ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
4th Floor Board Room
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Special Board Meeting

<u>July 14, 2004</u>

Conference Call Access Number:
1-866-297-6391
(Public Listen Only Line)

<u>SCHEDULE AND AGENDA OF MEETING</u>

<u>Wednesday, July 14, 2004</u>

4:00 p.m.   A.   Call Meeting to Order/Roll Call

            B.   Award of a Contract for the Implementation of the State-wide Student Information System

            C.   Closed Session

            D.   Adjourn

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
100 North First Street
4th Floor Board Room
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Wednesday, July 14, 2004

Call Meeting to Order/ Roll Call	The Chair, Dr. Janet Steiner, called the July 14, 2004 meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. She then requested that the roll be called. A quorum was present. MEMBERS PRESENT: Richard Sandsmark Dean Clark Ronald Gidwitz Joyce Karon Gregory Kazarian Janet Steiner Dr. Steiner stated that the Board would discuss and act upon one agenda item: the IBM Student Information System Contract.
Implementation of IBM Student Information System Contract	Dr. Steiner requested a motion to approve the IBM Student Information System Contract. Dean Clark moved that the Illinois State Board of Education approve the implementation of the statewide Student Information System contract between the Illinois State Board of Education and International Business Machines (IBM) and authorize the State Superintendent to execute said contract. Richard Sandsmark seconded the motion. Dr. Steiner then allowed discussion on the motion. Joyce Karon asked about the timeline with regard to when the system would go into effect. Dr. Schiller stated that the system should have been in effect a year ago. According to the Superintendent, the agency intends to expedite the implementation of the Student Information System in order to have a fully operational system by the 2006-07 school year. This will place ISBE in compliance with meeting the requirements of the NCLB Act and help us improve the process of data collection related to each student. Dr. Schiller stated the deliverables and the timelines have been worked out between IBM and ISBE with regard to the tests, the status of the projects, designs, requirements

and the phased-in payment schedule. In addition, Dr. Schiller said that the implementation of the system was coming at the same time as the agency proceeds to track and mark the new assessment program that should come online in 2006 so that we can have the kind of longitudinal studies. He proclaimed that economically the system would work out well as it will cost $2.30 per student to run.

Ms. Karon inquired as to the timeline for school districts' requirement for submitting information or data. Dr. Schiller said there will be a developmental interface period in which the school districts, the Project Manager and the agency are going to interface. Dr. Schiller requested that Clay Slagle and the Project Manager from IBM come forward to speak more about district interfacing and interaction. Dr. Schiller requested the IBM representatives introduce themselves. The IBM representatives present were: Howard Hammel, Project Manager, Kirsten Schroeder, and Jamie McQuirt. Ms. McQuirt spoke about the phases over 3 years and how the Student Information System, in conjunction with IBM, will develop and implement the tracking system that will help districts to provide more accurate student information for state assessments used for the Report Card.

- Phase I of the project (school year 2004-05), will involve two pilot projects with a consortium of selected districts, vendors that support their local student information systems, ISBE Student Assessment staff and ISBE testing contractors.

- Phase II (school year 2005-06) will expand Phase I activities statewide, building on the lessons and experiences gained during the Phase I pilots.

- Phase III (schools year 2006-07) will focus on integrating existing special education and career and technical education student systems into the ISBE SIS, and building interfaces to other ISBE systems.

Dr. Schiller asked how this integrates with school districts that might have systems with some kind of identifier. Mr. Hammel responded by stating that IBM will conducting a survey of what packages the school districts currently have in place. Once IBM has identified these school districts, they will meet with the vendor to see what they need to do to interface with them. IBM will then meet with

the vendor and school districts in the endeavor to import an Excel spreadsheet. Ms. Schroeder of IBM then proceeded to give more information for moving data from school district to the state agency system. She said IBM has worked with several national organizations to define a standard format for the importation of data. Mr. Kazarian suggested that a board summary be created that would detail the objectives of this contract along with the timeline of the deliverables. He also suggested a report be given to the Board with regard to the progress of this system. Dr. Schiller said that staff begin immediately and set up a timetable and quarterly updates on the progress of the three-year period.

Ms. Karon asked how the agency could communicate information about the system to the school districts. Dr. Schiller responded by stating the agency has informed the school districts of the Student Identifier System in several Weekly Updates to the field. He also asserted that the districts and superintendents will receive information on the system at the Annual Superintendents' Conference on September 21 and 22, 2004.

Mr. Kazarian stated that if he were a local superintendent, he would want to receive the summary the Board was going to receive. In addition, Mr. Kazarian asked Ms. McQuirt what Illinois would do differently than Ohio. Ms. McQuirt responded by stating that Ohio concentrated on instituting a unique identifier for each student and in North Carolina, the focus was on data collection. However, in Illinois, IBM would combine the two efforts. She also stated the unique identifiers for each student has been done for 2 years in Ohio and that 1.9 million students each had a student identifier number.

Dr. Schiller asked about IBM working with North Carolina on another phase. Ms. Schroeder responded by saying North Carolina had about 1.3 million students. She then explained how standard data from each school district was moved up to the state level. She also stated that IBM is in the process of writing programs to take advantage of the data standards and move the data from the school to the state level.

Mr. Kazarian inquired as to how Illinois' experience would differ from the Ohio experience in light of the previous work done with their student data. Ms. Schroeder responded affirmatively by stating that Illinois would

benefit, as many of the glitches have been worked out. She also stated that since having 9 more months to work on this, IBM has gotten wiser in the process and ISBE will be able to take advantage of these benefits.

Dr. Steiner asked if there were anything further questions.

For the record, Ron Gidwitz requested that the Superintendent or someone from IBM give the Board details of the agreement pertaining to duration and cost. Dr. Schiller responded by saying that ISBE and IBM have an agreement for three years at a fixed sum of $5,750,000, with half coming from federal monies out of Assessment and half coming from GRF, with a schedule of payment over a three-year period. He then asserted that a termination clause can also be brought in place within 30 days. In addition, the Superintendent stated that the contract included a delay penalty clause in the event the deliverables are delayed. In conclusion, he affirmed that the fund has been set aside for this project.

Mr. Gidwitz then asked the Superintendent to explain essentially what the agency would be doing with IBM once the contract was awarded. Dr. Schiller responded by saying that the agency would be contracting with IBM for them to develop and help ISBE implement a Student Information System that allows the agency to track student demographics, progress, achievement and a variety of other data from the 880 school districts that may not be at the agency's immediate disposal. Mr. Gidwitz then asked why the agency would want to become involved in such a venture.

Dr. Schiller responded by stating that ISBE must do this in accordance with AYP data, subgroups under NCLB, daily collection for attendance and particularly dropout information because at the moment ISBE has no way to measure any of these matters. Dr. Schiller asserted that at this point ISBE is at the mercy of collecting data as reported by the districts. Superintendent Schiller proclaimed that the system will give not only the bank and wealth of data but the opportunity to be able to transform that data into meaningful reports for policy development and tracking. Dr. Schiller further explained this is kind of a subset of NCLB that without the data and use of the data, then most of the AYP calculations and projections and how schools are doing is then left without the verification much less the statewide centering of the data.

Dr. Schiller then inquired with IBM on whether he had forgotten any further details. Ms. Schroeder added two additional points. She noted that this system will be a better longitudinal tracking of student progress and aggregate data which will enable a better look at trends, which is what AYP is requiring. She also stated that in looking at what other states are doing Illinois is not unique.

Mr. Gidwitz then inquired as to how ISBE arrived at choosing IBM as the preferred vendor. Mr. Slagle responded by saying that the RFP was developed and ranked along a 100-point scale which was subdivided into eight different categories. He further explained that out of those responders, who ranked 90 points or above, IBM was the lowest cost and ISBE successfully negotiated that contract accordingly.

Mr. Gidwitz further inquired regarding when the RFP was posted and whether the eight categories were articulated. Mr. Slagle affirmatively responded. Mr. Gidwitz thanked Mr. Slagle and said that he had no further questions.

Dr. Steiner then asked the Board member if there were any further questions.

Mr. Kazarian stated that the agency has had an issue with respect to which demographic categories and the flexibility of the demographic categories in terms of tracking. Mr. Kazarian inquired of Dr. Schiller how the contract accommodates this issue. He continued with saying that Illinois has the issue with students who want to identify themselves demographically and ethnically in a particular way. Mr. Kazarian inquired as to whether the new system reflects sort of a consensus in the right direction for the agency to handle this issue. Dr. Schiller asked ISBE staff member, Connie Wise, to come forward and respond to Mr. Kazarian's questions.

Ms. Wise responded by saying that this effort would certainly improve data quality coming from the districts and hopefully alleviate any of those problems that ISBE has encountered in the past where a student would code themselves in a certain category and the school would code them in another category. Ms. Wise further explained that this system would eliminate that problem.

Mr. Kazarian then inquired on the flexibility of the identifiers, and on whether a student could identify themselves as multi-ethnic. Ms. Wise responded by saying that multi-ethnic was currently a category.

To confirm, Mr. Kazarian asked if a student identifies themselves as multi-ethnically, then they would be able to identify themselves as such. Ms. Wise affirmatively responded.

Dr. Schiller stated that ISBE sets the demographic and ethnic fields and communicates those to IBM.

In addition, Dr. Schiller stated the Board made a policy decision last February or March pertaining to the determination about multi-racial. Mr. Kazarian concurred with Dr. Schiller's recollection.

Dr. Schiller further asserted that he believes that the design of this system became fluid for the Board to be able to determine the fields of what it wishes to collect and how it wishes to collect it. The Superintendent added that ISBE has to submit a lot for approval through the United States Department of Education and the Superintendent proclaimed that the system is set up to be that customized and fluid. IBM staff agreed with the Superintendent on that matter.

Mr. Clark asked if ISBE chooses to change or add a category, what would be the timeframe for this and would ISBE have to start at step one again or start the process over. Mr. Hammel said that ISBE would not need to start the process over. He said if ISBE were to add a category, the agency would update the table with the new categories, but if students change from one category to another, they would need to have a process in place to do that.

Greg Kazarian asked the Superintendent whether this system identifies the educational experiences of the student and for example, would this system allow me to know that in third grade, I was in this school district and in the fourth grade, I was in another district. Ms. Schroeder responded affirmatively. Dr. Schiller then responded by saying this was an important component given that the mobility ISBE experiences with students and that it will be very helpful in research with regard to transferability, especially drop-out students and students being reported erroneously. It will also be able to follow through on

	where the students are located.
	Mr. Kazarian asked if the system identifies a lapse in education (i.e., the student leaves the state for a period of time and then returns to the state). Ms. Schroeder said the system should be able to identify this information later in the process. She also stated that the student identification number will be in the system for approximately 25 years.
	Chair Steiner asked regarding the turn-around time. Supt. Schiller said that this is a direct on-line input system. Mr. Hammel said that the information would be available immediately.
	Joyce Karon asked about the process if a school district wanted to migrate their information. She wanted to know if there would be any parameters and how soon they would be able to do this. Mr. Hammel said that the survey must be done first. He also explained that there would be lots of technical assistance and guidance available to the districts to make sure they had help with inputting and transferring the data. He said that they would be working very closely with districts to help them on these issues.
	Greg Kazarian thanked the IBM representatives and Chair Steiner apologized for the delay.
Roll Call Vote to Approve IBM Contract	Dr. Steiner then requested a roll call vote to approve the IBM Contract. The motion passed as all members presented voted affirmatively.
Motion to Enter into Closed Session	Dr. Steiner stated that the Board would immediately adjourn to enter into Closed Session. She therefore requested a motion to do so. Ms. Karon moved that the Illinois State Board of Education go into Closed Session under the exceptions set forth in the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois as follows: Section 2 (c) (1) for the purpose of discussion information regarding appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of an employee, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kazarian.
Roll Call Vote	Dr. Steiner then requested a roll call vote to enter into Closed Session. The motion passed as all members presented voted affirmatively.
Adjournment of Meeting	Dr. Steiner stated that the Board would adjourn to go into Closed Session. The open portion of the meeting

	adjourned at 4:35 p.m.
	Please contact the Illinois State Board of Education office in Springfield at 217/782-7497 for an audio tape of the meeting. Respectfully Submitted, _____ Richard Sandsmark Secretary _____ Dr. Janet Steiner Chair