

P-20 Data, Assessment and Accountability Meeting  
December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016- Chicago  
Co-Chairs-  
Cordelia Meyer (Civic Committee of the Commercial Club of Chicago)  
Robin Steans (The Steans Family Foundation)

**Meeting Minutes**

Attendance: Dea Meyer (Civic Committee), Robin Steans (The Steans Family Foundation), Jim Nelson (IMA), Thalia Nawi (Education First), Ben Boer (Advance Illinois), Kevin Duff (Education First), Pam Reilly (ILSTOY), Erika Hunt (ISU), Roger Eddy (IASB), Larry Frank (IEA), Sara Shaw (Governor's Office), Sara Boucek (IASA), Jonathan Vanderbrug (Arts Alliance), Harvey Smith (Ill. Report Cards), Katie Stonewater (Ill. Chamber of Commerce), Josh Kaufmann (Teach Plus), Steve Cordogan (Geneva Dist.), Aimee Galvin (Stand for Children), Jennifer Koran (SIU), Brian Minsker (ILPTA), Melissa Mitchell (Fed. for Ill. Community Schools), Peter Leonard (CPS), Matthew Rodriguez (ILPTA), Diane Rutledge (LUDA), Mary Wagoner (Civic Committee), Emily Rusca (NIU), Charlie Rosemond (NIU), Janet Holt (SIU), Nate Wilson (Community College Board), Charles Chang (Erikson), Jane Russell (IFT), Amy Alsop (IFT), Bob Dolgan (Advance Illinois), Kurt Hilgendorf (CTU), Kylie Klein (CCSR)

**Meeting Objectives**

- Finalize principles for growth indicator and HS growth option
- Discuss and recommend prioritization of indicators
- Make recommendations for indicator weights
- Discuss broader school identification system

Note: We are sharing all of the indicators with ISBE that were discussed at the DAA meeting and that received support. The final report will indicate level of support along with key concerns, benefits and issues raised during discussion. There will be a survey monkey sent out for those unable to attend the meeting to weigh in on the indicators.

**Growth Indicators**

Every accountability system has a multistep process to recognize and assist schools

1. A set of measures to identify schools for support
2. A process to contextualize the school and understand the factors that drive performance
3. An appropriate plan for support and intervention

ESSA allows states to use the following metrics to identify schools for support: academic achievement, academic growth, graduation rate, and English language proficiency and student success and school quality

ISBE included four growth options in the latest draft of its ESSA plan

- Value Tables
- Student Growth Percentiles (SGP)
- Growth to Proficiency (GTP)
- Hybrid/Blended Modeling

Concerns and Comments:

- How do you divorce the political, technical, and policy for the growth- without having the background of all of them?

- Information from all models can be very useful when they aren't used for simply accountability measures but to inform needs and instructions.
- The workgroups are giving the hybrid model a great deal of consideration.
- Indicators are designed to raise a flag, not to form a conclusion.
- We need to use the information to target supports. Stay away from punitive and punish.
- Where the funding goes is still high stakes for districts.

The Accountability Workgroup at ISBE and the Technical Steering Committee are both working on the technical aspect of growth. Beyond the technical aspects of these measures, there are important policy considerations. Those are what DAA intends to explore.

*Voting Results from Poll Everywhere Questions:*

Should the growth measure adopted by the state consider growth towards proficiency standard?

- Yes- 60%
- No- 40%

Discussion:

- The Alliance has said that they strongly feel that they don't want proficiency and growth to be correlated.
- Some concern about whether such a method captures advanced/gifted students who may already be proficient
- Noted that PARCC provides two levels of performance above proficiency to capture higher-performing students
- Interest in understanding student progress toward objective measure of proficiency was clearly balanced by clear concern among the group that any final strategy, measure, or set of measures take into account race, poverty and other factors that may bear on student progress.

Should the growth measure adopted by the state compare how one school is doing with other schools with similar student populations?

- Yes- 67%
- No- 33%

Discussion:

- There was some worry about how comparative schools be selected – would it be based on demographics? Students with similar past performance levels?
- Again, strong interest in ensuring actual progress toward actual proficiency be balanced by taking student/school context into account – on theory that this better enables identifying schools that are struggling.
- Group generally did not want to expect less from any students, even as it wants to take context into account for accountability purposes.

On a scale of 1 to 4 with 4 meaning most concerned, how concerned are you that a growth measure correlates with demographics such as low-income and race?

- A:1- Least Concerned

- B:2
- C:3 - 26%
- D:4- Most Concerned – 64%

Discussion:

- Group continues to want to craft a set of measures that are not simply proxies for demographics.

On a scale of 1 to 4 with 4 meaning most concerned, how concerned are you that a growth measure expects less growth from students based on demographics such as low-income and race? 1 – least concerned to 4- most concerned.

Discussion:

- Group agreed to skip this question, as it needed a better frame of reference.
- In generally aiming to understand the relative importance of growth to proficiency versus comparative growth, there seemed to be consensus that we need a balance, as both play a role. More specifically:
  - Folks generally not worried about low-growth, high-proficiency districts when it comes to prioritizing limited state resources (though view might shift if sub-group was low-growth and low-proficiency);
  - Folks raised and liked notion that there be thresholds for growth and proficiency that help establish “triggers” for deeper dive and state support. Specifically, high growth district might still be red-flagged if overall proficiency is simply too low.
    - This raised question – should thresholds be considered up front, or as part of follow up deeper dive?
  - Folks raised the idea that they would be more comfortable weighing growth more heavily if overall system tends toward the punitive, and more comfortable weighing proficiency more heavily if the overall system is designed to provide support to struggling schools.

### High School Growth

States may choose to include academic growth in high school to balance out academic measures

- Growth is allowable as an academic metric in high school
- High school accountability has generally not used growth metrics
- Academic measures must be “substantially weighted” over school quality measures in high school accountability
- If growth is not included in the system, the system will have to lean more heavily on proficiency

There are multiple approaches to measuring growth in high school.

(Voting results from Poll Everywhere Questions)

Given that the academic part of high school accountability would otherwise be mainly proficiency rates, should we measure growth in high school?

- Yes- 83%

- No- 17%

Discussion:

- Difficult to answer as a philosophical vote absent of knowing how Illinois would go about setting itself up to measure growth in high school.
- There was support for using PSAT as second high school assessment, and it was noted that PSAT comes with individualized and free Khan Academy services.

### Prioritization of Indicators

Every accountability system has a multistep process to recognize and assist schools

1. A set of measures to identify schools for support
2. A process to contextualize the school and understand the factors that drive performance
3. An appropriate plan for support and intervention

Two key prioritization areas: achievement vs. growth  
and academic indicators vs. student success and quality indicators

(Voting results from Poll Everywhere Questions)

How should the state prioritize academic indicators compared to indicators of school quality?

- |                                   | Results |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| ○ A: 70% Academic and 30% Quality | - 29%   |
| ○ B: 60% Academic and 40% Quality | - 33%   |
| ○ C: 51% Academic and 49% Quality | - 38%   |

Comments:

- IBAM is pushing the priority of 51% Academic and 49% Quality
- We need to be sure that we have school quality indicators that give us good information; high school grades, middle school attendance, etc.
- Knowing that we don't know what lives in the academic and quality buckets yet it is difficult to answer this question.
- There may be amazing things happening in a school but they aren't making progress academically- are we getting kids where they need to go?
- I lean towards the 51%,49% because proficiency measures Math, Reading and Language Arts and there are lots and lots of other things that schools do besides these three subjects. If we come up with a higher academic measure we are only limiting it to three subject areas and there are many other subjects and things that schools do.
- Others noted that academic performance tends to reflect the broader scope of what schools do and how they do it.
- We are going to get away from qualitative measures. This will predict their futures- grades predict more than test scores.
- I don't want it to get it watered down so that all schools wind up above average.

### Indicator Weights

Other states are considering a wide range of weights.

### Elementary Schools

Indicator	Kentucky	Washington
Achievement	25%	Medium
Growth	25%	High
Graduation Rate	-	-
EL Proficiency	25%	Med-Low
School Quality	25%	Low

### High Schools

Indicator	Kentucky	Washington
Achievement	20%	Med-High
Growth	20%	-
Graduation Rate	20%	High
EL Proficiency	20%	Low
School Quality	20%	Low

We agreed it might make sense to revisit the implications of our various votes and discussion with some specific possible alternatives at the next meeting.

Notes:

- The Latino Policy Forum gave a presentation at the IBAM meeting with specific recommendations on the EL Proficiency and what their reasoning was. This presentation can be shared with the rest of the DAA members.
- ILC- recommends that a portion of quality indicators be broken out into the K-2 years and that percentage be at least 15% of the school quality indicators. Any indicators that can be disaggregated to K-2 years- should be and half of the percentage of those indicators is K-2. If it's a 60%- academic, 40% quality split for a school then 20% of school quality should come from K-2 and 20% from 3-8.
- Let's consider this further and send out a straw poll. There are lots of variables that will need to be considered.

#### Financial Resources Relating to ESSA

Update from the group that met to discuss how to take district funding (underfunding) into account in this process – assuming that using underfunding as an indicator is not a desirable option, but not wanting perpetual underfunding to continue undiscussed and unaddressed.

The group raised possibility of reporting (1) the level of optimal per pupil funding versus actual per pupil funding, (2) level of local tax effort (perhaps comparing tax rate to state

average), and (3) outcomes relative to other districts with similar spending levels on the state's report card and/or in a report from P20 Council or elsewhere.

They also posed possibility of having an analysis of long-term spending needs and possibilities included in any follow up strategy, along with training and support to districts to use funds most effectively and equitably.

The group discussed, but did not reach conclusions and will pick this up at the next meeting.

Discussion:

- It's alright to report as long as it's not punitive
- This isn't control and oversight – it's an analysis that feeds into the planning process for support. (There was concern if this was something like an FOP strategy.)
- Some expressed they'd like to see the support as optional for districts
- Is this to highlight that a potential reason a district isn't performing is because of funding and direct resources where they are needed?
- Folks don't want to assume low funding is only reason districts may struggle.

Next Steps:

- Education First will align our work from the DAA committee to the ISBE draft plan.
- Education First will have a draft to the DAA committee by Tuesday afternoon to review before our next meeting.
- Our next meeting date is Dec. 15<sup>th</sup> from 2-5 at the Steans Family Foundation.