

**Illinois State Board of education  
Innovation and Improvement Division  
Consolidated Committee of Practitioners**

ISBE Video – Conferencing Rooms

Chicago and Springfield

June 6, 2011

10:00 am to 3:00 pm

**MINUTES**

Chair: Larry McVey Secretary: Ava Harston ISBE Consultant: Cheryl Ivy

**Call To Order:** 10:10 AM

**Roll Call**

**Members Present:**

**Chicago** Office: Nancy Christensen, Yolanda Coleman, Jackie Daniel, Judith Green, Ava Harston, Kayleen Irizarry, Ricardo Johnson, Brenda Jones, Joyce McEwen, Vinest Steele, Leotis Swopes, Daniel Tully; ISBE Staff: Monique Chism, Melina Wright **Visitor:** Kimberly Thomas

**Springfield** Office: Bernadette Anderson, Donna Boros, Lynn Childs, Cynthia Garcia, Brenda Jones, Larry McVey, Karen Meucci, Daryl Morrison, Patricia Viniard ISBE Staff: Cheryl Ivy, Marcie Johnson

**Conference** call: Mary Ann Manos

**Proxy:** Jeff Fritchtnitch, Judith Johnson, Joanne Planeck

**Minutes February 7, 2011:** Correction Leotis Swopes provided a Proxy for 2/7/11 meeting.

Motion to Approve: Brenda Jones; Second; Jackie Daniels;

Minutes **Approved**

**Introduction of New Members**

Mary Ann Manos – Superintendent, Hartsburg-Emden CUSD #21

Yolanda Coleman – Federal and State Programs Coordinator, Joliet Public Schools Dist #86

Ricardo D. Johnson – Business Teacher, Thornton Township HS Dist #205

Karen Meucci – Parent, Nettle Creek Elementary, Morris IL

Vinest Steele – Title 1 Director, Rockford School District #205

Daniel Tully – Principal, Notre Dame College Prep, Niles IL

Monique Chism thanked everyone who applied and Cheryl Ivy for coordinating new member appointments.

**ISBE Introductions:**

Cheryl Ivy – Principal Education Consultant, CCOP Staff Liaison

Monique Chism - ISBE Innovation and Grants

Melina Wright – Title I Grants, Technical Assistance and Federal Liaison

**CCOP Feedback:****- How to integrate Title I Plans and Schoolwide Plans (and SIP's and DIP's if applicable?)****Monique Chism:**

ISBE has 10 Rising Star Plans that are due for approval

ISBE is attempting to create One Plan connected to budget and aligned to:

- Title I District Plan
- District Improvement Plan
- Comprehensive Schoolwide Program
- School Improvement Plans

**Monique requested Small Group Review of the four plans stated above and return to Large Group to Report Out the Recommendations for Integration**

The four plans were distributed to the committee for review and discussion.

**Chicago Group Discussion:**

CPS received clarification and combined required components.

Waukegan District #60 has 21 schools wherein they combined requirements and components.

Waukegan is currently Rising Star and ended up with an addendum to the school wide plan to follow Policy.

Should be a thread to integrate with schoolwide with all 10 components used as an anchor to align with Rising Star.

Curriculum needs to be included for connection to AYP.

Harvey Dist 152 suggested schoolwide contain all components for a starting point.

Harvey approached plans with a team comprised of reading and math teachers and administrators who used indicators to decide/select district and school level indicators. Both the district and schools ended up selecting the same indicators.

Joliet Public Schools found it was best to work from the schoolwide plan which is Federal and includes all components.

**Springfield/Chicago Large Group Report Out** (recorded as general comments)

CPS received a waiver not to do school improvement which is now Rising Star and updated their process and found common threads to review all plans.

Each plan still had specific requirements e.g. transition from Preschool to Elem.  
Schoolwide does have you focus on a specific program and special populations.  
Pieces unique to each plan were placed in Tabs as specific requirements to that particular plan.  
School Improvement is separate from Title I and should remain specific to each school.  
District Title I focuses on special populations.  
Still need to coordinate resources.  
District Improvement and Title I can be tied together.  
Disconnect could be timing and when reports are due.  
They all have financial implications and should be seamless.  
It wouldn't make sense for 10 separate schoolwide plans to be incorporated into one SIP.  
Comprehensive falls under Data assessment.  
Instead of separate strands, action plans should include parent and Professional Development activities that would be integrated into actual action plans.  
Districts have made comments that planning takes time away from actual activities and want to pare down for more efficiency.  
**District #60** places 3 sections into strategies that includes the components in each strand.  
Information may appear to be inconsistent, but it is consistent just repeated throughout the various plans.  
Schools feel the repetition is redundant.  
Schools are using Rising Star to address specific indicators in SIP and DIP.  
Are more schools going to be able to use the Rising Star format?  
Rising Star requires an outside person coming in to provide leadership and resource.  
Indicators can be used to address plan needs.  
Take SIP information and simplify the data for integration into schoolwide plans.  
If Rising Star is a focus then provide indicators in each section of the other plans to fit with the other components.  
Connection between SIP and DIP whereby Professional Development in the district is used for not making AYP in reading to connect with schools so it is not so disjointed in goals and strategies.  
Use the connection with schoolwide for school improvement.  
Areas that are similar or the same should be the goals for both district and each school.  
Maybe system could be disaggregated for individual needs which will increase leadership direction for the entire district.  
Springfield Technology plan is also required and is connected to ISBE with District Tabs for the 10 components.  
Some schools are not in improvement maybe there could be a checkbox for Rising Star and not SIP.  
CPS would be the one with 500 Tabs due to the large number of schools; a guide would be needed for individual schools.  
**Question:** Is this integration a plan for 2012?

**Answer:** Monique indicated yes, ISBE would like to move forward with integration plans for the 2012 school year.

ISBE has a draft for Technology and SIP.

Monique Thanked the CCOP members for the feedback and requested a committee to work with ISBE to take a look at the “crosswalks”.

Kim Thomas, CPS District 299; Judith Green; Waukegan District #60; and Jackie Daniels, Chicago Heights School District #170 will work on the Ad Hoc committee to review the “crosswalk” process.

**- what specific technical assistance is needed to provide services to Private School students regarding implementing effective schoolwide programs and in reference to target assistance schoolwide?**

**Melina Wright:**

Distinction between small populations of Title I and Title II. Could something be put online for student access to identify and target certain children in reference to targeted assistance? Even pooling does not provide enough funding to truly run a program.

**Suggestions:**

For non – publics, Study Island where individualized programs are \$7 per person could be used for the students. Each student has a password.

? - How do you monitor nonpublic versus public funding? **Answer:** private schools can purchase software package such as Study Island to use in school and as additional time for instructional support, the issue becomes staffing.

Melina requested input to her and Cheryl for brainstorming from the committee in reference to ramping up assistance to Private Schools:

Schools between districts have to prove which district they are in.

ISBE states it is where the students reside.

? - Private Schools do not understand (e.g. Charters decide that they are in a particular district when they are not).

**Answer:** When students are registered with the state their address should indicate where they live. This question will be shared with ISBE consultants for more definitive answer.

? - What about parochial schools where a student lives in public school district?

**Answer:** Public school districts is responsible for them.

? - Archdiocese finds it difficult to coordinate between Chicago and suburbs where the students come from several different districts as residence. Can funding be pooled to offer programs from a third party?

**Answer:** Comments regarding third party idea. There is a separate cost for administration of the 3<sup>rd</sup> party program; it takes money off of the top for funding that could go to the public school.

? - ISBE provides Technical assistance workshops in different areas of the state how can ISBE invite non publics? Where are the opportunities for non publics to attend and learn about the

funding? Districts try to provide info to the non publics but sometimes the dioceses have a different interpretation of funding.

**Comment:** Some nonpublic's feel it is not egalitarian to administer the programs in different manner to their schools.

**Answer:** ISBE cannot mandate attendance at a workshop but will try to provide additional avenues for information to non publics. Sharing the power points without suggesting mandatory meetings.

**Comment:** Non publics should not be able to dictate to the public school districts what they want. The public school offers what is available and the non public needs to decide how they want to be involved. Attitude of public and non public schools can come if they want does not go hand in hand with the collaborative nature of the programs.

Invitations are sent in Rockford for the nonpublics and then individual consultant is provided if necessary. Relationships are important and need to be continued.

**Melina** will contact the Dept of Ed with ideas. ISBE will consider availability to provide more Regional meetings and/or additional information to be shared for nonpublic participation.

**Suggestion:** Hear from practitioners in the field with successful programs.

**Comments:** Some privates are disconnected for whatever reason from public schools but they do use the ISBE website for Fall housing report but maybe ISBE could place info there on the ISBE website for the non public.

? - What if non privates do not know how to register and identify eligible children?

**Answer:** Melina will provide the info from ISBE private school website and access to the 2 consultants. The private schools must register.

**Monique** - In the beginning any school in improvement status was eligible. This year direction changed and funds are for Title I only. RESPRO's only served federally funded schools. ARRA funds were used for ROE's to service schools, no ARRA funding next year so they will not receive funding.

? - How far does ISBE need to go across the state? Is best contact at the school level or district level?

**Answer:** School level is the best entry level. Most agreed.

**Suggestion:** For someone to be trained at the District level for use in each school. Would have to add a staff member. Title I Directors are already overwhelmed.

**Comments:** Rising Star has been very successful with helping the schools move forward with the Respro Coaches.

Depends on size and scope of the District.

Needs to be 50/50 district and schools for most effective use of funding for systems of checks and balances.

District support lets schools know their needs as opposed to Respros just working with the schools.

Funding requires either/or connection of District/RESPRO or School/RESPRO.

**Suggestion:** Cluster services (e.g. 5 schools in a cluster) currently one Respro coach works with the middle schools.

**Monique** - next year the RESPRO's will continue what occurred this year but they will not take any NEW school and have been told to focus on the common core.

e.g. adding into each area a content Expert. Position for Literacy, Math, Data/Assessments.

District with some in IIRC and some in Rising Star can have a District decisions for all schools with dedicated coaches for the current school in Rising Star and another person to work with the schools that were not originally in Rising Star.

? – if district knows funding will cease can the district move to a “train the trainer model” to build capacity for teams as continued support to develop a cohesive tool?

there are some RESPRO's that are working at schools only and not at the District level. Next year the RESPRO'S will connect with the districts of those schools.

Statewide System of Support will replace the term RESPRO. Current coaches will be evaluated to be sure the staffing is current.

## **Lunch**

### **ISBE Feedback**

#### **Accountability 2.0**

**Melina Wright** states: Superintendent Koch thru CCCSO has applied for a waiver if Reauthorization does not occur

States want to approach Accountability in a different manner thru 8 Objectives

US Dept of Ed is emphatic there will be no waivers because Reauthorization will occur

ISBE is hoping there will be a more detailed Accountability 2.0

**CCOP will be asked to review Accountability 2.0 and provide input.**

If a transition waiver becomes available it will in the Fall 2012.

PARCC is a “gold model” of accountability

Melina will provide CCOP with a brief synopsis of the 8 elements for the minutes. (attached at the end of the minutes)

Most important and complicated are the AYP Calculations.

Status would remain but there would be a variation on Safe Harbor through:

- Targets
- Growth
- Residual Indicators
- Achievement Gap

Implementation would be 2012 – 2013 school year.

ISBE needs PARCC in place and a transition waiver.

20% set aside would be discussed if this were to be implemented.

ISBE would like as much alignment to current plans as possible.

## **SES**

ISBE handout Waiver Requests was distributed.

Deadline to apply is before the start of school.

## **CCOP Questions posed at NCLB Conference**

Handout distributed.

**Card #1** – Discuss the monitoring of Rising Star – What is working? What is not working?

Too much detailed is required and all districts are not involved to post as minutes on the CCOP Website

Suggestion: gather input on what is and what is not working to post on the website

**Card #2** – Please address the conflict between NCLB and IDEA with graduation rate. We are being penalized because we have IEP students who we educate until they are 21. We filed an appeal but it was rejected because of State/Federal law.

**Answer:** Feds mandated a four year graduation cohort rate. Currently the laws are in conflict.

ISBE did not have the data system in place this year to apply for an adjusted cohort waiver.

Hopefully by next year the data system will be in place to place identifiers in 9<sup>th</sup> grade as required. ISBE is monitoring this closely.

Many districts are in status due to Special Education and the requirement to provide 6 years of education. Special Education as a group cannot be used as an identifying cohort.

## **Card #3**

1. Strategic alignment/strategy management of planning proves. The plans don't coordinate well; this appears to be a "system" problem not a design problem. Then when the RESPRO agent shows up they are largely unaware of all of it.

2. Coping vs. planning

3. Communication – transparency and accountability

**Card #4** – How can you help districts with federal grants and then sustain the programs when the grant period runs out?

## **Questions to be addressed on website.**

Brenda Jones will draft a response to 1, 2 and 3.

Kayleen Irizarry will draft a response to 4.

Draft of responses will be sent to Cheryl Ivy.

CCOP will review the responses before they are posted on the website.

**Suggestion:** FAQ on CCOP website.

### **ISBE Updates:**

NCLB – Title I Application Toolkit to be released in July notification via IWAS.

There will be a 3 chapter prerecorded webinar (20 minute segments). If there are any questions Districts/Schools can call an ISBE Consultant.

Application is available this week of June 6, 2011.

### **Progress of SIG 1003(g)**

SIG applications were due May 2. ISBE received apps from 14 districts and 24 schools.

May 16<sup>th</sup> external reviews of all 24 schools.

Recommendations for finalist were made.

Last week contacts and interviews were conducted with recommendations to Superintendent Koch next week 6/13/11 and awards by the end of June.

Seven new Lead partners were added and the list is available now.

Access will not be incorporated into PARCC.

### **New Business:**

Discussion of V-Tel as something new for this meeting.

Better Attendance

Cannot See Everyone

Saves time and money

Chicago is getting a new V-Tel system.

Does Committee consider V-Tel a viable meeting option?

CCOP can have two face to face and two V-Tel meetings.

Suggestion for next meeting in September to be scheduled in Springfield.

CCOP will try V-Tel again in December 2011.

### **Next Meeting Agenda:**

Revisit having V-Tel meeting in December

Meeting Date for December 2011

CCSSO Update

Crosswalk of Plans

Accountability 2.0 Update

FAQ's

Save room on Agenda for CCOP Member Agencies Outreach Reports

ISBE will identify List serve Appropriate Questions



**Meeting Dates/Locations**

- Next Meeting: **Tuesday September 20, 2011 in Springfield**
- IATD Conference September 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>
- IATD Conference November 29<sup>th</sup>

**Kayleen Irizarry** was approached to consider working in DC.

Kayleen accepted the position as an Assistant Superintendent of Elementary and Secondary Education of DC Public and Charter Schools to begin on July 18th.

CCOP wished Kayleen well in her new endeavor and we will definitely miss her!

**Adjourn**

Motion by Nancy Christensen

Second by Joyce McEwen

**2:52 PM**

Respectfully submitted,

Ava Harston

CCOP Secretary

**See Page 10: Accountability 2.0 – 8 Elements from Melina Wright**

**From:** WRIGHT MELINA [mailto:mewright@isbe.net]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 07, 2011 2:37 PM

**To:** Ava Harston

**Subject:** RE: Accountability 2.0

Element 1: Performance objectives aligned to the goal of CCR (pg. 12 of roadmap)

Goal: To measure performance for all students and student groups to ensure that all students are college and career ready by high school graduation. Include targets and benchmarks for each grade level and learning progressions

Element 2: Valid measures and metrics focused on student performance outcomes

Goal: Through course model of summative assessments. Quarterly assessments. Focus on status and growth

Element 3: Determinations that meaningfully capture school and district performance

Goal: To determine how good the district/school is. (status) And

Is the district/school getting better (growth?)

Element 4: Transparent reporting of determinations Goal: Timely presentation of data; data presented in a variety of ways; district, school, and classroom

Element 5: Diagnostic review to ensure comprehensive analysis of and accurate conclusions about school & district performance

Goal: Utilize a diagnostic review process based on quality standards to identify strengths and areas for improvement

SEA would utilize before and after state determines classification and would include state/federal monitoring and compliance

Connect to accreditation process

Element 6: Classifications that meaningfully distinguish schools & district Goal: To offer the appropriate type, intensity and duration of supports and interventions for districts. Identify the lowest performing schools by both overall student performance and greatest gaps in performance. Identify highest performing schools and recognize

Define State Level Interventions.

Element 7: Supports & interventions to reinforce school and district efforts to produced CCR students

Goal: Provide incentives, supports, and interventions and evaluate impact.

Element 8: Innovation, evaluation, and continuous improvement of the system