are recommended.

Sara Boucek also mentioned that Illinois may be a leader in the nation on the new ESEA. If No Child Left Behind is removed, states may be responsible for creating accountability systems.

The Chairwoman opened the meeting to public comment—there was none.

The next meeting is scheduled for December 11 at in Springfield and Chicago ISBE Offices via video conference 11am-2pm.

Kurt Hilgendorf moved to adjourn the meeting. Karl Goeke seconded and it passed with a unanimous voice vote. The meeting ended at 3:03 pm.