

GROWTH MODEL MEETING

AUGUST 30, 2010

10:00 CDT-3:15

Present: Dr. Lizanne DeStefano, Chair; Chris Koch, State Superintendent of Schools; Joyce Zurkowski, ISBE; Joseph Matula; Amy Nowell; Mark Doan; Amy Alsop; Carmen Acevado; Travis McQuire; Mike McKindles, guest speaker, ISBE; Jeremy Shoen, guest speaker, IBM; Nellie Kelley, guest speaker, IBM; Terry Chamberlain, guest speaker, ISBE; Robin Ehrhart; Linda Tomlinson, ISBE; Debbie `Meisner-Bertauski, IBHE; Laura Cresap; Jamie Craven; Connie Wise, ISBE; Colleen Legge; Bob Grimm; Ellen Cwick; Wilma VanSyoc, ISBE; Brian Durham; Susy Woods; Beth Yacobi; Mark Mitovich; and Kathlene Shank.

Item # 1: Refresher on our Work and Overview of this Meeting

Chair DeStefano reviewed what we have done in our first two meetings. Summaries have been emailed to committee members relative to both of these meetings.

Chair DeStefano stated that today's meeting would commence with an up-date on Race to the Top; that in this meeting we would spend considerable time on "Illinois Longitudinal Data System project; and presentations would be given on "District assessments of student growth".

**Dr. Koch joined us as we began the overview of the Illinois Longitudinal Data System and stayed with us for part of McKindles presentation (see Item # 4 below). Dr. DeStefano shared an overview of our work as it meshes with PCAP and PARCC. She asked Dr. Koch about the "Assessments for Learning" RFP and its status due to its relationship to our work. Dr. Koch responded that all this relates to reauthorization of ESEA. He said ISBE continues to look at ways to fund these efforts. Dr. DeStefano said this group's recommendation would be to move ahead with the formative assessments of learning as districts would really benefit from this work.

Item #2: PCAP Up-Date by Joseph Matula

Joseph Matula is on both committees, PCAP and Growth Models; he shared that PCAP at its August 20 meeting had presentations on three principal and teacher evaluation systems. PCAP has broken down into sub-committees and Joe is on the group looking at "multiple measures of student growth". PCAP has district people and teachers. This group is moving forward on developing a state template; this may occur as early as its next meeting. The model developed by this committee will focus on performance.

Dr. DeStefano addressed how this committee and our work go together. Dr. DeStefano noted that there is real correlation between the concerns and thoughts expressed on this committee and on PCAP. Dr. DeStefano asked about the “principal performance review”; she suggested we may want to look at this document. Dr. Tomlinson said this document is on the ISBBE website.

Item #3 Race to the Top

Joyce Zurkowski explained there are two aspects of the Race to the Top. The state grant fund competition which we were not awarded; we were #15 and only 10 states were funded.

The other aspect of Race to the Top is the focus on assessment; there are two consortiums competing for these funds. Illinois has joined one of these two; we joined PARCC. This consortium provides for states to have a more involved voice. Specific issues are currently being discussed at meetings including consortium members. The next meeting of the consortium will involve higher education relative to the college level common goal component. The consortium will work together in development of the end of high school assessment and when this is developed this test will be the test used as the end of high school assessment. Dr. DeStefano said that states are supposed to have autonomy as a member of PARCC and able to make its own discrete decisions. Amy Alsop asked what subject areas were being addressed; Joyce said the focus is on English, language arts, and Math at this point. Joyce said part of the discussion will be about how the information and efforts of the states which got Race to the Top will be accessed and used by the consortium. There is a total of 350 million available over four years.

In September this committee will further explore PARCC and the work ahead of this consortium.

Dr. DeStefano asked about the formative assessment item development RFP that was included in our Race to the Top proposal as to whether this will still occur. Connie Wise responded this was still under consideration; Chair DeStefano said she felt this work was important to our work.

Item # 4 Illinois Longitudinal Data System (See handout: Illinois State Board of Education, Illinois Longitudinal Data System on committee web-site)

Illinois Longitudinal Data System-

Mike McKindles, ISBE, shared an overview of the Project. (**Dr. Koch joined us as we began this presentation. See Item #1 above).

Mr. McKindles said that there are federal and state funds providing financial support of this work. Dr. DeStefano commended ISBE for getting the significant grants that funded this work.)

There are five components including a “State Education Data Advisory Committee whose work is in progress. There are twenty eight members from varying stakeholders. This group has met six times and is helping in defining the directions and evaluation criteria. This group will be

involved in implementation relative to communication, pilot testing, on-going feedback, and training needs.

A second component involves developing an “enterprise-wide data architecture”. This will result in a blueprint for the Education Enterprise Data Warehouse.

Number 3 component is to “establish a system of data stewards and enhanced data audit procedures”. Goals are to work to reduce redundancy; ensure accuracy; provide staff training in use of data; and provide technical assistance. An important aspect of this is sustainability.

Component #4 is the “data warehouse”. There will be a public side; there will be support of research agendas. Providing federal data is a very important element. This will include data from varying currently existing systems. The data warehouse will provide for linking data.

Component #5 is to “link the ISBE student data with Postsecondary and employment data and use the data for research and analysis”. The question was asked about this linking relative to Community Colleges. Mr. McKindles responded that there is a consortium that includes community colleges and four year institutions and this consortium includes 95% of the institutions providing higher education. This consortium is already looking at data being collected and to be collected in the future.

Mr. McKindles shared the timeline; all five components are underway with some level of activity. The data warehouse piece has just been initiated (Component #4); design should commence in January 2011 with some initial pieces coming out of the warehouse by December 2011.

Dr. Koch again mentioned that ESEA will really affect this work and our work as we do not want to go too far and get ahead of reauthorization.

Joseph Matula asked who the governing body is over the data; Mike McKindles answered that ISBE is the governing body and the Advisory Group for the Illinois Longitudinal Data System. Another question asked was about access to data for research; Mike responded the intent is for this to enhance access to data for researches not interfere with this type of work.

There are three focus groups working with the Advisory Group: Data Advisory Committee, Enterprise-wide Data Architecture (PCG has been selected as a vendor and is doing work relative to the architecture component); and Data Stewardship. Relative to Data Stewardship two positions of four needed have been filled and analysis is underway. Maine, Arkansas, New Jersey, and Louisiana are also working with PCG on data system architecture.

The RFSP for Data Warehouse to seek a vendor is in progress. Data sharing agreements are in place to enhance the data available and use of the data; high school feedback report data sharing activities are ongoing. Linking of ISBE data with Postsecondary and Employment Data and use of this data for research and analysis is the goal. Eventually ACT will produce the report for us.

One of the challenges is being able to match the data. The student ID needs to link from high school to higher education. Dr. DeStefano asked what would be the student identifier; ISBE currently assigns an identifier and this is the identifier that will be used. It is not currently used by public higher education. Publics will link but privates will have an option.

Activities in the SLDS Expansion Grant (ARRA) Project include four components.

#1: Statewide Transcript System for Middle and High School Students

A system that ties teacher to student will be established. It will capture courses, grades, and teachers; it will allow for multiple teachers. The current thinking is that it would be set up so that one teacher could be identified as primary and others as secondary. A question asked was who would have access and McKindles answered this was not his decision but the intent was not at this time to have full public access. To do this courses would have to be defined and this is progress for vocational and technical courses. Connie Wise answered there was work in progress cross-walking state definitions to federal which would be shared with superintendents this fall.

A comment about access to this data and teacher evaluations and the confidential nature of these was made. Confidentiality is important. Mike responded we are developing the system but governance lies in other entities. This is a very sensitive area.

ISBE is collecting data that has as a possibility of being used to assess teachers' effectiveness. Evaluation of teachers is a local district responsibility thus use of data is a local decision and the data feed for this is not yet under consideration. Data feeds being established at this time are specific to the "transcript system for middle and high school students". Data feeds include to "State Transcript Depository", ISAC; and postsecondary institutions for student applications and enrollment functions.

A question was asked about students in special education and McKindles responded we currently collect significant data related to special education and the system of data collection for special education will be refined and modified.

Part of the definition of courses in progress includes remedial, honors, and other aspects of who is in courses and differences in courses. Carmen Acevedo brought up issues with grading and what a grade represents; McKindles said a teacher focus group also expressed this concern and that what grades mean is very subjective. How useful grades truly are is a big question.

Dr. DeStefano asked about the relationship of this work to data related to growth.

The second component is "Integration of Student Level Data with Teacher and Administrator Data". This will involve "redesign of ISBE teacher and administrator data collection systems".

The third component is “Improvement of Postsecondary and Workforce Data Collection through Greater Access to Public and Private Higher Education Data and Incorporation of Unemployment Insurance Wage Records into the Data Collection Systems”. The link will be to the final exit assessment at the end of the high school. One goal is to plan and design modifications to High School Feedback Report to expand upon information regarding postsecondary enrollment and performance. Another goal is to plan and design a process to incorporate data from the National Student Clearinghouse to better track transfer and concurrent enrollment of students.

The fourth component is “Expansion of Early Childhood Data Collection System”. Goal is to expand currently collected student information.

This funded set of activities recently funded by ARRA is less advanced than the previous work described. The timeline reflects the four components of this work on-going through 2013. The “Data Quality Campaign” identified 10 essential elements of data collection and we either already do these or it is in progress. “America Competes” has 12 essential elements and we do most of these. The P-20 Act specifies data to be collected and Illinois is aligned to these.

Illinois is collecting data from very collection systems including: Student Information System; Special Education Data System and Special Education Approval and Reimbursement System; Child Nutrition; Educator Certification System; Electronic Grants Management System; Annual Financial Report; Financial Reimbursement Information System; Non-Public Registration; Facilities and Inventory; Federal Career and Technical Education; Bilingual Education Reports; and Regional and Truants Alternative and Optional Education Program reporting.

What don’t we currently collect in Illinois: daily attendance; student health information; grades and course information; library records; AP information; transportation records; formative assessment information.

Two members of the Growth Model group are on the Illinois Longitudinal Data System Advisory Committee also and will be our liaisons to this advisory committee’s work, Amy Alsop and Amy Nowell.

Item #5: Student Information System presentation by representatives of IBM (Jeremy Shoen and Nellie Kelley-See handout on website: Growth Model Presentation)

This project has been in progress since 2005. The project piloted collection of student data in 2005 and additional data collections have been added each year. (IBM is the vendor and the contract goes through 2013.)

Each student is assigned a unique student identifier number (SID). The project collects demographic, enrollment, performance, and program participation data for each student. Dr.

DeStefano asked about how districts use this SID. Responses to this query included that some districts use this ID number and others assign an ID and link it to the SID.

This system interfaces with internal ISBE systems. It tracks students from school/facility to school/facility and district to district within the state. It provides schools, districts, and facilities the ability to report timely and accurate data/information through standardized reporting capabilities.

A question was asked as to whether data relative to enrollment was reported differently last year on the school report card and Joyce said she would look at this and get an answer back.

Assessment data received from vendors includes: ACCESS, I, ISAT, and PSAE. Student data received from the schools has approximately 350 data elements, including native language, home language, race/ethnicity, and gender. Program indicators include: migrant, career/tech education, SES, homeless, LEP, IEP, FRL/low income, Century 21, eligibility for immigrant education, Reading 1st, Reading Improvement Block Grant Program and Title 1.

Resource materials are available on the ISBE SIS webpage at www.isbe.net/sis/. A question was asked about entities that have access to the information provided to a district. The response was that the superintendent of the district determined who got access and at what levels and which information.

The question was asked how SIS fits into the data warehouse. The answer was that SIS collects data whereas the data warehouse is how it is housed for use.

Item #6 Reflections on what we have heard thus far today

It was mentioned that SIS does collect information on characteristics of learners that we previously had talked about may be factors we would want to consider in a growth model, such as SES, native language, and IEP.

Another comment related to the differences in districts relative to level of use of data and resources/capacity to support data use and collection was made. Mr. McKindles talked about capability to collect and level of collection does come into play.

Dr. DeStefano commented that levels of access to information are an important consideration. She also commented that with the data warehouse system there had to be a link with districts similar to the one SIS has. Another concern is that the Data Warehouse planned is for middle and high school and does not include high school.

It was brought up that consideration had to be given to classroom teacher access to data if the data is to help teachers to make decisions.

Dr. DeStefano asked about the real time processing of data so it is useable by teachers. Also, collection of formative data is not being addressed as the current data collected is all summative.

A comment made also addressed the affordability of efforts as small districts may not have the capacity.

Dr. DeStefano asked about “data stewards”. Ms. Wise responded by giving an example that currently a data steward looks at data quality issues by examining data from what year to a next.

Another comment made spoke to being sure that we consider carefully and plan for “roll out” of a growth model and training to understand and use data, what it means and what it does not mean.

A clarification was made that PARCC will develop the assessment to be used but not be the determiner of what course the assessment aligns to.

Another comment was made that it is important that the work districts are already engaged in will be considered as we move ahead as some districts are moving ahead relative to measuring student learning. We need to keep in mind what districts have and are doing. A state wide survey was suggested as a way to look at capacity. A question was asked of Ms. Wise if there were efforts to help districts relative to increasing capacity. The response was not really but there were some efforts to help districts with technology.

Item #7: Sharing by Committee Members of Local Perspectives

Carmen Acevedo: Carmen shared the “Plainfield Community Consolidated School District 202: The Journey towards Growth”. The district has common assessments for PreK-12. The district partners with the “Curriculum Leadership Institute”. The district has subject area committees. For each subject the curriculum is examined relative to what is taught and it is aligned to learner goals. Gaps are found and curriculum is developed. After curriculum is developed assessment development occurs. Common assessments are validated before data is collected. Data collected is analyzed and recommendations are made for district-wide interventions.

An important aspect is that textbooks are considered a resource and not as constituting the curriculum. The outcome assessments can be customized as to format; this is done electronically. There is time set aside at elementary and middle grade levels for intervention.

Growth in enrollment and diversity has been significant in Plainfield. Plainfield has analyzed data for seven years in Math and Reading; it has looked at data relative to race and ethnicity and compared the district to other districts. AYP data has also been analyzed. Carmen conveyed that the district believes that the focus on development of a district curriculum, having resources that align and support the curriculum, the common assessments, and teacher development and ownership of the assessments have significantly contributed to the gains made by students in reading and math. The district is not using a growth model at this time. A key component is the electronic data analysis which assures data is readily available to the teacher. The reports provide information that is helpful in making classroom decisions. Plainfield has been involved in this

work for five years. A question was asked as to whether five years was reasonable; could it be done in a shorter amount of time? Carmen answered that it took time to do this well. Also, Carmen said that teachers have to own the process and system and have to see value in the processes and this takes time.

Bob Grimm: Dr. Grimm presented on District 211's (Palatine) Teacher Evaluation Pilot Program. This district tied the work of Charlotte Danielson to a high school setting. The domains are: Domain 1- Planning and Preparing for Classes; Domain 2-Classroom Environment; Domain 3- Instruction; and Domain 4- Professional Responsibility.

Common concepts are assessed with the assessment being formative; assessments are developed by teachers. These assessments are designed to "test for understanding". (These have not been done in all subjects.) The assessments are used by the teachers and data is generated. Teachers meet in professional learning communities to examine the data from these subject matter specific measures of student growth and to make comparisons as to the extent given sets of students have learned given concepts. Discussion occurs as to how to help students that did not get it, get it and how different teachers approached teaching a given concept.

Teachers set their goals and this is used for evaluation. Goals must be agreed to by the evaluator. Currently most teachers use the "professional learning community" (PLC) goals.

A question posed is "To what extent does collective responsibility for student growth come into play."

Item #8 What Comes Next

At our next meeting, September 27th, in Springfield we will look at PARCC as hopefully it will be funded.

Timing is an issue; the implication of timelines versus the time it takes to do assessment of student learning well is something we need to address.

Development of a test bank was discussed as being necessary to align to common core standards. Selection by teachers and buy in by teachers was also discussed. Part of the value of development of curriculum and common assessments is the process.

The lack of consistency in the preparation of teachers was brought up as an issue. Teachers don't all come in ready and able to do the same things.

It was shared that according to a recent National Clearinghouse on Teacher Quality report the majority of teachers (70%) are not self-contained or single subject matter teachers for which achievement test scores directly measure what the teacher has taught. It is important we keep in focus that assessment of student learning goes beyond the common core areas (TQ Research &

Policy Brief “Challenges in Evaluating Special Education Teachers and English Language Learner Specialists”, July 2010, www.TQSOURCE.ORG).

We are on multiple tracks according to our Chair. Teacher and principal evaluation must include measures of student growth. The state must also select a “Growth Model” to use for district and building accountability. The fourth would be for instructional purposes.

A suggestion was made that at the next meeting we collectively generate a list of ways we perceive student growth can be measured

Data quality is important; also important is the interconnectiveness of assessments. Linking assessments to varying uses is also a consideration.

We agreed by show of hands to send a letter to Superintendent Koch to encourage development of an item bank specific to the common core that could be used by teachers and districts. We are not suggesting this be like the one described in Race to the Top. Other states have done this and these item banks are not stagnant.

NEXT MEETING IS SEPTEMBER 27, 2010-ISBE, Springfield; 10:00 a.m. CDT.