CPS Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency

Accountability Technical Advisory Group

Meeting #4 Summary

13 MAY 2024 | TIME 12:00-4:00 PM | CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ROOM 2C-108

ATTENDEES

A-TAG Members: Elaine Allensworth, Paula Barajas (partial), Alahrie Aziz-Sims, Monica Bhatt, Cy Hendrickson, Sara Kempner

> **Members not in attendance:** Nelson Gerew, Paul Zavitkovsky, Paula Barajas (partial), Pavlyn Jankov, Peter Leonard, Nicole Abreu Shepard

Guests: Felipe Perez, Camino Group; Jill Gottfred Sohoni, Circle Root Collaborative; Racyel Mayo, Office of Early Childhood Education; Theresa Robles, Office of Innovation & Incubation

CPS CIDT Implementation Staff: Augusta Smith, Jeff Broom, Lauren Brumett

Center for Assessment Staff: Erika Landl, Laura Pinsonneault

Meeting Materials

All meeting materials are available on this A-TAG webpage:
https://sites.google.com/view/cidt-atag/home

AGENDA

Welcome & District Context

Laura Pinsonneault opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda and norms. She also offered an opportunity for participants to add meeting norms to the list.

Jeff Broom then provided an update about District work to implement the Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency (CIDT) policy via the 5-year strategic plan. He emphasized that the framing of the strategic plan work is the work of the CIDT and vice versa. Each priority is framed in terms of CIDT components. The CIDT is not an isolated "project" or "initiative". It is the work of the District.

Finally, Jeff highlighted how the feedback from ATAG in the March 11th meeting informed not only updates to the metric proposals reviewed in that meeting but also how the District is approaching metric development going forward. Specifically, ATAG feedback uncovered that the design approach used in metric development resulted in metric proposals that were reactive to SQRP rather than innovative and reflective of the intentions of the CIDT policy.

Metric Updates

Laura emphasized Jeff's point about how ATAG feedback has impacted metric design work, and shared a summary of key takeaways and recommendations from the March 11th ATAG meeting: 1) metrics can and should be simplified; 2) the metrics should be developed in a manner that connects across other metrics and indicators; and 3) the role of the District should be clearer in future iterations. She noted that the same summary has been shared with the Executive Committee.

August then provided an overview of the updated proposal documents, which prioritized use cases and connections to practices and supports. The group was given time to start their individual review of the updated metrics for chronic absenteeism, 1-year dropout rate, and 4-year cohort graduation rate. Laura explained that there would not be enough time for a complete review of all three metrics; the intention was to introduce the updates and start the process, and members would be asked to complete their review following the meeting.

The feedback tool asks members to respond to this question for each metric: Do you support moving ahead with implementation of these metrics? The purpose of this question is to gather a signal that the Office of School Quality Management and Research should move to the next stage of work, connecting with IT and developing reporting plans, which will allow for collection of additional evidence to further inform metric implementation, including possible adjustments. Laura explained that metric development - and overall implementation of the CIDT policy - is an iterative process; moving forward with a metric does not lock in a particular plan; it merely allows for collection of additional information to bring back to ATAG and other stakeholders and implementers.

After individual review, Laura asked the group for observations or questions about any of the updated metrics. The conversation focused on some technical topics and on use cases.

Technical feedback

Some people identified that the chronic absence proposal references "improvement", but the description of the metric says that three years of data will be presented. There is a recommendation to focus on reporting multiple years of data. Others prioritized viewing absence in attendance bands with the idea that it would better differentiate and identify where there are groups of students that need intensive attendance interventions.

For one-year dropout rate, the group would like greater clarity about who will be included (and excluded) from calculations.

Use cases

There was feedback to include context when reporting results. Additionally, members would like to be included in providing feedback on internal and external reporting plans.

Some members wanted to better understand what this looks and feels like in schools, what resources will be provided, and specifically how different users will be empowered with the information provided by the system. This includes a better understanding of root cause processes. The group identified this tension: some metrics look no different or only slightly different than current practice in terms of methodology and the expectation is that people will use these data in different ways. If that is to be the case, some members feel that additional information about how the District will support use cases is necessary.

Jeff acknowledged that there are challenges external to schools that impact attendance but pointed out that this should not change the fact that it is important for all students to attend school regularly. The District has prioritized providing information about this in order to help schools determine where they can support students in this area.

Augusta pointed out that the initial priority is on public-facing dashboards, and Jeff noted the need to focus on incremental progress.

Metric Review, On-Track

Laura introduced the three on-track proposals - for elementary, 9th grade, and 10th grade (plus) - noting that they are in the original, not updated format. The group was given time to start to document individual feedback using the metric review tool, and then Laura invited full group discussion, focusing on each grade level/span. As with the review of the March 11th metrics, feedback was both technical in nature and focused on reporting and use cases.

Elementary

One member explained that the proposed metric reflects what they do in their school and it is useful. They particularly like being able to filter for different populations of students and to examine distributions of outcomes.

Another member pointed out the importance of interactive dashboards, and Laura explained that this is the goal. The member elaborated the value of interactive reporting is to examine intersectionality. Another member discussed being able to "dig into" the data via more detailed distributions within a quadrant or band.

CPS staff explained that a challenge in transitioning from a binary on-track metric is how to aggregate the information. The group agreed with the cut points and the four quadrants.

Regarding use cases, a member pointed to the difference between "big picture" data that may help parents and students understand District priorities and outcomes in their schools versus data that can really inform continuous improvement. Another member pointed out that service providers outside the District may benefit from access to publicly-facing data (even download files) to better support the District. A member pointed out that policy and intervention levers for attendance and academics are largely aligned with the categories presented; it is good this metric presents that relationship.

High School (9th and 10th grade plus)

One member felt that the proposed transition from 5 credits to 6.5 credits is too high for 9th grade and prefers to stick with current practice. Another member pointed out that 6 credits is meaningfully more predictive than 5 credits in predicting on-time graduation. More recent research suggests that more courses are important in better understanding later outcomes for students. Students with five credits at the end of 9th grade have a much lower probability of graduating on-time regardless of whether courses were core or non-core.

Some members seek additional information to better understand the threshold for requiring 6.5 credits by the end of 9th grade.

Members acknowledged the risk of people feeling compelled to "game the system" if more credits are required. This feedback signals a need for professional learning around grading practices and how best to support students in graduating from high school on time and prepared for success after high school.

Someone asked about tracking credit recovery credit hours; this acknowledges the work going into these efforts. Another member acknowledged that this could be helpful for school leaders.

Metric Review, Out of School Time & Enrichment Opportunities

Again, the group had time to start their individual review of the out of school time and enrichment opportunities metric, followed by full group discussion.

One member pointed out that, because this metric is new, it will be important to be very clear regarding what is and is not included. This led to a discussion about the wide variability of what counts as an enrichment opportunity and what counts as participation.

The group was not clear about the rationale for the 40% target and would like more information, empirical evidence for this particular threshold. They urged consideration of community factors that impact opportunities in schools.

Laura asked the group about what the District should value regarding out of school time and enrichment opportunities: is this about diversity of programming, security and stability, and/or participation? Some members felt that participation was the priority. Others felt that, if so, the District needs to be clear about challenges for capturing participation data and having fair comparisons across the District.

Overall, the group felt that there are many competing factors at play impacting out of school time and enrichment opportunities and participation. They felt that this metric may work well as a badge to recognize that schools meet a minimum standard for offerings and/or participation to make sure that students have access and opportunities. They also recommend examination of these data over time to determine if it makes sense to include additional data in the future.

There was discussion about how people will use this information, with particular attention to making sure that network chiefs are able to interpret the data and use it appropriately to support school leaders, not push for offerings that do not make sense for a particular community.

The District needs to define what service provision should look like; this is different from other outcome metrics, and it shouldn't be treated like a traditional outcome metric.

Metric Review, College Enrollment and Persistence

There was no time to discuss this metric, and Laura invited the group to provide their feedback via the metric review tool. She pointed out that subject matter experts recommended no change to current practice for this metric.

Wrap Up

Laura thanked the group for their time and briefly described plans for the June 20th meeting, highlighting for the group that this will be a six-hour meeting. She asked members to continue to provide feedback about the March 11th metrics via the Google form and to capture their individual notes on the metrics reviewed in this meeting using the metric review tool.

Before concluding the meeting, Laura asked members to complete the meeting evaluation and encouraged them to be specific in their feedback so that Center and CPS staff can best plan for future meetings.

Adjournment

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Center for Assessment staff** will write and post a meeting summary to the ATAG landing page.
2. **ATAG members** will complete their individual review of metrics updated since March 11th and share their feedback via the Google Form no later than Wednesday, May 22nd.
3. **ATAG members** will complete their individual review of the new set of metrics reviewed for the first time in this meeting.
   a. On-Track
   b. Out of School Time & Enrichment Opportunities
   c. College Enrollment and Persistence

   They will compile their individual feedback in the appropriate 'Individual Review' tabs of the review tool for each metric no later than Wednesday, May 22nd.