ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION POLICY PLANNING DISCUSSION
Board Room, 4th Floor

January 25, 2012
3:15 p.m.
(immediately following previous session)

III. Education Policy Planning Discussion (David Fields, Committee Chair)   3:15 p.m.
(This discussion will begin immediately following the previous session.)

A.   Public Participation

B.   December Education Policy Committee Minutes *(Education Policy pp. 2-3)*

C.   *Discussion of State Model for Principal Evaluation *(Education Policy Planning pp. 4-31)*

D.   *ESEA Waiver Application *(Education Policy Planning pp. 32-34)*

E.   *Growth Model *(Education Policy Planning pp. 35-46)*

F.   District Oversight (verbal update)

G.   Strategic Agenda Update (verbal update)
 1. Common Core Standards and Assessment
 2. Teacher/Leader Quality
 3. Longitudinal Data System
 4. Improving Low-Performing Schools

H.   Motion for Closed Session

 * Items listed with an asterisk (*) will be discussed in committee and action may be taken during plenary
   session.

EDUCATION POLICY PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
<u>**MINUTES**</u>

DRAFT   *Pending Board Approval*

Thursday, December 15, 2011
9:15 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.
Board Room, 4th Floor
Springfield, Illinois

<u>**Members Present**</u>   <u>**Members Absent**</u>
Dr. David Fields, Chair   None
Mr. Jim Baumann (by phone)
Dr. Andrea Brown
Mr. Steven Gilford
Dr. Vinni Hall
Ms. Lanita Koster
Ms. Melinda LaBarre
Mr. Gery Chico

The Education Policy Planning Committee (EPPC) meeting convened at 9:15 a.m.

A. **BOARD MEMBER PARTICIPATION BY OTHER MEANS:** Committee Chair, Dr. David Fields, stated that Jim Baumann was participating by phone per a vote taken at the outset of this two-day meeting. See above for detailed listing.

B. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**

Ryan Swift, Vice President of EverFi, Inc., spoke to Committee members regarding an online learning platform that teaches, assesses, and certifies high school students in financial education. The online tool is a six-hour course designed to support and supplement what is being taught in the class and is user friendly for both teacher and student. Illinois banks and savings institutions can partner with their local high schools to bring this important program into the schools at no cost to the school.

C. **CHARTER SCHOOLS REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:** Darren Reisberg, General Counsel, spoke to the Board regarding 2012 Illinois Charter School Report. The 2012 report will be similar in format to the 2011 report due to insufficient time to promulgate rules and collect appropriate data from the charter schools. The charter schools did receive a form from ISBE (copy provided in the board packet) to provide data to make appropriate changes to the 2012 report. Mr. Reisberg also discussed the Charter Commission meeting on November 15, 2011.

D. **DRAFT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ANNUAL REPORT:** Matt Vanover, Director of Public Information, presented the Board with the Draft of the 2011 State Board of Education Annual Report. There will be additional data added after the first of the year.

E. **DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RACE TO THE TOP PHASE 3 APPLICATION:** Superintendent Koch spoke to the Board regarding the draft Race To The Top Phase 3 application and indicated that if Illinois receives the $42.8 million, half of the money will go to local school districts looking to move aggressively in the implementation of ISBE's reform agenda.

F. **STRATEGIC AGENDA UPDATE** (verbal update)

1. **ESEA WAIVER:** Superintendent Koch indicated there is a very aggressive timeline for the waiver application and briefly spoke about the adoption of a proposal on Growth Model. Susie Morrison and Pooja Agarawal will provide more information on the Growth Model at the January Board Meeting.

    Ms. Morrison updated the Board on timelines associated with the application.. She also indicated staff are seeking input from stakeholders regarding indicators other than math and reading scores, Ms. Morrison spoke about disaggregating ACT reading and math scores, adding the third component of WorkKeys and using Explore and Plan as part of the growth model. She suggested rewarding high performing schools with recognition.

    Chairman Chico recognized Matt Vanover for the communications aspect to the ESEA Waivers.

2. Superintendent Koch mentioned that the Early Learning Challenge (part 2 of this topic) would be discussed on Thursday.

G. **DISCUSSION OF STATE MODEL FOR PRINCIPAL EVALUATION:** Linda Tomlinson indicated that the draft model is being developed and will be presented to the PEAC group for feedback before bringing it to the State Board. Vicki Phillips provided additional information on the model and spoke regarding the rubric being aligned to the standards.

H. **DISTRICT OVERSIGHT – MONTHLY UPDATE:** Superintendent Koch indicated that discussions with the Navy continue regarding a North Chicago charter school. He informed the Board about his meetings with the local union leadership in both East St. Louis and North Chicago.

I. **INFORMATION ITEM – BILINGUAL ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT:** Dr. Reyna Hernandez provided the Board with a copy of the Bilingual Advisory Council Report that is has been delivered to the Governor, General Assembly, State Superintendent pursuant to Public Act 97-305.

J. **ADDITIONAL ITEMS:** Hearing no request for additional items to be discussed, the meeting adjourned at 10:54 a.m.

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
January 25-26, 2012

TO: **Illinois State Board of Education**

FROM: **Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education**
                      Linda Tomlinson, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: **State Model for Principal Evaluation**

Staff Contact(s):   Vicki Phillips, Interim Division Administrator for Educator and School Development

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Center for School Support Services requests the Board to authorize the State
Superintendent to approve the Principal Evaluation State Model to support the initiative
pursuant to the Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 [Public Act 096-0861].

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board's Strategic Plan
The PERA/PEAC Principal Evaluation State Model is linked to Board's Strategic Plan goals of
"Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high
school" and "Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school
leaders" by providing a linkage between student growth and educator performance evaluation.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Performance Evaluation Reform Act (P.A. 96-861) requires the State Board of Education to
develop and implement, among other things, a "principal model evaluation template [that] must
incorporate the requirements of [Article 24A of the Illinois School Code, 105 ILCS 5/24A] and
any other requirements established by the State Board by administrative rule, but [that also]
allow[s] customization by districts in a manner that does not conflict with such requirements."
105 ILCS 5/24A-20(a)(2).

This State Model for Principal Evaluation (which is also applicable to the evaluation of Assistant
Principals) is designed to satisfy the State Board of Education's statutory requirement but, more
importantly, serve as a resource to Illinois school districts as they work to incorporate student
growth as a significant factor in the evaluation of principals and assistant principals (which all
school districts are required to do by September 1, 2012).

Please note that no school district is required to use the State Model for Principal Evaluation;
however, all school districts must comply with any and all requirements of the School Code as
well as any relevant administrative rules.

Background Information
The Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) of 2010, as amended by Public Act (P.A.) 97-
0008, sets forth a number of changes to Article 24A of the School Code [105 ILCS 5/24A]
specifically regarding the evaluation of certified instructional staff (i.e., teachers) and principals
and assistant principals (hereinafter "principals"). In order to implement the law's requirements,
PERA directed ISBE to convene a Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) comprised
of stakeholder groups, including representatives of teacher unions, school district management,
and persons with expertise in performance evaluation processes and systems, for the purpose

of providing recommendations regarding the system's components and ongoing implementation.

Under PERA, school districts must implement performance evaluation systems for teachers and principals that provide for the use of four evaluation ratings (i.e., excellent, proficient, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory) and, ultimately, address student growth as a *significant factor* in the rating of a teacher's or principal's performance. The minimum components of the performance evaluation systems that all school districts must incorporate will be set forth in administrative rules. A district may choose to use the state's model for its principal evaluation system, or it may develop a local principal evaluation system that meets the requirements set forth in PERA, Article 24A of the School Code, and any other requirements established by ISBE by administrative rule.

<u>Effectiveness</u>
Last Evaluation of the program: N/A
Results of evaluation or effectiveness indicators: N/A

<u>Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications</u>
Budget Implications: N/A
Legislative Action: N/A
Communication: Please see the *Next Steps* section below.

<u>Superintendent's Recommendation</u>
I recommend that the following motion be adopted:

> The State Board hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to adopt the Principal Evaluation State Model for use as needed by school districts throughout Illinois.

<u>Next Steps</u>
Upon approval, the State Superintendent will notify and post on www.isbe.net the Principal Evaluation State Model in accordance with Board approval.

Illinois State Board of Education

Performance Evaluation Advisory Council

State Model for Principal Evaluation

Recommendations for Principal Performance Evaluation by:
Principal Evaluation Sub-Committee of the Illinois Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC)

These recommendations reflect the consensus of the principal evaluation sub-committee, based on work over the last year. In each situation, we are guided by the goal of drafting rules and frameworks that will create a new approach to principal evaluation that leads to quality feedback and development for principals across the state, and that can be implemented by the wide variety of districts within the state.

Introduction

The Performance Evaluation Reform Act (P.A. 96-861) requires the State Board of Education to develop and implement, among other things, a "principal model evaluation template [that] must incorporate the requirements of [Article 24A of the Illinois School Code, 105 ILCS 5/24A] and any other requirements established by the State Board by administrative rule, but [that also] allow[s] customization by districts in a manner that does not conflict with such requirements." 105 ILCS 5/24A-20(a)(2).

This State Model for Principal Evaluation (which is also applicable to the evaluation of Assistant Principals) is designed to satisfy the State Board of Education's statutory requirement but, more importantly, serve as a resource to Illinois school districts as they work to incorporate student growth as a significant factor in the evaluation of principals and assistant principals (which all school districts are required to do by September 1, 2012).

Please note that no school district is required to use the State Model for Principal Evaluation; however, all school districts must comply with any and all requirements of the School Code as well as any relevant administrative rules. The State Board has authorized administrative rules on principal evaluations. The Proposed PERA Administrative Rules can be found at http://www.isbe.net/rules/proposed/pdfs/50wf.pdf. Because the Proposed PERA Administrative Rules are not yet final, legal requirements that are contained in this State Model for Principal Evaluation are subject to change.

REQUIREMENTS

> **The State Model for Principal Evaluation is built upon the foundation of the Statute— 105 ILCS 5/24A-15 (found below) and the proposed PERA Administrative Rules (found in Appendices C & D). All statue requirements and proposed administrative rules are imbedded within the State Model. The State Model consists of two major sections: Section I is Evaluation of Principal Practice and Section II is Student Growth.**

Statute—105 ILCS 5/24A-15

- The evaluation shall include a description of the principal's or assistant principal's duties and responsibilities and the standards to which the principal or assistant principal is expected to conform.
- The evaluation for a principal must be performed by the district superintendent, the superintendent's designee, or, in the absence of the superintendent or his designee, an individual appointed by the school board who holds a registered Type 75 State administrative certificate. The evaluation for an assistant principal must be performed by the principal, the district superintendent, the superintendent's designee, or, in the absence of the superintendent or his or

her designee, an individual appointed by the school board who holds a registered Type 75 State administrative certificate.

- One copy of the evaluation must be included in the principal's or assistant principal's personnel file and one copy of the evaluation must be provided to the principal or assistant principal.
- Failure by a district to evaluate a principal or assistant principal and to provide the principal or assistant principal with a copy of the evaluation is evidence that the principal or assistant principal is performing duties and responsibilities in at least a satisfactory manner and shall serve to automatically extend the principal's or assistant principal's contract for a period of one year after the contract would otherwise expire, under the same terms and conditions as the prior year's contract.
- Prior to September 1, 2012, school districts must:
    o Consider the principal's or assistant principal's specific duties, responsibilities, management, and competence as a principal or assistant principal
    o Consider the principal's or assistant principal's strengths and weaknesses with supporting reasons
    o Align evaluations for principals and assistant principals with the Illinois Professional Standards for School Leaders or research-based district standards.
- On and after September 1, 2012, school districts must (in addition to the requirements above):
    o Rate principals and assistant principals as "Excellent", "Proficient", "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory"
    o Evaluate principals or assistant principals once every school year by March 1 (or July 1 for Chicago Public Schools)
    o Provide for the use of data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in rating performance

Section I: Evaluation of Principal Practice

Principal Practice Instruments:
The framework for the evaluation of principal practice utilized in the State Model for Principal Evaluation is the Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation (Appendix A). Appendix B provides a rubric of the standards.

Determining the Ratings for Each Standard

- If a principal provides evidence of performance for at least 75% of the descriptors at a specific level of performance (e.g., Proficient), the principal should be rated at that level of performance (i.e., Proficient) for that standard.
- If a principal demonstrates performance for a standard that is split between 2 levels (excluding Distinguished), the principal's evaluator will use her/his discretion to determine the level most appropriate for that standard
- In order to receive a Distinguished rating on a standard, a principal must demonstrate at least 75% of the Distinguished descriptors for the standard (and any descriptors not Distinguished must be Proficient).

- 3 -

Summative Rating on Principal Practice

- The principal evaluator identifies a performance rating along with written evidence to support the assigned rating for each standard. The final principal practice review identifies the strengths and growth areas of the principal's practice.
- The final "principal practice" rating assigned is either:

  - **Distinguished** – At least 4 standards rated as "Distinguished" including Improving Teaching and Learning; no "Basic" ratings
  - **Proficient** – At least 4 standards rated as "Proficient" including Improving Teaching and Learning
  - **Basic** – At least 3 standards rated as "Basic" including Improving Teaching and Learning
  - **Unsatisfactory** – Any standard is rated as "Unsatisfactory"

Section II: Student Growth for Principal Evaluation

Definition of Student Growth - A measurable change in student outcomes at the school level.

- By statute, 50% of the State Model Principal Evaluation is comprised of data and indicators of student growth.
- The Proposed PERA Administrative Rules require that at least 25% of principal and assistant principal evaluations are comprised of student growth based on academic assessments in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, and at least 30% of principal and assistant principal evaluations are comprised of student growth based on academic assessments in 2014-2015 and beyond:
  - "Academic" is defined as any instructional area for which Illinois state standards exist
  - Require the use of multiple academic assessments
- The state model uses assessments that meet the definition of Type I and Type II for principal evaluation, including state assessments and Type III assessments may be used for schools serving a majority of students who are not administered a Type I or Type II assessment. In these situations, the qualified evaluator and principal may identify at least two Type III assessments to be used to determine student growth (refer to Appendix E for more information)
- For purposes of the State Model Principal Evaluation, the remaining 25% (and then 20%) of the student growth portion can focus on similar academic assessments of growth, or on a broader set of student outcome measures (see Appendix D.10 for sample list)

Process for Student Growth:

- Selecting Assessments and Setting Targets - No later than October 1 of every calendar year, the principal or assistant principal's evaluator must inform the principal or assistant principal which assessments, data, and targets will be used to judge student growth for the year, and specify the weights of each outcome and target
- Including Students in Growth Calculation - A student will be included in the student growth metric as long as the student has been assigned to the school long enough to have at least two data points on a comparable assessment (e.g. 2012 ISAT and 2013 ISAT, or a beginning of year assessment and mid-year assessment within an aligned interim assessment system.)

- 4 -

State Model for Principal Evaluation
Recommended Student Growth Composition for Elementary/Middle Schools:

Element	Assessment/Outcome	Measure
30% Academic Assessments	20% based on growth on ISAT from previous year*	Increase in % meets standards AND increase in % exceeds standards – looking at same students from grade to grade
	10% based on interim assessment with a normed prediction of performance for each student based on baseline	% of students meeting or exceeding predicted growth OR average growth over predicted
20% Other Outcomes	10% based on attainment measures on ISAT*	% of students exceeding expectations OR % of students meeting expectations (if a school has a low % of students meeting expectations)
	10% based on: • Increasing attendance and reducing unexcused absences • AND/OR other non-test measures aligned to the school improvement plan	• Increase in average daily attendance/decrease in total unexcused absences • AND/OR another non-test measure selected by the district

* Given timing of state test data and the March 1 evaluation completion requirement, these measures will not be available for first year principals and districts will need to use an additional interim assessment in place of the ISAT data.

State Model for Principal Evaluation
Recommended Student Growth Composition for High Schools:

Element	Assessment/Outcome	Measure
30% Academic Assessments	20% based on growth in EPAS sequence (from previous year)*	% of students meeting or exceeding predicted growth OR average growth over predicted
	10% based on interim assessment with a normed prediction of performance for each student based on baseline	% of students meeting or exceeding predicted growth OR average growth over predicted
20% Other Outcomes	20% based on: • Cohort graduation rates, grade-to-grade progression, or "on track" rates • AND/OR other student outcomes aligned to the school improvement plan	• % increase in graduation rate or increase in % of students that progress from grade to grade • AND/OR another student outcome measure selected by the district

* Given timing of state test data and the March 1 evaluation requirement, these measures will not be available for first year principals and districts will need to use an additional interim assessment in place of the EPAS data.

Defining Student Growth Performance Levels:
- **Exceeds Goal** - Exceeds the target for a majority of the student growth measures; meets all targets
- **Meets Goal** - Meets or exceeds the target for a majority of the student growth measures; does not have negative growth on any measures

- 5 -

- **Minimal Growth** - Meets only 1 or 2 student growth targets; has no more than one measure with negative growth results
- **No Growth or Negative Growth** - Does not meet any student growth targets; demonstrates negative growth on one or more measures

Summative Rating Matrix

To be used to combine Principal Practice Evaluation Ratings and the Student Growth for Principal Evaluation

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td colspan="5">Rating of Principal Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="6">Rating of Student</td>
<td>Exceeds Goal</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>PROFICIENT</td>
<td>Gather Further Information— EVALUATOR JUDGMENT DETERMINES RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Goal</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>PROFICIENT</td>
<td>PROFICIENT</td>
<td>Gather Further Information— EVALUATOR JUDGMENT DETERMINES RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Minimal Growth</td>
<td rowspan="2">NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td rowspan="2">NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td rowspan="2">NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>Experienced Principals: UNSATISFACTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Principals: NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">No Growth/ Negative Growth</td>
<td rowspan="2">Gather Further Information— EVALUATOR JUDGMENT DETERMINES RATING</td>
<td rowspan="2">Gather Further Information— EVALUATOR JUDGMENT DETERMINES RATING</td>
<td>Experienced Principals: UNSATISFACTORY</td>
<td>Experienced Principals: UNSATISFACTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Principals: NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>First Year Principals: NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
</table>

Recommendations for Principal Performance Evaluation by:
Principal Evaluation Sub-Committee of the Illinois Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC)

These recommendations reflect the consensus of the principal evaluation sub-committee, based on work from 2010 through 2011. In each situation, we are guided by the goal of drafting rules and frameworks that will create a new approach to principal evaluation that leads to quality feedback and development for principals across the state, and that can be implemented by the wide variety of districts within the state.

For more information contact Vicki Phillips, Interim Division Administrator, Educator and School Development, Illinois State Board of Education. vphillip@isbe.net.

A p p e n d i x A

Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation

ILLINOIS PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

Standard	Indicator
I. Living a Mission and Vision Focused on Results The principal works with the staff and community to build a shared mission, and vision of high expectations that ensures all students are on the path to college and career readiness, and holds staff accountable for results	a. Coordinates efforts to create and implement a vision for the school and defines desired results and goals that align with the overall school vision and lead to student improvement for all learners b. Ensures that the school's identity, vision, and mission drive school decisions c. Conducts difficult but crucial conversations with individuals, teams, and staff based on student performance data in a timely manner for the purpose of enhancing student learning and results
II. Leading and Managing Systems Change The principal creates and implements systems to ensure a safe, orderly, and productive environment for student and adult learning toward the achievement of school and district improvement priorities	a. Develops, implements, and monitors the outcomes of the school improvement plan and school wide student achievement data results to improve student achievement b. Creates a safe, clean and orderly learning environment c. Collaborates with staff to allocate personnel, time, material, and adult learning resources appropriately to achieve the school improvement plan targets
III. Improving Teaching and Learning The principal works with the school staff and community to develop a research-based framework for effective teaching and learning that is refined continuously to improve instruction for all students	a. Works with staff to develop a consistent framework for effective teaching and learning that includes a rigorous and relevant standards-based curriculum, research-based instructional practices, and high expectations for student performance b. Creates a continuous improvement cycle that uses multiple forms of data and student work samples to support individual, team, and school-wide improvement goals, identify and address areas of improvement and celebrate successes c. Implements student interventions that differentiate instruction based on student needs d. Selects and retains teachers with the expertise to deliver instruction that maximizes student learning e. Evaluates the effectiveness of instruction and of individual teachers by conducting frequent formal and informal observations providing timely feedback on instruction as part of the district teacher appraisal system f. Ensures the training, development, and support for high-performing instructional teacher teams to support adult learning and development to advance student learning and performance g. Develops systems and structures for staff professional development and sharing of effective practices including providing and protecting time allotted for development

Standard	Indicator
IV. Building and Maintaining Collaborative Relationships The principal creates a collaborative school community where the school staff, families, and community interact regularly and share ownership for the success of the school	a. Creates, develops and sustains relationships that result in active student engagement in the learning process b. Utilizes meaningful feedback of students, staff, families, and community in the evaluation of instructional programs and policies c. Proactively engages families and communities in supporting their child's learning and the school's learning goals d. Demonstrates an understanding of the change process and uses leadership and facilitation skills to manage it effectively
V. Leading with Integrity and Professionalism The principal works with the school staff and community to create a positive context for learning by ensuring equity, fulfilling professional responsibilities with honesty and integrity, and serving as a model for the professional behavior of others	a. Treats all people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect b. Demonstrates personal and professional standards and conduct that enhance the image of the school and the educational profession. Protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff c. Creates and supports a climate that values, accepts and understands diversity in culture and point of view
VI. Creating and Sustaining a Culture of High Expectations The principal works with staff and community to build a culture of high expectations and aspirations for every student by setting clear staff and student expectations for positive learning behaviors and by focusing on students' social-emotional learning	a. Builds a culture of high aspirations and achievement and for every student b. Requires staff and students to demonstrate consistent values and positive behaviors aligned to the school's vision and mission c. Leads a school culture and environment that successfully develops the full range of students' learning capacities—academic, creative, social-emotional, behavioral and physical

A p p e n d i x B

Rubric of Illinois Principal Evaluation Standards

I. LIVING A MISSION, VISION, AND BELIEFS FOR RESULTS

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
a. Coordinates efforts to create and implement a vision for the school and defines desired results and goals that align with the overall school vision and lead to student improvement for all learners					
Collaborates to Develop and Maintain a Shared Vision of High Expectations	Co-creates a shared vision of high expectations with multiple stakeholders; builds staff capacity to maintain and implement a shared vision for high student achievement and college and career readiness	Involves staff and students in developing, maintaining, and implementing a shared vision of high expectations, including college and career readiness, for all students	Develops minimal opportunities for staff and students to learn about a vision of high expectations, including college and career readiness, for all students; gives staff limited input into the development and maintenance of the vision	Does not collaborate to create or maintain a vision of high expectations and does not attempt to ensure all staff to have high academic expectations	• There is visible alignment between the vision and the school goals [observations and artifacts: the School Improvement Plan, School Report Card, and grade level goals] • School vision and goals are shared with stakeholder groups [observations and artifacts: presentation to stakeholders] • Building level staff development plan supports and is aligned to the School Improvement Plan and the district vision and mission [observations and artifacts: the School Improvement Plan and the building staff development plan] • Written values and beliefs reflect high expectations for all students [observations and artifacts: school level and grade level goals]
b. Ensures that the school's identity, vision, mission, drive school decisions					
Ensures vision and mission drive school decisions	Uses the vision and mission to make all decisions, uses protocols for making decisions that refer staff and team decisions back to the vision and mission; builds staff capacity to use the vision and mission to make instructional decisions	Uses the vision and mission to make all decisions, creates and uses protocols aligned to the vision and mission to make decisions	Refers to school vision when making decisions but may not be guided by the vision	Actions contradict the school vision or demonstrate inconsistency between stated beliefs and actions	• Building wide goals and vision are shared and widely known within the school community [observations and artifacts: posters and newsletters] • Parents, staff and other are clear about academic expectations and homework guidelines [observations and artifacts: homework policy, academic guidelines, parent handbook] • Team meetings focus on improving student achievement [observations and artifacts: team meeting agendas and minutes]
Confronts Low Expectations	Builds capacity of staff to address other staff or stakeholders who contradict the vision by displaying low or negative expectations; contests or eliminates courses and grading policies that contradict the vision and mission	Consistently addresses staff who contradict the vision by displaying low expectations; contests class offerings and grading policies that contradict the vision and mission	Inconsistently addresses staff who have low expectations; attempts to implement grading policies that support the vision and mission	Does not confront staff who have low expectations for some or all students	• Academic work and homework guidelines are shared with parents, staff and others to ensure that expectations are clear to all [observations and artifacts: homework policy and academic guidelines] • Builds effective professional learning communities within the building that use data to develop plans and strategies to improve student achievement for all students [observations and artifacts: PLC learning agendas and plans] • Rigorous course content is accessible to all students [observations and artifacts: student's course load, schedules, and sub-group data]
c. Conducts difficult but crucial conversations with individuals, teams, and staff based on student performance data in a timely manner for the purpose of enhancing student learning and results.					
Conducts difficult Conversations to Improve Student Results	Builds the capacity of other leaders within the school to address areas of underperformance with individuals, teams and staff; models how to conduct difficult conversations with individuals, teams, and staff based on student performance data	Addresses areas of underperformance in a timely manner with individuals, teams and staff; proactively leads difficult conversations with staff to improve and enhance student learning and results as necessary	Inconsistently address areas of underperformance and/or may only address concerns to a sub-set of the staff; inconsistently holds conversations on improving and enhancing student learning results	Does not addresses areas of underperformance with staff members; does not hold conversations on improving and enhancing student learning results	• School staff development plan addresses difficult conversations to improve and enhance student learning [observations and artifacts: school development plan] • Teacher conversations and meetings are focused on improving student achievement and demonstrate high expectations [observations and artifacts: team meeting minutes or staff development plans] • Faculty meetings are focused on improving results [observations and artifacts: meeting agendas and minutes]

II. LEADING AND MANAGING SYSTEMS CHANGE

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
a. Develops, implements, and monitors the outcomes of the school improvement plan and school wide student achievement data results to improve student achievement					
Assesses the Current State of School Performance	Completes a comprehensive assessment of the school's strengths/weaknesses including an assessment of the school practices and student learning outcomes	Assesses the school by using multiple forms of data (e.g. annual, interim and formative data) and the previous years' school improvement plan to track, and review progress	Uses limited data to assess current student achievement results and school practices	Does not assess the current state of the school and/or does not use data to assess student achievement or overall school performance	• Uses disaggregated student data to determine the current state of the school [observations and artifacts: analysis of data, RTI data and team minutes, formative and summative assessment analysis, and the School Improvement Plan] • School Improvement Plan reflects current state of the school developed through analysis of disaggregated data [observations and artifacts: grade level targets, analysis of data, RTI data and team minutes, formative and summative assessment analysis, and the School Improvement Plan]
Develops a School Improvement Plan	Uses a comprehensive analysis of the school to determine appropriate grade and content area targets and priorities for improvement with staff; organizes staff to monitor, track, and review progress and creates a detailed school improvement plan that identifies a strategy to reach school-wide targets and goals	Uses the outputs from a school-wide assessment to identify priority areas for improvement and to set measurable goals with specific grade level and content areas targets; names milestones and benchmarks of student progress and develops a school improvement plan that identifies a strategy to reach school-wide targets and goals	Uses limited data to identify priority areas for improvement and sets some measurable school-wide goals; names a few milestones and benchmarks of student progress and develops a school improvement plan that identifies a limited strategy to reach school-wide goals	Does not use data to identify priority areas or goals for improvement; has no way to track progress; does not complete a school improvement plan and/or creates a plan that is not aligned to school priorities for improvement	• The School Improvement Plan identifies strategies to reach school and grade level goals [observations and artifacts: the School Improvement Plan, presentation or materials on data and how data will be used] • Grade level targets are derived from the assessment of the current state and support the School Improvement Plan [observations and artifacts: grade level targets, analysis of data, RTI data and team minutes, formative and summative assessment analysis, and the School Improvement Plan]
Maintains a Focus on Results	Remains focused on student achievement results at all times; builds staff ownership for the goals and builds capacity of staff to monitor benchmarks and milestones within specific grade or content areas including continuous review of disaggregated data for student groups who have traditionally not been successful in the school	Demonstrates focus on improving student achievement results; keeps the school-wide goals present for staff and stakeholders by referencing goals in all meetings and planning sessions; tracks progress against milestones and benchmarks to monitor, track, and review progress, and adjusts strategies	Inconsistently focuses on improving student achievement results; refers to goals on an inconsistent basis and does not concretely connect the goals to the day-to-day work of the school and implements a limited number of strategies to reach results	Does not maintain focus on improving results or meeting school goals - rarely refers to goals and does not identify and/or implement strategies to reach results	• Faculty assume shared accountability to reach goals [observations and artifacts: staff goals aligned to school goals, school staff development plan, and team meetings focus on student results] • Staff adjust strategies and plans if interim benchmarks are not met [observations and artifacts: grading systems that focus on meeting standards over time, RTI data and meeting minutes, and analysis of disaggregated data] • Student and staff successes are celebrated when milestones and benchmarks are met [observations and artifacts: assemblies and recognition programs]
b. Builds, evaluates and develops a team of educators and support staff to ensure the learning environment is safe, clean, and orderly					
Creates a Safe, Clean and Orderly Learning Environment	Plans for and implements facility and equipment expansions & improvements and identifies creative solutions to maximize and share space; complies with all components of the safety drill and conducts multiple trainings with staff and multiple drills every year; builds staff capacity to lead and manage components of school safety	Ensures learning environment is conductive to learning and positive; supervises facilities and equipment management to enhance learning and ensures that the school environment is safe; complies with the Illinois Safety Drill Act	Ensures that the school environment is relatively safe and is in basic compliance with the school safety act	Does not ensure that the school is safe; does not comply with the school safety act	• Routines and procedures are in place, discussed, and implemented [observations and artifacts: severe weather and drill plans, school crisis plan, completed Illinois drill documentation form, building rules are posted, student handbooks/parent handbook, bus duty hall duty schedules] • School building is clean and safe – all basic facilities are in working order [observations and artifacts: bathrooms, windows, sinks, locks] • Physical plant supports major academic priorities/initiatives [observations and artifacts: reading nooks, improved library, enhanced computer lab comfortable staff lounge/meeting area]

II. LEADING AND MANAGING SYSTEMS CHANGE

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
c. Collaborates with staff to allocate personnel, time, material, and adult learning resources appropriately to achieve the school improvement plan targets					
Allocates Resources to Support Student Learning	Continually assesses and reassesses resources and creatively utilizes and leverages existing school and district resources, and is relentless in actively accessing human and fiscal resources that align to strategic priorities to support the achievement of school improvement plan targets; builds capacity of staff to have an appropriate role in the creation and monitoring of budgets within their grade and content areas	Allocates and maximizes resources in alignment with mission and student learning goals, and assesses external resources to fill gaps; ensures that staff have necessary materials, supplies, and equipment; effectively plans and manages a fiscally responsible budget that supports the school's goals, and ensures school is financially secure in the long-term	Sees the school's resources as given and is not knowledgeable of possibilities for accessing alternate human and fiscal resources; develops skills in planning and managing a budget that supports school's goals	Unable to accurately assess and/or leverage school and district resources; does not effectively manage budget	• Resources support the core components of academic, social, emotional, behavioral, physical development, educator quality, and learning environment [observations and artifacts: building staff development plan, budget, professional learning structures, and the School Improvement Plan] • Finances and other resources are aligned with strategic priorities [observations and artifacts: budget and run rate] • Support Staff (e.g. ELL, literacy and math teachers, and gifted and talented instructors) are strategically utilized to support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan [observations and artifacts: teacher schedules and, the School Improvement Plan, and school budget]
Prioritizes Time	Prioritizes and monitors the use of school time to ensure that staff and student activities focus on improving student learning; organizes how professional time is used and adjusts how time is spent to support student learning activities	Prioritizes the use of school time to ensure that staff and student activities focus on improving student learning; organizes professional time to ensure that high leverage activities and school priority areas that focus on student learning are given adequate time	Prioritizes the use of school time to ensure that staff activities sometimes focus on improving student learning; organizes majority of professional time to the school priorities, but may engage in time wasting activities	Does not manage time effectively; does not prioritize activities that will improve student learning and is frequently distracted by time-wasting or low impact activities	• Organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the district and the school [observations and artifacts: Building staff development plan and calendar of professional learning] • School time is focused on the improvement of student achievement in alignment with the School Improvement Plan and the district and school goals [observations and artifacts: periodic assessments, team meetings and team minutes, walk through data]

III. IMPROVING TEACHING AND LEARNING

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
a. Works with and engages staff in the development and continuous refinement of a shared vision for effective teaching and learning by implementing a standards based curriculum, relevant to student needs and interests, research-based effective practice, academic rigor, and high expectations for student performance in every classroom					
Implements Curricular Scope and Sequence	Ensures year end goals and student needs are met by using formative and interim assessments to modify the instructional scope and sequence	Improves components of the instructional scope and sequence to improve alignment with year end goals	Attempts to ensure scope and sequence are aligned with year end goals	Does not or cannot ensure scope and sequence align to year end goals	• Systems ensure that lesson and unit plans align to the scope and sequence and prepare students to be on a college and career readiness track [observations and artifacts: assessment calendar and grade and content curriculum guide] • Lesson plans and curriculum materials produce explicit evidence of curriculum coordination and alignment to Common Core standards [observations and artifacts: staff lesson plans]
Reviews Instructional Practices	Regularly assesses instructional practices and builds teacher capacity to implement a variety of practices that are relevant to student needs and interests, research based, and based on academic rigor and strategies that supports the learning of all students	Assesses instructional practices, identifies a few practices that are research-based, rigorous and relevant that will be implemented school-wide and supports teacher development around those practices	Measures the quality of instructional practices and attempts to articulate research based and rigorous strategies for improving instructional practices	Does not attempt to assess instructional practices and is unable to articulate clear strategies to improve instruction; does not use or attempt to introduce research-based instructional practices	• Staff have a broad repertoire of instructional strategies that they reference in their lesson plans [observations and artifacts: staff lesson plans, teacher observations, walkthroughs and evaluations and instructional strategy professional development session plan] • Throughout the school classroom activities are designed to engage students in cognitively challenging work that is aligned to the standards [observations and artifacts: staff lesson plans, walkthroughs, teacher observations and evaluations] • Consistent practices are observable across multiple classrooms [observations and artifacts: lesson plans, walkthroughs and teacher observations
b. Creates a continuous improvement cycle that uses multiple forms of data and student work samples to support individual, team, and school-wide improvement goals, identify and address areas of improvement and celebrate successes					
Implements Data Driven Decision Making	Consistently uses and analyzes multiple forms of data to identify areas of instructional improvement, to refine and adapt instructional practice, and to determine appropriate strategies across all grades and content areas	Uses data sources to drive instructional decisions, prioritize school wide areas of improvement and to identify a few targeted school wide strategies for instructional improvement	Uses a few data sources to drive instructional direction and uses data appropriately to identify school wide areas of improvement	Uses data inconsistently and/or is not clear how to use data to drive instructional strategies or practices	• Key data is reviewed at every meeting and all teachers are aware of school and grade targets and have aligned individual targets for their students [observations and artifacts: analysis of data, RTI data and team minutes, formative and summative assessment analysis, the School Improvement Plan, and evidence of how data is used] • Uses disaggregated student data to determine adult priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement [observations and artifacts: analysis of data, RTI data and team minutes, formative and summative assessment analysis, the School Improvement Plan, and evidence of how data is used] • Multiple analyses of student performance data is examined to support informed decision making [observations and artifacts: grade-level performance data, subject-area performance data, classroom level performance data, individual student performance data, student work and evidence of data use in team meetings and planning]

III. IMPROVING TEACHING AND LEARNING

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
b. Creates a continuous improvement cycle that uses multiple forms of data and student work samples to support individual, team, and school-wide improvement goals, identify and address areas of improvement and celebrate successes					
Implements Data Driven Instruction	Supports and develops staff ability to analyze data to identify and prioritize needs, guide grouping, re-teaching, and to identify/prioritize needs and continuous improvement; build staff capacity to use data in determining team and individual goals	Multiple sources are used to drive instructional decisions and uses data appropriately to identify/prioritize school wide areas of improvement; data is routinely used to identify and adjust school-wide priorities and to drive re-teaching plans and changes in practice for individual teachers	Supports staff in using data to identify/prioritize needs; data is used to drive school-wide practices	Unable to lead staff through continuous data review or lacks consistency in implementation	• Continuous data review process is in place to ensure that students learned taught material [observations and artifacts: analyses of interim and formative assessments, classroom observations, and re-teaching based on results] • Multiple analyses of student performance data is examined to support informed decision making [observations and artifacts: grade-level performance data, subject-area performance data, classroom level performance data, individual student performance data, and evidence of data use in team meetings and planning] • Clear re-teaching plans are used to guide the work of individual teachers [observations and artifacts: re-teaching plan, teacher observers]
c. Implements student interventions that differentiate instruction based on student needs					
Uses Disaggregated Data	Uses disaggregated data to create structures for differentiation with varied instructional strategies that meet all student needs; focuses all staff on closing achievement gaps between subgroups of students and uses data to quickly determine appropriate interventions for students or subgroups not making progress	Uses disaggregated data to support differentiation and re-teaching but does not ensure that instructional strategies are matched to the needs of all students; engages all staff in analyzing and utilizing disaggregated data to identify school wide and individual students' learning gaps and to determine appropriate interventions	Inconsistently uses data to inform the implementation of differentiation and interventions; introduces staff to data, but may not engage staff in the analysis of data	Does not effectively use data to identify students' learning gaps; does not attempt to ensure that instruction is differentiated based on student need or that students receive appropriate interventions	• Differentiated classroom activities based on students reading or achievement levels are present in every classroom [observations and artifacts: classroom observations, lesson plans, student work] • Disaggregated student data informs instruction [observations and artifacts: analysis of data, RTI data and team minutes, formative and summative assessment analysis, the School Improvement Plan, and evidence of how data is used] • Students receive rapid, data-driven interventions matched to current needs, and intervention assignments and schedules are frequently updated to reflect student needs and progress [observations and artifacts: individual student performance data, professional learning on differentiation, RTI Team minutes and data, student work, classroom observations of differentiated instruction] • Most effective teachers are teaching the students with the greatest needs for growth [observations and artifacts: student data, teacher evaluation data]
d. Selects and retains teachers with the expertise to deliver instruction that maximizes student learning					
Selects and Assigns Effective Teachers	Implements a clear selection criteria and strategically assesses and places teachers in grade level and content areas to create a balanced team with a variety of strengths	Has a clear and articulated selection criteria in place and assesses staff skills to place teachers in grade level and content areas	Has a selection criteria and articulates the intention of selecting staff based on grade and content needs, but does not have detailed assessment of staff skills to inform placement	Has no selection criteria and the determination for why teacher selection occurs is not transparent	• Selection processes focus on matching staff to specific position expectations [observation and artifacts: building staffing plan and interview questions]
Retains Effective Teachers	Uses multiple data sets including teacher evaluations to inform a formal retention strategy that creates opportunities for growth and development including opportunities for staff to assume additional leadership roles	Identifies effective teachers and moves them into leadership roles; implements a formal retention strategy that recognizes effective staff through performance evaluation and gives retention offers based on effectiveness	Implements a formal retention strategy that uses teacher evaluations to determine which teachers will be given retention offers, overtime tracks retention rates	Has no clear retention plan in place	• Retention of teachers and recommendations for leadership are partly determined on the basis of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by student learning [observation and artifacts: school retention data, new staff supports, staff climate survey, and exit interview data] • High percentage of teachers rated effective are stay in the school [observation and artifacts: school retention data, new staff supports, staff climate survey, and exit interview data]

III. IMPROVING TEACHING AND LEARNING

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
e. Evaluates the effectiveness of teaching and holds individual teachers accountable for meeting their goals by conducting frequent formal and informal observations in order to provide timely, written feedback on instruction, preparation and classroom environment as part of the district teacher appraisal system					
Observes Staff and Gives Feedback	Ensures that systems for observations occur multiple times a year with staff getting regular, consistent, and actionable feedback that is specific to each individual's development plan from multiple observers	Provides frequent and regular observations and actionable feedback and/or has systems in place so that staff receive specific feedback from multiple observers	Adheres to and completes required observations, but does not differentiate frequency of observation or feedback based on teacher skill and/or need	Observations are infrequent and inconsistent; feedback is vague and general	• Observation protocol/practice includes not only consistent school-wide expectations but individual teacher development areas and study of specific student sub-groups as identified by data [observation and artifacts: schedule of teacher observation and feedback meetings; written teacher evaluations, and teacher goal setting worksheets] • Teachers receive frequent observations and actionable feedback [observation and artifacts: classroom observations, observation records, teacher goal setting worksheets and written feedback]
Evaluates Staff	Completes all aspects of a rigourous evaluation process that includes goal setting, mid-year formative and summative ratings based on observations and multiple metrics of student results; ensures that evaluation processes are clear and transparent to all staff and includes assessment of student outcomes, learning environment, quality of instruction and planning and preparation	Implements a goal setting process, mid-year formative and summative ratings based on observations and student outcome results; communicates clear and transparent evaluation processes	Attempts to implement and communicate a clear evaluation process that includes limited observation and student outcome data	Does not have a clear or consistent evaluation processes; does not complete evaluation	• Performance expectations are clear and aligned with district's policies, the school mission and school wide expectations [observation and artifacts: written teacher evaluations aligned to student achievement goals, improvement plans for under performing staff] • Rigorous completion of the full evaluation process is completed for every teacher [observation and artifacts: evaluation documentation and consistency between practice ratings and student outcomes over time]
f. Ensures the training, development, and support for high-performing instructional teacher teams to support adult learning and development to advance student learning and performance					
Develops an Instructional Team	Implements a strategy to build the capacity of teacher teams to lead effective meetings focused on student learning data and student work	Ensures that effective teacher teams use student learning data and student work to advance student outcomes	Introduces common team structures and expectations for teacher teams	Does not create consistent teacher team structures	• Structures are established for job-embedded collaborative learning [observation and artifacts: professional learning communities, common planning time, protocols for examination of practice designed to guide collaboration] • Instructional teams support adult learning and student achievement [observation and artifacts: teacher team conversations about formative student data, teacher team meetings about instructional strategies, instructional consistency, instructional development of staff, building staff development, evaluation data]
g. Supports the system for providing data-driven professional development and sharing of effective practice by thoughtfully providing and protecting staff time intentionally allocated for this purpose					
Implements Professional Learning	Implements a job-embedded professional learning system for consistent support, development, coaching, and peer learning opportunities; allocates regular time for whole group and individual staff development and learning opportunities	Creates multiple structures for teacher learning including large group professional development, grade level and content team specific development; protects staff time for development opportunities	Relies on whole group development sessions including trainings on how data should be used, with some specific supports	Does not offer professional development and support that is timely, relevant or differentiated	• Teacher-driven professional development focuses on student learning challenges and progress toward student achievement goals [observation and artifacts: teacher team meetings, building staff development plan, and peer visitations] • Staff develop a broad repertoire of instructional strategies that they reference in their lesson plans [observation and artifacts: staff lesson plans, teacher observations, walkthroughs and evaluations and instructional strategy professional development session plan] • Structures are established for job-embedded collaborative learning [observation and artifacts: professional learning communities, common planning time, protocols for examination of practice designed to guide collaboration]

IV. BUILDING AND MAINTAINING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
a. Creates, develops and sustains relationships that result in active student engagement in the learning process					
Builds On-going Relationships	Develops school-wide capacity to establish trusting relationships and supports positive relationships among and between all stakeholder groups	Enhances and maintains trusting relationships among and between a variety of stakeholder groups	Articulates a belief that building and maintaining relationships are important, but may not be able to successfully establish or enhance relationships	Does not develop positive relationships and/or undermines positive relationships that exist	• Processes are in place to ensure multiple opportunities for school staff to meet, interact and work with families and members of the community [observations and artifacts: building climate survey results, community and university partnerships] • Staff and community members report are positive relationships with the principals and other members of the school [observations and artifacts: school climate survey]
b. Utilizes meaningful feedback of students, staff, families, and community in the evaluation of school programs and policies					
Includes Multiple Voices and Perspectives	Incorporates many different perspectives and encourages dissenting voices to gain new perspectives and to improve the school's instructional program	Incorporates different perspectives into decisions and creates forums to hear multiple and dissenting view points	Asks for feedback to a developed plan, but does not seek input when developing the plan from multiple voices	Is disrespectful and/or excludes voices from community forums to discuss school performance	• Community leaders and school system managers are active partners in the leader's decision making process [observations and artifacts: parent advisory agendas and minutes, school leadership team includes parents or community members, times and locations for all meetings are known, school-wide open door policy]
c. Proactively engages families and communities in supporting their child's learning and the schools learning goals					
Engages Families	Continuously creates two-way links between family presence in the school environment and the instructional program	Respectfully informs families of learning expectations and specific ways they can support their children's learning	Shares the school values with families and with the community	Does not make time to meet with families and is openly disrespectful or dismissive of the role of families	• Families are included and invested in the school community [observations and artifacts: parent engagement and survey data, PTO/PTA meeting attendance, student progress reports, parent access to grades, and parent outreach strategy] • Families are aware of learning expectations and strategies to support student learning outside the school day [observations and artifacts: parent engagement and survey data, PTO/PTA meeting attendance, student progress reports, parent access to grades, and parent outreach strategy]
d. Demonstrates an understanding of the change process and uses leadership and facilitation skills to manage it effectively					
Builds Capacity to Manage Change	Creates space for staff, students, and families to share feelings about change and supports the community while describing the possibility present in the future; maintains focus on meeting school goals when trying to confront and support staff in challenging values, beliefs, assumptions, and/or habits of behavior that may not match the school vision	Directly addresses and helps stakeholders to understand that change may raise questions, doubt, and feelings and positively supports staff as they face challenges; balances the need to make change within the school quickly while supporting the staffs ability to learn and develop new skills	Articulates that change will raise emotions and attempts to support staff, but does not effectively manage all needs; struggles to remain focused on school goals when trying to confront and support staff in challenging values, beliefs, assumptions, and/or habits of behavior that may not match the school vision	Does not recognize the role that the change process will have on the school community; does not support staff in changing staff values, beliefs, assumptions, and/or habits of behavior that may not match the school vision	• Staff are supported through the change process [observations and artifacts: professional development on the research on change] • School improvement outlines multiple tactics and strategies and can be adapted to reach identified goals [observations and artifacts: the School Improvement Plan, formative and summative evaluation data]
Demonstrates Personal Resolve and Response to Challenges	Focuses all conversations, initiatives and plans on improving student achievement and is relentless in pushing staff to maintain and improve their focus on student outcomes; uses every challenge as an opportunity to learn and develop themselves and their staff	Demonstrates personal resolve and maintains staff focus on student achievement goals and demonstrates persistence for the staff in the face of challenges	Sometimes demonstrates resolve, but may lose focus or make concessions on student achievement goals in the face of persistent challenges	Does not demonstrate personal resolve or maintain staff focus on student achievement goals and does not constructively respond to challenges	• Processes are in place to identify and address challenges when they arise [observations and artifacts: staff feedback survey data, building climate survey, and superintendant observation]

DRAFT

V. LEADING WITH INTEGRITY AND PROFESSIONALISM

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
a. Treats all people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect. Protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff					
Models Equity and Dignity	Develops structures, outreach and training to ensure that staff develop the skill set to treat all people equitably and with respect	Upholds the foundations of mutual respect for all stakeholders and meets all legal requirements for work relationships; takes swift appropriate actions when inappropriate conduct is reported or observed	Meets all legal requirements for work relationships; takes limited actions when inappropriate conduct is reported or observed	Does not treat and/or ensure that all stakeholders are treated respectfully and does not meet all legal requirements for work relationships; does not take swift appropriate actions when inappropriate conduct is reported or observed	• All staff are treated with respect and conflicts are dealt with quickly and efficiently [observations and artifacts: conflict resolution protocol, building staff development plan, disciplinary report data]
b. Demonstrates personal and professional standards and conduct that enhance the image of the school and the educational profession. Protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff					
Protects Rights and Confidentiality	Teaches all staff about FERPA and develops systems to ensure that on-going training and monitoring occur	Follows FERPA by maintaining student's privacy by keeping student level data and student records and all information directly related to students (e.g. counseling, mental health supports, and/or details of the student's home life) confidential	Implements most parts of FERPA in a manner consistent with the law; learns from mistakes and uses them as a personal learning opportunity to improve practice	Does not follow FERPA protocols or policies to maintain and protect student privacy and does not address staff who do not follow FERPA	• Staff are aware of the laws, policies, procedures and guidelines around student confidentiality [observations and artifacts: FERPA training, volunteer and staff confidentiality statements, and parent notification of rights] • Parents are aware of their rights [observations and artifacts: parent handbook, protocols for sharing IEP minutes]
c. Creates and supports a climate that values, accepts and understands diversity in culture and point of view.					
Recognizes the Strengths of a Diverse Population	Recognizes and integrates the learning opportunities that come from a diverse community	Examines and addresses any school structures or school practices that limit the participation of groups of students and families	Demonstrates personal comfort talking about diversity and culture and takes the steps to develop personal skill set	Demonstrates limited awareness of the impact of diversity on student learning	• School actively creates opportunities for all community members to support diverse student needs [observations and artifacts: professional learning activities build capacity of staff to support diverse student needs] • Opportunities exist for students to be in diverse settings and to learn about diverse cultures [observations and artifacts: partnerships with schools that may have different populations, intra-school conversations for students to explore culture and diversity]
Creates a Culturally Responsiveness Climate	Engages staff in learning and action planning around the treatment of and supports for diverse groups in and outside the school	Provides differentiated professional development to teachers and staff to improve their understanding of how their own world views inform their interpretation of the world and addresses and correct moments of cultural incompetence	Provides whole group undifferentiated professional development about working in and supporting a diverse community and attempts to address moments of cultural incompetence	Does not address or correct intolerant or culturally incompetent statements and does not create an environment that supports all students	• Staff participate in and lead learning experiences where they explore their personal assumptions and their approach to diversity [observations and artifacts: building staff development plan]
Engages in Courageous Conversations about Diversity	Develops staff capacity to engage in courageous conversations about diversity and culture—and how they impact student learning	Builds the school's and community's collective capacity by initiating direct conversations about culture and diversity, and how they impact student learning	Actively seeks opportunities to engage in courageous conversations about diversity and culture	Does not engage in courageous conversations about biases or has limited skill set in addressing biased language and behaviors	• Community conversations about culture and diversity occur regularly [observations and artifacts: PTA/PTO meetings, professional learning conversations to develop staff capacity to initiate conversations about culture and diversity]

VI. CREATING AND SUSTAINING A CULTURE OF HIGH EXPECTATIONS

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
a. Builds a culture of high aspirations and achievement for every student					
Links Aspiration to College and Career Opportunities	Creates structures and processes to make explicit links between student aspiration, classes and content they are learning in school and overall academic achievement; creates opportunities for all students to learn about a range of careers so that they can create their own personal visions and career aspirations	Shapes the environment to make explicit links between student aspiration, classes and content they are learning in school; creates structures that expose all students to college and career experiences; connects aspiration to college and career opportunities	Creates a few deliberate routines that help students connect their aspirations to classes and content they are learning in school achievement; provides limited exposure to college and career opportunities	Does not help students link their aspirations to classes and content they are learning in school; does not expose students to college or career opportunities	• Growth, not just attainment is recognized [observations and artifacts: parent education programming on growth and attainment] • Effective effort is acknowledged and celebrated [observations and artifacts: assemblies, community service programs, teacher observation and walkthrough data, student recognition for effort] • Students and families engage in rich college-going and career access experiences [observations and artifacts: college visits, community partnerships, job shadowing, internship, field trips, career day, family college and career awareness programming, and career programs] • Students communicate their aspirations and can identify connections to current learning goals [observations and artifacts: student goal sheets]
Develops a Student Goal Setting Process	Creates systems for students to develop goals, create a plan on how they will reach their goals, benchmarks to track their progress, and teaches students how to adapt their goals and plans as necessary; creates systems for sharing goals and learning	Implements a system where students create short and long term goals; ensures that students review goals at the end of the year, but may not ensure that goals are adapted and adjusted throughout the year	Introduces formal goal setting process where students identify goals and create a plan on how they will reach their goals	Does not create or support goal setting structures for students	• Students track their own progress [observations and artifacts: student portfolios, evidence of students tracking their own progress, and student surveys]
b. Requires staff and students to demonstrate consistent values and positive behaviors aligned to the school's vision and mission					
Translates the School Values into Specific Behaviors	Translates the school values into specific age-appropriate behaviors and ensures that all staff and students learn the expected behaviors; builds staff and student capacity to deliver clear and consistent messaging about the values and behaviors to all stakeholders	Translates the school values into specific behaviors and ensures that all staff and students learn the expected behaviors; ensures staff deliver clear and consistent messaging about that values and behaviors to students	Attempts to translate the school values into specific behaviors but is inconsistent in ensuring that all students learn expected behaviors	Does not make values or behavioral expectations clear to staff or students	• Values and behaviors are referenced in daily school structures: [observations and artifacts: School Improvement Plan, PBIS building plan, code of conduct, parent/student handbook, and referral logs - discipline, tardies, absences] • A system of positive and negative consequences is consistent with the school values (with age appropriate differentiation) across classrooms, grades and content areas [observations and artifacts: PBIS plan for building, code of conduct, parent/student handbook, referral logs - discipline, tardies, absences] • Written values and beliefs reflect high expectations for all students [observations and artifacts: school level and grade level goals]
Develops a Code of Conduct	Implements tracking systems to assess how well individual students and student cohort groups meet conduct expectations and values; uses multiple forms of student data to monitor and revise the code of conduct and identify benchmarks and milestones to gauge and measure adoption of behaviors	Develops clear expectations for student conduct based on the school values and beliefs and identifies clear positive and negative consequences; ensures that every adult understands their role in implementing both positive and negative consequences and that consequences are consistently implemented	Develops components of an effective system of conduct for staff and students and builds staff agreement on the types of student actions that are consistent with school value and behaviors; creates consistent responses and consequences for students who have had behavioral infractions in the past	Tolerates discipline violations and enforces code of conduct inconsistently	• School-wide code of conduct aligned with district and school priorities is in place [observations and artifacts: consistent code of conduct across classrooms, data on attendance, tardies, and office referrals, analysis of students most frequently referred] • Code of conduct is consistently implemented across all classrooms [observations and artifacts: positive recognition of students and staff who consistently demonstrate positive behaviors]

VI. CREATING AND SUSTAINING A CULTURE OF HIGH EXPECTATIONS

Element	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Examples of Evidence
c. Leads a school culture and environment that successfully develops the full range of students' learning capacities—academic, creative, social-emotional, behavioral and physical					
Creates a Culture that Supports Social Emotional Learning	Builds the capacity of adults to use and train others on the five Illinois Social-Emotional Learning Competencies (self-awareness; self-management; social awareness; relationships skills and responsible decision making); uses a variety of assessments to gauge the SEL skills of students and uses that data to develop additional curriculum and supports; builds the capacity of all adults to support the positive growth of student emotional skills	Trains adults on how to support positive student growth through the development of the Illinois Social-Emotional Learning Competencies (self-awareness; self-management; social awareness; relationships skills and responsible decision making); uses a variety of assessments to gauge the SEL skills of students and uses that data to develop additional curriculum and supports	Shares the Illinois Social-Emotional Learning Competencies (self-awareness; self-management; social awareness; relationships skills and responsible decision making); uses a limited amount of tools and assessments to gauge the SEL skills of students	Does not share or implement the Illinois Social-Emotions Learning Competencies; does not assess student SEL skills and does not support the development of SEL skills	• Adults support SEL skill development [observations and artifacts: referral data, student survey] • Students demonstrate an increase in SEL skills [observations and artifacts: student referral data and positive relationship] • Appropriate socio-emotional supports are provided to all students [observations and artifacts: Building staff development plan, teacher training on SEL, and observation and walkthrough data] • Core components of social, emotional, behavioral supports are in place to support student learning [observations and artifacts: teacher lesson plans, student survey data, positive peer, family, and work relationships]
Creates a Culture that Supports Effective Effort	Creates structures that support the development of effective effort skills for every student (teamwork, study skills, organization, time management, resiliency, valuing mistakes, seeking assistance; persistence); incorporates effective effort into every aspect of the school culture	Trains adults to support the development of effective effort skills (teamwork, study skills, organization, time management, resiliency, valuing mistakes, seeking assistance; persistence) for every student	Introduces the concept of effective effort skills (teamwork, study skills, organization, time management, resiliency, valuing mistakes, seeking assistance; persistence); provides limited development for staff on how to build students' effective effort skills	Does not introduce or support the development of effective effort skills; does not recognize the role of effort in improving student achievement	• Effective effort is acknowledged and celebrated [observations and artifacts: assemblies, community service programs, teacher observation and walkthrough data, student recognition for effort] • Students describe and demonstrate effective effort behaviors and beliefs across classrooms [observations and artifacts: communication service and student work]

A p p e n d i x C

General Rules for Principal Practice

Appendix C

<u>General Rules for Principal Practice</u>

All rules in the practice section apply to principals and assistant principals (though language refers only to principals)

1. Minimum Weight for Principal Practice - the "principal practice" portion of the principal evaluation must comprise at least 50% of the overall principal evaluation

2. Requirements for Principal Evaluation Instruments
- Every district must align the instruments for evaluation of principal practice to the revised Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation (drafted by the sub-committee and attached as Appendix A)
- Every district must create or select a rubric that has clear indicators for each standard and clear descriptions of at least 4 performance levels for each indicator
- For any district not adopting the default rubric, the district must create a training process to build shared awareness and understanding of the rubric and principal practice expectations with all principals and principal evaluators

3. Rules for Gathering Data on Principal Practice
- The principal evaluator must conduct a minimum of two formal school site observations for every principal. Formal school site observations defined as:
    - Time spent in the school site observing school practices, that may also include direct observation of principal action
    - Scheduled in advance with at least one specific observation objective (reviewing classrooms, observing a leadership team meeting, etc)
    - Followed within 10 principal work days by feedback on the observation shared from evaluator to the principal in writing
- The evaluator will share any information or data that would impact the overall principal rating of practice in a timely manner
- The evaluator may conduct additional formal observations as needed
- The evaluator may conduct as many informal site observations as needed, and information from informal site visits may also be included in the summative evaluation as long as it is documented in writing
- Principal will complete a self-assessment against the standards of practice no later than February 1 of each calendar year. The evaluator will use the information provided in the self-assessment as one input to the overall evaluation of principal practice
- In the summative evaluation, the evaluator must identify a performance rating with written evidence to support the rating for each standard

4. Rules for the Summative Rating of Principal Practice
- In the summative evaluation, the evaluator must identify a performance rating with written evidence to support the rating for each standard
- The summative evaluation must identify the strengths and growth areas of the principal
- The district must define how the data gathered against the principal practice standards will be used to determine a summative practice rating

- 10 -

A p p e n d i x D

General Rules for Student Growth

Appendix D

General Rules for Student Growth

1. Definition of Student Growth for Principal Evaluation - A measurable change in a student's or group of students' knowledge or skills between two or more points in time

2. Defining Significant Factor for Principal Evaluation - Require student growth to be at least **30%** of the principal evaluation

3. Rules for Assessments used in Principal Evaluation:
- The student growth portion of the principal evaluation must be based on academic assessments
    - "Academic" is defined as any instructional area for which Illinois state standards exist
- Require the use of multiple academic assessments
- Districts may use any assessments that meet the definition of Type I and Type II for principal evaluation. Type III assessments may be used for schools serving a majority of students who are not administered a Type I or Type II assessment. In these situations, the qualified evaluator and principal may identify at least two Type III assessments to be used to determine student growth (refer to Appendix E for more information)
- State assessments may be used as one of the measures of student growth
- When the state has a school-level value added score available for all schools in the state, this value-added score must comprise a majority of student growth

5. Rules for Selecting Assessments and Setting Targets - No later than October 1 of every calendar year, the evaluator must inform the principal which assessments and targets will be used to judge student growth for the year, and specify the weights of each assessment and target

6. Rules for Including Students in Growth Calculation - A student will be included in the student growth metric as long as the student has been assigned to the school long enough to have at least two data points on a comparable assessment (e.g. 2012 ISAT and 2013 ISAT, or a beginning of year assessment and mid-year assessment within an aligned interim assessment system)

7. Rules for Adjusting for Student Characteristics - The district or principal evaluator shall determine how certain student characteristics (e.g., special education placement, English language learners, low-income populations) shall be considered for each assessment and target chosen to ensure that they *best measure the impact that the school has on students' academic achievement*

8. Rules on Usable Data:
- Principal evaluators must use the most recent administration of a selected assessment as the "end point" for any measures of student growth
- Growth between two assessments, even within one year (example – between a baseline assessment at the start of a year and an interim assessment in January), may be used as a valid measure of student growth within the principal evaluation

9. Rules for Generating a Summative Rating on Student Growth - The district or principal evaluator must specify how student growth results will be used to determine the summative rating of student growth

- 12 -

10. Other Student Outcomes Measures for Use in Principal Evaluation
- Academic Measures:
  - Attainment measures on academic assessments
  - Cohort-to-cohort improvement measures on academic assessments
  - Sub-group performance data on academic assessments
  - Pass rates on AP exams, and potentially by sub-group as well
  - 21st Century skill assessments (may be non-test depending on assessment)
  - Growth for ELL students
  - WorkKeys assessments

- Non-test Measures:
  - Attendance
  - Postsecondary matriculation and persistence
  - Graduation rate
  - % on track to graduation
  - 9th grade and 10th grade promotion
  - Truancy
  - Excused/Unexcused Absences
  - Discipline information (referrals) – if district has consistent definitions and approach (ex. PBIS, student behavior programs)
  - AP completion rates
  - Dual-credit earning rates

11. Student Growth Definition for Assistant Principals:
- Expand the definition of student growth for assistant principals to include a broader range of possible student outcomes, including improvements in attendance or behavior indicators
- Assistant principal evaluators will select student growth measures that are appropriate for the assistant principal assignment (e.g. assistant principal in charge of attendance and discipline)

A p p e n d i x E

Type I, Type II, and Type III Assessment Information

Appendix E

Assessments for Principals

Assessments shall be defined according to three distinct types:

Type I	Type II	Type III
An assessment that measures a certain group of students in the same manner with the same potential assessment items, is scored by a non-district entity, and is widely administered beyond Illinois	An assessment developed or adopted and approved by the school district and used on a district-wide basis that is given by all teachers in a given grade or subject area	An assessment that is rigorous, aligned with the course's curriculum, and that the evaluator and teacher determine measures student learning *Special circumstances only*
Examples: Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) MAP tests, Scantron Performance Series	*Examples: Collaboratively developed common assessments, curriculum tests, assessments designed by textbook publishers*	*Examples: teacher-created assessments, assessments of student performance*

- 15 -

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
January 25-26, 2012

TO: **Illinois State Board of Education**

FROM: **Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education**
                        Susan C. Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief of Staff

Agenda Topic: **Illinois Application for ESEA Flexibility Waiver**

Staff Contact(s):   Monique Chism, Ph.D., Division Administrator Innovation and Improvement

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Board will review the Illinois ESEA Flexibility Waiver application and provide feedback.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board's Strategic Plan
The agenda item supports the mission and all three goals of the Strategic Plan.

Mission Statement
The Illinois State Board of Education will provide leadership, assistance, resources and advocacy so that every student is prepared to succeed in careers and postsecondary education, and share accountability for doing so with districts and schools.

Strategic Goals:
1. Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.
2. Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders;
3. Every school will offer a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
The Illinois State Board of Education will better understand the scope of the application for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver and potential next steps.

Background Information
On September 23, 2011, President Barack Obama announced the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Package. President Obama stated, "To help states, districts and schools that are ready to move forward with education reform, our administration will provide flexibility from the law in exchange for a real commitment to undertake change. The purpose is not to give states and districts a reprieve from accountability, but rather to unleash energy to improve our schools at the local level."

The ESEA Flexibility is designed to offer flexibility with respect to ten specific ESEA requirements and their associated regulatory, administrative, and reporting requirements. The ESEA Flexibility will allow for a better focus on improving student learning and increasing the quality of instruction. This voluntary non-competitive opportunity will provide educators and State and local leaders with flexibility regarding specific requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 in exchange for rigorous State-developed plans designed to improve

educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction. This flexibility is intended to build on and support the significant State and local reform efforts already underway in critical areas such as transitioning to college-and career-ready standards and assessments; developing systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support; and evaluating and supporting teacher and principal effectiveness.

To obtain this flexibility ISBE must submit a comprehensive, high-quality application describing how it will meet a set of principles concerning the development and implementation of rigorous academic content standards to prepare all students for college and careers and high-quality assessments that are aligned with those standards, a differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system that appropriately targets interventions and supports and recognizes or rewards excellence, and activities that elevate the education profession by better evaluating and supporting teacher and principal effectiveness,

Once the ESEA Flexibility application has been submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, a designated group of peer reviewers will examine the application. This review process will help ensure that the application is consistent with principles set forth by the U.S. Department of Education, and is both technically and educationally sound. Reviewers will evaluate whether and how the request will support a comprehensive and coherent set of improvements in the areas of standards and assessments, accountability, and teacher and principal effectiveness. At this time, ISBE will have an opportunity, if necessary, to clarify its plan and answer any questions the reviewers may have. Further, if needed, the reviewers and the U.S. Department of Education will provide feedback to ISBE about the components of the request that may need additional development in order for the request to be approved.

The U.S. Department of Education has outlined a rolling process for states to apply for waiver flexibility. Applications submitted in the "February" window can expect a peer review in spring of 2012. It is ISBE's intent to submit the application to the U.S. Department of Education on February 21, 2012.

There are several policies that need consideration before the agency submits the waiver request.

Decision Points That Impact Waiver Submission	Budget Considerations
In order to correct the misalignment of cut scores on the ISAT and PSAE, the cut score on the ISAT will be recalculated to better align student performance on the ISAT and performance on the PSAE, which will provide meaningful information about each student's likelihood of readiness for postsecondary success.	There would be no additional cost to revise ISAT score reports for the 2012 or 2013 test administration.
In order to provide schools and districts a complete picture of student progress from grades 3-11, while also allowing for the calculation of student growth for high schools, ISBE proposes to require EXPLORE for all Illinois students at grade 8 (in lieu of ISAT) and PLAN for all Illinois students at grade 10..	We currently fund Explore and Plan at $2.3 Million but not all districts participate, as it is optional. Additional costs may be offset somewhat if ISAT costs can be reduced but $300,000 more will be needed otherwise.. We are proposing reinstatement of the line specific to Growth Models.

In order to bolster career readiness indicators, ISBE proposes to add the third WorkKeys assessment for high school students. This will allow students an opportunity to obtain a National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC). Districts and schools will provide students' NCRC status on their high school transcripts which will allow students to use their transcripts as they prepare to enter the workforce.	Approximately $875K is needed to administer the third Work Keys Assessment, *Locating Information,* (test and certificate distribution) and will require 45 minutes of additional testing time for the 2013 test administration.
The waiver grants the state flexibility from the requirements in ESEA section 1116(b) and (c) which relates to how districts and schools are identified and the mandated sanctions for districts and schools not making adequately yearly progress. Currently if a district has schools in improvement status they must set-aside 10% for professional development and 20% for choice/SES. ISBE staff recommendations that the state no longer mandates the above-mentioned set-asides.	School and district leaders should be given the maximum flexibility allowed in order to make local decisions that will be in the best interest of their students.

Superintendent's Recommendation
The State Superintendent recommends the following motion be adopted.

The State Board of Education hereby authorizes the State Superintendent to continue discussions and to submit an application for an ESEA Waiver prior to the February 21 deadline.

Next Steps
ESEA Flexibility Waiver will continue to be presented to stakeholder groups across the State of Illinois, in order to gather feedback. Based upon feedback from the Board of Education, stakeholder groups, and external experts, modifications will be made to the application.

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
January 25-26, 2012

TO: **Illinois State Board of Education**

FROM: **Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education**
                     Susan C. Morrison, Deputy Superintendent/Chief of Staff

Agenda Topic: Value Table Growth Models

Materials: Illinois's Growth Model Approach Using the Value Table Method

Staff Contact(s): Pooja K. Agarwal, Ph.D., Division Administrator of Student Assessment
                     Rense Lange, Ph.D., Principal Consultant/Psychometrician
                     Andy Metcalf, Ph.D., Principal Consultant/NAEP State Coordinator

Purpose of Agenda Item

To provide the Board with an overview of three growth models that were considered for Illinois's adoption for school and district accountability, including additional information regarding the recommended growth model, Value Tables.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board's Strategic Plan

This agenda item supports **GOAL 1:** Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item

The Board will be asked to approve a motion authorizing the adoption and use of Value Tables as Illinois's statewide growth model for school and district accountability.

Background Information

Illinois is committed to the recognition and reward of student achievement *and* growth over time.

Beginning in May 2010, the Illinois Growth Model Working Group (GMWG) was appointed with representatives from more than 10 Illinois organizations, as well as a variety of district superintendents, technical advisors, and other stakeholders, to identify a growth model or models for Illinois's school and district accountability system. Following extensive discussion and thoughtful consideration, a final report by the GMWG was submitted to the Illinois State Superintendent in April 2011, in which the GMWG recommended three growth models as viable and worthy of further study:
1. Student Growth Percentile Rankings
2. Value Added models
3. Value Table models

Subsequently, beginning in April 2011, the Illinois Technical Advisory Council (TAC) conducted empirical investigations of these three models using Illinois's state assessment data and the TAC's results were presented in September 2011. Both the GMWG and the TAC concluded that

there is no single "right" or "best" growth model to select, as each comes with positive attributes and limitations. It is with this caveat in mind that Illinois proceeded cautiously in selecting a statewide growth model to demonstrate student progress over time and hold schools and districts accountable for student growth.

In order to select a statewide growth model for school and district accountability, the following growth model objectives were taken into account by Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) agency staff:

Illinois will select a growth model that:
- Is transparent and understandable by educators and the public,
- Provides educators and students with a goal to work toward, and
- Sets the same growth expectation for all students.

The three growth models selected for further study were evaluated using the criteria above. Of the three growth models, Value Table models most closely satisfy the objectives specified above, and for this reason, Value Tables are the recommended growth model for Illinois.

Value Tables are relatively easy to understand, easy to implement, valid and reliable, and informative for students, teachers, schools, and districts. In addition, while we are cognizant that Value Added methods provide a differentiated growth model system for subgroups, we believe that all students should be held to the same expectations for student achievement and growth. We remain confident that Value Tables, particularly when used as part of our proposed differentiated accountability system in Illinois's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver application, will serve as a meaningful and informative measure of student progress and growth over time.

Please see the attached report for a comparison between Value Tables and other growth models. Note that while the overall use of Value Tables is recommended for Illinois's growth model, the precise methods and Value Table points assigned to growth require additional development and consideration (please see Next Steps, below, for more information).

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action, and Communications

Policy Implications: Illinois's adopted growth model will be used as part of a new accountability measure for schools and districts, as outlined in Illinois's ESEA Waiver application. Note that Value Tables may or may not be used as part of performance evaluations for teachers and principals as permitted by applicable statutes and rules. In other words, growth model selection for the use in performance evaluations may be left to the discretion of schools and districts.

Budget Implications: Funds allocated to the Illinois Longitudinal Data System (ILDS) will be used to support the dissemination of growth data to schools, districts, and teachers. Funds requested for FY13 will be used to support the ongoing calculation of growth model data for school and district accountability.

Legislative Action: None at this time.

Communication: The Value Table growth model may be of significant interest to educators and the public. We have already discussed the Value Table growth model during stakeholder

meetings about Illinois's ESEA Waiver application and have received positive feedback. We have received additional support from our TAC and other stakeholders throughout Illinois.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions

Growth models, in general, are statistical techniques – they cannot provide underlying reasons for *why* a student, school, or district is making progress. All three growth models considered correlate highly; however, results will differ depending on the growth model selected. Growth models should also be implemented with caution for schools and districts with fewer than 100 students. Even so, growth models (and Value Tables) provide valuable information regarding a student's academic achievement, information which can be used to drive instruction, improve performance, and achieve accountability targets.

Superintendent's Recommendation

The State Superintendent recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the following motion:

The Illinois State Board of Education hereby authorizes the use of Value Tables as Illinois's growth model for student, school, and district accountability.

Further, the Board authorizes the State Superintendent to make such technical and non-substantive changes as the State Superintendent may deem necessary in response to suggestions regarding the weighting of point values, the specification of performance categories, and other technical aspects of Value Tables.

Next Steps

Upon Board authorization of the use of Value Tables for Illinois's growth model for school and district accountability, Agency staff will seek input from technical experts, stakeholders, and senior management regarding the precise weighting of point values, the specification of performance categories, and other technical aspects of Value Tables. We plan to convene these meetings in March and will seek Board approval when the technical aspects of the Value Table growth model have been determined.

Once the technical aspects of Value Tables have been approved, growth model data at the student, school, and district levels will be provided online for schools, districts, and the public in order to inform instruction. Agency staff will also use Value Tables and growth model data as one indicator for a broader school and district accountability system, as outlined in our ESEA Waiver application.

Illinois's Growth Model Approach Using the Value Table Method

Pooja K. Agarwal, Ph.D.

Rense Lange, Ph.D.

L. Andy Metcalf, Ph.D.

Overview

Illinois is committed to the recognition and reward of student achievement *and* growth over time. In an era when decisions have been based solely on student assessment scores, the *progress* and *growth* of a student received little attention. More recently, public interest in growth models has increased as these models provide valuable and meaningful information to educators, parents, students, and stakeholders about the ongoing progress and improvement of our students, schools, and statewide education system. In addition, the use of growth models for student, school, and district accountability has increased nationwide. The purpose of this report was to evaluate and select a growth model for Illinois's school and district accountability system.

Beginning in May 2010, the Illinois Growth Model Working Group (GMWG) was appointed with representatives from more than 10 Illinois organizations, as well as a variety of district superintendents, technical advisors, and other stakeholders, to identify a growth model or models for Illinois's school and district accountability system[1]. Following extensive discussion and thoughtful consideration, a final report by the GMWG was submitted to the Illinois State Superintendent on April 14, 2011[2], in which the GMWG recommended three growth models as viable and worthy of further study:

1. Student Growth Percentile Rankings
2. Value Added Models
3. Value Table Models

Subsequently, beginning in April 2011, the Illinois Technical Advisory Council (TAC) conducted empirical investigations of these three models using Illinois's state

---

[1] See http://www.isbe.net/GMWG/pdf/GMWG_members.pdf for a list of members of the Illinois Growth Model Working Group.

[2] See http://www.isbe.net/GMWG/pdf/gmwg_final_report_0411.pdf for the final report by the Illinois Growth Model Working Group.

assessment data and the TAC's results were presented in September 2011. In general, the following overarching themes emerged from the TAC's reports:

- All three models correlate highly with each other
- Reliability for all three models is drastically reduced for schools and districts with fewer than 100 students
- Use caution when applying growth models at the classroom level

Perhaps most importantly, both the GMWG and the TAC concluded that there is no single "right" or "best" growth model to select. It is with this caveat in mind that Illinois proceeded cautiously in selecting a statewide growth model to demonstrate student progress over time and hold schools and districts accountable for student growth.

Growth Model Objectives for Selection

In order to select a statewide growth model for school and district accountability, the following growth model objectives were taken into account by Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) agency staff:

Illinois will select a growth model that:

- Is transparent and understandable by educators and the public,
- Provides educators and students with a goal to work toward, and
- Sets the same growth expectation for all students.

The three growth models selected for further study were evaluated using the criteria above[3]. Table 1 shows the overarching method for each growth model, along with pros and cons for each method.

---

[3] Please note that the growth models evaluated in this report were considered solely for the purpose of school and district accountability. These growth models may or may not be used as part of performance evaluations for teachers and principals as permitted by applicable statutes and rules. In other words, growth model selection for the use in performance evaluations may be left to the discretion of schools and districts.

Table 1: Methods, pros, and cons for the three growth models selected by the Illinois Growth Model Working Group for further study

Growth Models	Methods	Pros	Cons
Student Growth Percentile Rankings	Rank how well students grow relative to other students starting at the same place.	Easy to understand and explain to stakeholders. Compares students to "academic peers."	There will always be students in the bottom 50% and in the top 50%. Because the rankings are relative, it is impossible for everyone to achieve high growth. "Academic peers" may be similarly ranked, but for various reasons. Does not provide a specific goal to work toward.
Value Added Models	Predict/project student growth as "on track" while controlling for and partialling out non-school factors (e.g., income status, race/ethnicity, etc.).	Able to isolate the impact of school factors on student achievement. Most rigorous statistical model for predicting teacher and school impact.	Difficult to understand regression models. Informs stakeholders whether a student is "on track" but does not provide a specific goal to work toward. Sets different expectations for subgroups.
Value Table Models	Assign points based on student growth between previous and current years.	Somewhat easy to understand and explain to stakeholders. Provides a specific goal to work toward. Sets the same expectation for all students.	The assignment of points to progress levels is subjective – there is no industry standard.

Recommended Growth Model: Value Tables

As shown in Table 1, each of the three models includes positive attributes and limitations. Of the three models, Value Table models most closely satisfy the growth model objectives specified above – Value Tables are understandable, provide a goal, and set the same expectation for all students. For these reasons, Value Tables are the recommended growth model for Illinois. At the same time, we remain mindful that there is no one "best" growth model to select, evidenced by the fact that a variety of growth models are currently in use across the United States. In particular, the intended *use* of growth models should be carefully considered when making selection decisions, as some models may be more appropriate for measuring student progress whereas other models may be more appropriate for measuring teacher impact at the classroom level. For the purpose of school and district accountability, and also for the purpose of informing instruction, we feel that a Value Table model is the most appropriate growth model at this time.

While we are cognizant that a Value Added model provides a differentiated growth model system for subgroups, Value Added models do so by setting different expectations depending on subgroup status. In contrast, we believe that all students should be held to the same expectations for student achievement and growth. As such, we remain confident that Value Tables, especially when used as part of our proposed differentiated accountability system in Illinois's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver application, will serve as a meaningful and informative measure of student progress and growth over time, while still holding all students to the same expectations. For example, as part of our ESEA Waiver application, schools and districts will be held accountable for improvements in subgroup performance and growth, and they will also be held accountable for reducing achievement gaps (e.g., for historically low performing minorities, English Language Learners, students with disabilities, low income students, etc.). In essence, we propose using growth and the Value Table model as part of a broader, differentiated accountability system for all students and subgroups.

The remainder of this report provides the reader with additional information regarding Value Tables. Please note, however, that the precise weighting of point values, the specification of performance categories, and other technical aspects of Value Tables requires careful consideration and development. As noted in Table 1, there is no industry standard at this time for setting Value Table point determinations

and performance categories. As such, Illinois will seek input in the coming weeks from technical experts, stakeholders, and others to inform the development and implementation of Value Tables in our school and district accountability system.

Value Table Methods: Preliminary Recommendations & Next Steps

Illinois prefers a Value Table approach because it relies on familiar concepts like score categories, and the computation of students' "Value Points" based on these tables involves little more than simple lookups and weighted student counts. Despite the simplicity of the Value Table approach, recent work by our psychometric experts on our TAC indicates high agreement among the outcomes of the Value Table method and those of more complex methods (e.g., Value Added methods) that rely on the use of hierarchical linear modeling and quantile regression. Furthermore, while Value Tables may remain the "lesser known" of the three models recommended by the GMWG, Value Tables have been successfully implemented in other states, including Delaware, Iowa, Michigan, and Minnesota.

Illinois recommends the implementation of Value Tables using a two-year growth approach. This two-year approach is designed to,

- Include as many students in the growth calculation as possible, and
- Ease planning and understanding for teachers, administrators, and parents over time.

These goals are best obtained when no more than two consecutive years of data are needed.

To begin the development of a Value Table model, we need to determine the number of progress categories within the Value Table. A total number of six performance categories is recommended based on preliminary analyses using Illinois statewide assessment data, as six categories provided enough specification to demonstrate growth without such specificity as to minimize the importance of growth. Different numbers of categories are used in other states, but we have found that most of the states using Value Tables employ five to seven categories. Upon stakeholder input, however, the number of performance categories may change.

Second, we need to set score ranges for each of the performance categories. Once set, these score ranges should remain consistent; in other words, the Value Table performance category score ranges are *not* to be recomputed yearly.

Third, we need to assign "value points" for progress that students obtain between the performance categories in two adjacent years. In general, student progress from lower categories into higher categories reflects improvement (above the gray diagonal in Tables 2 and 3 below), whereas movement from higher categories into lower categories reflects a decrease in progress (below the gray diagonal in Tables 2 and 3). Again, the precise determination of value points requires careful consideration, including point values on the diagonal, above the diagonal, and below the diagonal.

As examples, Table 2 includes a Value Table with equal value points such that all growth is weighted equally regardless of where students "start" in Year 1. In contrast, Table 3 includes a Value Table with *weighted* value points such that growth is more heavily weighted for students who were originally low-achieving in Year 1 but demonstrate growth in Year 2.

Table 2: An example of an *equally-weighted Value* Table showing students' value points as a function of their performance categories achieved in the previous year (displayed in rows) vs. the current year (displayed in columns)

		Student Performance in Year 2 (Current Year)					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Student Performance in Year 1 (Previous Year)	1	50	60	70	80	90	100
	2	40	50	60	70	80	90
	3	30	40	50	60	70	80
	4	20	30	40	50	60	70
	5	10	20	30	40	50	60
	6	0	10	20	30	40	50

Table 3: An example of a *weighted* Value Table showing students' value points as a function of their performance categories achieved in the previous year (displayed in rows) vs. the current year (displayed in columns)[4]

		Student Performance in Year 2 (Current Year)					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Student Performance in Year 1 (Previous Year)	1	50	100	140	170	190	200
	2	40	60	100	130	150	160
	3	30	50	70	100	120	130
	4	20	40	60	80	100	110
	5	10	30	50	70	90	100
	6	0	20	40	60	80	100

Note that students' growth and progress, defined in terms of average value points, can be computed separately for ESEA subgroups (e.g., race/ethnicity, English Language Learners, students with disabilities, low income students, etc.). In addition, value point averages can be computed for schools and districts, and value point indices can be combined with other variables to create a differentiated school and district accountability system.

Finally, in the development of a Value Table model, Illinois will need to develop policy guidelines for missing data and small schools. Any growth model relying on longitudinal data across grades will always be plagued with missing data as students transfer, drop out, leave the state, and so on. In addition, the reliability of any growth model decreases as the number of students included in the model decreases. Based on preliminary analyses, extra caution should be used for schools and districts with fewer than 100 students.

---

[4] We thank David Figlio, Orrington Lunt Professor of Education and Social Policy at Northwestern University, for his help in the weighted Value Table point example.

Conclusion

The purpose of this report was to provide insight into Illinois's selection process and ultimate preference for Value Tables. Based on extensive discussion with the Illinois TAC, GMWG, and other stakeholders, we found the following:

- A Value Table model provides educators and the public with an understandable goal for student progress
- A Value Table model provides all students with the same progress goals to work toward
- A Value Table model can be used in a broader system of differentiated accountability for schools and districts
- A Value Table model is highly correlated with the other two models considered (Value Added and Student Growth Percentile Ranking models)

Further, we recommend the following:

- A Value Table model should include a two-year growth approach, which includes as many students as possible and eases understanding of the growth calculation
- A Value Table model should include approximately six performance categories
- A Value Table model requires careful consideration in setting scale score ranges for the performance categories and point values on, above, and below the diagonal
- A Value Table model should include guidelines regarding missing data and use for schools and districts with fewer than 100 students

Upon adoption of a Value Table model for Illinois's differentiated accountability system for schools and districts, we expect that the Value Table growth model will provide valuable and meaningful information to educators, parents, students, and stakeholders about the ongoing progress and improvement of our students, schools, and statewide education system.

Upon Board authorization of the use of Value Tables for Illinois's growth model for school and district accountability, Agency staff will seek input from technical experts, stakeholders, and senior management regarding the precise weighting of point values, the specification of performance categories, and other technical aspects of Value Tables. We plan to convene these meetings in March and

will seek Board approval when the technical aspects of the Value Table growth model have been determined.

Once the technical aspects of Value Tables have been approved, growth model data at the student, school, and district levels will be provided online for schools, districts, and the public in order to inform instruction. Agency staff will also use Value Tables and growth model data as one indicator for a broader school and district accountability system, as outlined in our ESEA Waiver application.