

## ISBE's Overarching Goals

- All kindergartners are assessed for readiness.
- Ninety percent or more of third-grade students are reading at or above grade level.
- Ninety percent or more of fifth-grade students meet or exceed expectations in mathematics.
- Ninety percent or more of ninth-grade students are on track to graduate with their cohort.
- Ninety percent or more of students graduate from high school ready for college and career.
- All students are supported by highly prepared and effective teachers and school leaders.
- Every school offers a safe and healthy learning environment for all students.
- 60 percent of Illinoisans with a high-quality degree or postsecondary credential by 2025
- Empowerment of districts
- Equitable outcomes for all students
- Whole, healthy children (as defined in CSP) nested in whole, healthy system

### Overarching Theory of Action: How will these goals be met?

<b>Goals and Design Priorities</b>	<b>How goals will be achieved (hypothesized mechanism)</b>
<b>Promote Equity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fair and easy access to high quality educational opportunities for each and every child</li> <li>- equal access to highly effective educators</li> <li>- equal access to safe schools</li> <li>- a holistic, comprehensive system of supports to schools in need</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Emphasize growth in the accountability system</li> <li>• Identify equity gaps between subgroups that are/are not excelling</li> </ul>
<b>Support Academic Excellence – improve outcomes for all students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure a rigorous curriculum</li> <li>• Establish a universal culture of high expectations for all students</li> <li>• Attend to the Whole Child</li> <li>• Identify and provide appropriate supports for schools that are struggling</li> </ul>
<b>Support the Whole Child</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commit to supporting educators develop knowledge, skills, and understandings necessary to meet needs of the whole child (e.g., able to adapt instruction based on interest and readiness level)</li> <li>• Provide students with access to multiple educational opportunities based upon student interests</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide students with necessary transitional supports (between grades and schools)</li> </ul>
<b>Honor Local Expertise and Context</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the role of school climate</li> <li>• Leverage high performing districts to support and share best practices</li> <li>• Prioritize ongoing stakeholder feedback related to design, implementation and required supports</li> </ul>
<b>Empower Districts and Support Local Improvement Efforts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide districts and schools with the tools and resources required to support effective needs assessment and improvement planning/implementation activities.</li> <li>• Allow districts/schools to be an active participant in the statewide system of support (e.g., by selecting services/vendors aligned to their needs within IL EMPOWER)</li> <li>• Identify high performing districts so that they are empowered to support districts in need</li> <li>• Establish a non-punitive, equitable accountability system that serves to educate, support and inform</li> </ul>

ISBE has worked to ensure the system and each indicator is designed to be:

- **Educative:** provide information that informs continuous improvement;
- **Equitable:** not privilege or disadvantage schools based on factors such as size, geographic location, students served, etc.;
- **Non-punitive:** focused on providing supports and fostering local expertise to promote improvement rather than imposing penalties for poor performance.
- **Serves to Differentiate Schools:** provides useful and reliable information about school’s relative performance so that appropriate support can be provided.

The design principles listed in the table below reflect *additional* considerations highlighted by ISBE and the TAC during further discussions of each indicator. When identifying the evidence necessary to inform the evaluation of each indicator (as well as the system overall) all relevant design principles should be considered.

Indicators	Rationale for Inclusion	Design Priorities	Key Question the Indicator Addresses	Research/Data Necessary to	
				To evaluate if system is working as intended	To support schools/ educators understand how to impact change
<b>Academic Achievement</b>  <i>Measure: percent proficiency on state tests and DLM</i>	Required indicator in ESSA (ELA & Math only)  Academic achievement has been the historical method for differentiation of schools in IL.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The calculations should be straightforward to understand and implement</li> <li>• High performing schools that show slight declines should not be penalized</li> <li>• Retain the focus on long-term goals and interim targets</li> <li>• Incentivize meaningful progress for all schools, including low performing</li> <li>• Differentiate schools performing below the interim target in terms of the proportion of the target achieved within that year</li> </ul>	To what extent is my school meeting the state’s annual targets related to academic achievement (i.e., proficiency) in Math, ELA and Science ? overall and for each student group?		
<b>Academic Progress (3-8 only)</b>  <i>Measure: Mean SGP</i>	Promotes equity  Serves to meaningfully differentiate schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relatively straightforward to understand and implement</li> <li>• something educators perceive to be influenced by their actions</li> <li>• relatively stable</li> <li>• weakly correlated with prior year status<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• sufficient to allow for all outcomes, including favorable outcomes, to be available to all types of schools</li> </ul>	To what extent are the students in my school, on average, demonstrating expected growth?		

<sup>1</sup> Academic growth should be attainable for students at all achievement levels. The TAC placed a value on solutions in which the student’s prior score did not unreasonably determine their growth score.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sensitive to changes in student achievement, particularly for students at the low end of the ability distribution</li> <li>• resistant to ceiling and floor effects</li> <li>• useful and informative<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• able to provide for reliable estimates of school growth within a given year</li> <li>• resistant to significant fluctuations in year to year performance</li> <li>• able to detect (not mask) important school level effects<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>			
<p><b>Graduation Rate (HS only)</b></p> <p><i>Measure: weighted sum of 4, 5 and 6 year adjusted cohort grad rate.</i></p>	<p>Required indicator</p> <p>Outcome reflecting CCR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentivize meaningful progress for all schools, including low performing</li> <li>• Differentiate schools by distributing performance within an established “acceptable” range.</li> <li>• Do not award any credit for performance that falls below a state-defined floor.</li> </ul>	<p>To what extent is my school’s weighted graduation rate falling within an acceptable range?</p>		

<sup>2</sup> The growth outcome should be as instructive as possible (e.g., foster helpful conversations about improving achievement) as opposed to an outcome that offers no insight.

<sup>3</sup> Growth models can be highly specified to minimize effects of certain school characteristics, such as by adding covariates. Taken to an extreme, this can create lower expectations for some student groups and obscure findings that are important to detect. The TAC cautioned against pursuing models that mask effects that should be detected.

<p><b>Progress Toward ELP</b></p> <p><i>Measure: Degree to which students meet annual ELP target gains.</i></p>	<p>Required indicator under ESSA.</p> <p>Ensures appropriate emphasis placed on supporting ELL students to succeed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize and award student progress toward proficiency at a rate that would allow for exit from the system in a state-specified number of years (5 years).</li> <li>• Incentivize and award incremental progress, even if not at the desired rate.</li> </ul>	<p>On average, are the students in my school meeting their annual targets for ELP growth?</p>		
<p><b>Chronic Absenteeism</b></p> <p><i>Measure:</i></p>	<p>Research showing strong relationship between CA and student outcomes<sup>4</sup>.</p> <p>Stable data collected consistently across LEAs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish rigorous, yet attainable criteria that incentivize schools and teachers to engage in practices focused on reducing absentee rates.</li> </ul>	<p>Where does my school's chronic absentee rate fall given the range of CA rates observed across schools in the state?</p>		
<p><b>Climate Surveys</b></p> <p><i>Measure: Percent Participation on School Climate Survey</i></p>	<p>Evidence that school culture and climate has an impact on student achievement<sup>5</sup></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish rigorous, yet attainable participation rate criteria.</li> <li>• Incentivize high participation rates.</li> <li>• Clearly reflect the state's intent that participation below 50% is unacceptable.</li> </ul> <p><i>Ongoing consideration is required to determine if student response data, rather than participation rate data</i></p>	<p>To what extent is my school demonstrating an expected rate of participation on the school climate survey?</p>		

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Education. "Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools. An Unprecedented Look at an Educational Crisis." (2016): <https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/chronicabsenteeism.html>.

Center, Utah Education Policy. "Research brief: Chronic absenteeism." Research Brief, University of Utah, College of Education (2012).

<sup>5</sup> Bryk, Anthony S., Penny Bender Sebring, Elaine Allensworth, John Q. Easton, and Stuart Luppescu. Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 2010.

		<i>should be scored for inclusion in the system.</i>			
<b>9<sup>th</sup> Grade On-Track</b>	Strong relationship between on-track status and on-time HS graduation <sup>6</sup>	Clearly reflect the state’s expectations regarding what is considered an unacceptable on track rate.  Incentivize high schools and teachers to engage in practices that support freshmen in meeting 9 <sup>th</sup> grade credit requirements.	To what extent are the 9 <sup>th</sup> graders in my school meeting the state’s defined expectations for being on-track?		
CCR Indicator (HS Only)  <i>Measure: TBD</i>		Pending Additional Discussion			
P-2 Indicator  <i>Measure: TBD</i>		Pending Additional Discussion			
Fine Arts Indicator  <i>Measure: TBD</i>		Pending Additional Discussion			
Elementary/ Middle Grade Indicator  <i>Measure: TBD</i>		Pending Additional Discussion			

---

<sup>6</sup> Additional information on 9<sup>th</sup> grade on-track may be accessed at: <http://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/p78.pdf>  
Research on validity of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade on-track may be accessed at: [https://www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/REL\\_2012134.pdf](https://www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/REL_2012134.pdf)

