

CPS Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency
Data Transparency Stakeholder Advisory Group
Meeting #3 Summary

Rauner YMCA Rauner, 2700 S Western Ave, Chicago, IL 60608

September 19 | 9am-12pm

ATTENDEES:

Facilitators & Presenters: Felipe Perez (Facilitator), Jill Gottfred Sohoni (Facilitator), Jeff Broom (CPS), Augusta Bryant (CPS), Alejandra Sanchez (coordinator)

Committee Members: Jasmine L. Thurmond (CPS Exec), Heidi Moran (Principal), Jaqueline Vargas (Parent), Bernadette Glover (Principal), Maurice Miles (Parent), Erika Gonzalez (Parent), Grace Chan McKibben (Community), Leonor Torres Whitt (CTU), Claiborne Wade (Parent) Lucy Ogbodie (Student), Michelle Velez (Teacher), Otis Dunson (Principal), Marcus Flenaugh (CAC), Perriyana Clay (CAC).

Members not in attendance: Ileana Ineri (LSC), Chay King (Teacher), Lynda Smith (LSC), Orlando Montoya (Student), Berenice Pond (CPS Exec), Marcelina Pedraza (CPS), Andrea Orozco (Student), Ryan Belville (CPAA), Melissa Sweazy (Principal), Chris Harris (CAC), Sarah Amouipour (Teacher), Ricardo Trujillo (CPS Exec)

MEETING MATERIALS

[Meeting Deck \(English\)](#)

[Meeting Deck \(Spanish\)](#)

[Review Rubric](#)

[Website Mock-up](#)

AGENDA

Breakfast + Check In:

The meeting opened with light refreshments and an opportunity for informal networking among committee members.

Welcome & Introductions

Facilitators Jill Gottfred Sohoni and Felipe Perez welcomed the committee, setting

the tone for the day's work. Committee members participated in a speed-round introduction, sharing their names, roles, communities, and pronouns. This helped to establish rapport and build a sense of community in the room.

Community Builder

Jill led a "Community Bingo" activity where committee members engaged in a quick round of networking to fill out bingo cards. The exercise created a light-hearted environment and allowed participants to connect over shared experiences and fun facts. Perriyana Clay won the round and earned bragging rights for her quick bingo.

Meeting #1 & #2 Recap + Follow-Ups

Felipe revisited key themes from the first two meetings, particularly the importance of trust, transparency, and community agreements. The group re-confirmed their commitment to the established community agreements and reflected on lessons learned from previous sessions. The committee also discussed the Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency (CIDT) framework and how it will drive CPS's accountability efforts moving forward.

- **Community Agreements:** We reiterated the agreements developed in earlier meetings, which included principles like equity of voice, minimizing jargon, and leaning into discomfort to foster growth. The committee recommitted to these agreements to guide their work, but to also revisit and update as needed. As an important follow up, we discussed how the committee would hold one another accountable to these norms. Facilitators recommended that we appoint a norm-checker, chosen from the committee, who would be responsible for calling out norm violations and help the group to recenter. Claiborne agreed to be our inaugural norm checker.
- **Committee Transparency:** We revisited our meeting transparency question, and after weighing the pros and cons of full transparency, the committee leaned toward a middle-ground approach where meeting schedules, agendas, and notes would be made public, and observers - including other interested parties from within CPS- could attend but not participate. We noted that materials, meeting schedules, and the opportunity to register for meetings would happen through the CIDT website. Lori asked if the committee could bring in feedback from people not in the room, Felipe clarified that every member was welcome to seek additional feedback from their respective networks, but was not required to do so. Marcus asked about whether the media could sit in as observers. This opened a fruitful discussion of how to be

proactive in sharing the work of this committee with the broader public, while acknowledging the potential trade-offs to candor and openness. We agreed to revisit the question of media engagement at our next meeting.

RAPID Decision-Making Framework

Jill introduced the RAPID decision-making framework, outlining how the committee will serve as recommenders, while CPS leadership will have final approval authority. The discussion clarified how the committee's feedback would be used in shaping the school accountability metrics, emphasizing transparency in the policy-making process. The goal of this section was to promote "radical clarity" with respect to the role of the committee. Michelle noted that as part of the SEDT, she experienced the great influence a stakeholder committee can exert, even if not in the role of decision maker.

For further clarity, Jill reviewed the original "what this is/ what this is not" overview of the committee to reorient the committee to the specific scope and goals of its work.

School Data Indicators Presentation

The committee reviewed the school data indicators that CPS will use to measure accountability. To create the overall context for the work ahead, Jill provided an overview of the 4 components, 18 indicators, and 25 metrics that are part of the approved policy.

Jill then led the committee through a gallery walk exercise where members could review all available metrics and descriptions, and were asked to provide feedback on at least 4, answering the questions: "Is this metric description language easy to understand? If not, how would you adjust?" and "What else do you need to know to better understand this metric?" They each then had 10 minutes to review one another's responses. Their responses on each poster of the gallery walk are listed as **Appendix 1**.

Discussion of the indicator exercise covered several themes. One theme was the clarity of language, and whether terms like "cohort" or "rate" needed to be explained. Another theme was the inadequacy of written text to fully explain these concepts, and the need for numbers and graphics. Another member noted how some of these concepts need examples to help the reader truly grasp the concepts presented (eg, High Quality Curriculum, grade level standards). Lastly, one member named his desire to go deeper and seek context for every metric listed, but

wondered whether that detail would be helpful or harmful to most users.

Indicator Review Protocol & Rubric

Lastly, Jill led the group through a "test drive" of the indicator evaluation rubric. The rubric was developed based on the feedback provided during meeting 2, and members used a mock-up of the proposed CPS CIDT website to evaluate the rubric's effectiveness. The goal was to assess how well the rubric could guide the review process for each indicator and provide actionable feedback on the clarity and usability of the metrics. Each member used the rubric to capture feedback about the content itself, then the group had a discussion of the review process itself. Several themes emerged, both about process and content:

- **Time for Review & Collaboration:**

Many participants felt that more time was needed for a thorough review of the metrics and rubric. There was a strong interest in cross-collaboration, with suggestions to divide the committee into smaller teams that could focus on specific indicators. This would allow for more targeted, in-depth discussions and ensure the evaluation process was manageable.

- **Integrated Tools & Resources for Clarity:**

There was a consensus that additional tools and resources would be beneficial to help users navigate the data. This included providing clearer explanations and context for the indicators, especially for those unfamiliar with technical terms or data interpretation. Ensuring that the website and supporting materials were easy to understand for all audiences was a high priority.

- **Protocol for Capturing "Translation" moments**

Some members noted that in their mixed stakeholder groups, the principal ended up playing the role of "translator," giving context for metrics, explaining how they are used, and defining key terms. We noted that those are important moments that our updated protocol needs to document and capture.

- **Simplification and Accessibility:**

Many members noted that the mock up was complex and needed to be adjusted to accommodate different levels of understanding. Members suggested that the layout and presentation of data should be simplified, with more intuitive graphs and visual aids. This would make the data accessible to all users, from those with basic data literacy to those more comfortable with

complex information.

There was a strong call to simplify the language used in the metrics, ensuring it was accessible to all stakeholders, including parents, students, and community members. This involved breaking down complex ideas into plain language and using visual aids, such as pie charts, to convey key points. Simplifying the content would make the data more actionable and easier for users to engage with.

- **User-Focused Design:**

The discussion highlighted the need for a user-focused design that catered specifically to different groups, particularly parents and students. Participants suggested that the website should prioritize ease of navigation, with key information being readily accessible from the main page. For example, a parent-focused interface would make it easier for users to find school-specific data quickly without having to sift through complex menus.

- **Integration with School Profiles:**

Several participants felt that the CIDT metrics should be integrated into the existing school profile pages rather than hosted on a separate website. This would create a seamless experience for users who are already familiar with school profiles, allowing them to view all relevant data, such as performance and health metrics, in one place.

Next Steps & Closeout

Felipe outlined upcoming in-person and virtual meetings, and committed to bringing the media question and an updated rubric/ review process to our next meeting. Committee members were encouraged to complete an exit feedback survey and continue building connections with one another between sessions.

Appendix 1: Gallery Walk Feedback

College Enrollment & Persistence	Balanced Assessment System	High-Quality Curriculum	Healing Centered Culture Supports and Socio-Emotional Interventions	Out-of-School Time and Enrichment Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why 2yrs? 2 checks,+!! - Why is this not more than 2 years - No, this should include 2 separate sentences for the exploration (check) - May also drop out because they are ill-prepared curriculum-wise) with low literacy,math skills,writing skills) - Many drop out for financial reasons after the first 2 years - Is college enrollment the only indicator for post secondary success? - Diverse students have barriers to entering a school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Types of assessments may be spelled out -What is an assessment plan?(for parents/community members) -Where do state-mandated assessments factor in? -May need to include small bulletin points of what district standards are -Is there a way to present or define district standards? -What is the meaning of balanced assessments across grade levels and ages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, but the order of the sentence should be arranged to provide the meaning of a high-quality curriculum first - Plus Plus(x2 checks) - Yes(x2) - need to define "high quality" more rigorously - Need to define "Diverse learners." There are different levels of diverse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Translate:Of Course but in schools they are not transparent - There is no type of support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes(7) - Translated:Yes, but we need more for diverse children

On-Track	Early College and Career Credentials	Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	Student Proficiency	English Learner Progress to Proficiency
<p>-Agree</p> <p>-On-Track means something for a 3rd grader different for a freshman</p> <p>-Needs some more info on how "On-track" is defined</p> <p>-What specific data makes up "on-track" data?</p> <p>-How is this differentiated (3rd vs freshman)</p>	<p>-!!Yes, and access to such programming is key</p> <p>-Yes(x3)</p> <p>-Yes-Maybe explain or have bullet points outlining what career credentials are</p>	<p>-Clear Description</p> <p>-Maybe 48 months instead of 4 years?</p> <p>-I think messaging the definition/ meaning of cohort within the statements</p> <p>-Yes(2x)</p> <p>-Are there any factors that contribute to the context of the outcome-ie grade rate</p> <p>-Include 4 & 5 year data</p> <p>-What about re-engagement program data? How does that factor?</p>	<p>-No, I think it's important to factor in growth</p> <p>-Yes--> Very clear</p> <p>-What is meant by rate!! Check</p> <p>-What are the grade level standards (parent/guardian/ community member) include information or subset outlining what those are</p> <p>-Can this be rated over time?</p>	<p>-Measure through more than outcomes on ACCESS + check</p>

Student Growth to Proficiency	Diverse Learner Progress	School and Community Partnerships and Engagement	Access to Postsecondary Opportunities	Chronic Absence
<p>-If we used this description, the category(SGP) needs to reflect the various tests/exams CPS has instituted(Ex Common Core,SATs,star-360,NWEA)</p> <p>-Define "Multiple years"-need to clearly state the assessment time frame(Ex. last years/last 10yrs)</p> <p>-Use daily grades instead of standardized testing to back students' growth but understand the language</p>	<p>-We need more transparency and more information on this department</p>	<p>-Translated: Of Course but it depends on the school's requirements where those students can enter</p> <p>-Is there an active student voice committee?</p> <p>-Student council?</p>	<p>-Clarify, are these just pathways?</p> <p>-All postsecondary options(trades?)</p>	<p>-Yes, but include an example of how it's calculated or include the quantity</p> <p>-Yes, but I think it needs more context</p> <p>-Why is this important to know?(+)</p> <p>-Need to capture reasons for absence</p> <p>-Isn't this metric already captured in "On-track" data?</p>

-Remove quickly -growth takes time check +				
--	--	--	--	--

Rigorous instruction	One-Year Dropout Rate:	Conditions for Learning and the Student Experience	Leadership Context	Teachers and Staff Capacity
-I think this Hem + quality curriculum might be conflated by non-educator stakeholders	-Clear description -Agree -Yes(3x) -Stuff that motivates students and better opportunities within schools for example, classes where they feel included	-Perhaps the supportive environment questions on 5ES survey could fit here	-Should be based on tenure and engagement in professional learning	-NCCT -Degrees/certifications? -Possibility incorporate badges to reflect engagement in various professional learning opportunities

Distributed Leadership and Teacher Leader Development	Research-based Academic Interventions within a MTSS Framework	Adult Capacity and Continuous Learning	School Vision and Continuous Improvement Practices	Daily Learning Experiences	Evidence of Student Learning and Well-Being
-Can schools report on their ILT capacity(share the ILT self-assessment)					

Appendix 2: AGENDA

By the end of our discussion, Transparency Committee will:

- grow trust with fellow committee members, facilitators and/or CPS staff responsible for project
- be refreshed on where we have been to date, including confirmation of community agreements and transparency policy
- understand their role within the RAPID decision making framework
- get a full picture of all of the indicators up for review, and provide feedback on metric description language
- test drive and provide feedback on review protocol for each indicator

Breakfast + Coffee	20 min
Welcome + Introductions	15 min
Community Builder	10 min
Session 1/2 Refresh + Follow-Ups: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Agreements - 5 min• Committee Transparency - 5 min	15min
RAPID Decision Making Process	15 min
What are the School Data Indicators?	45 mins
Brain Break!	10 min
Indicator Review Protocol + Rubric	45 mins
Next Steps & Closeout	5 min

Appendix 3: Make Up Meeting Materials

Via Zoom

October 2nd, 5-6pm

Attendees:

Facilitators & Presenters: Jeff Broom (CPS), Felipe Perez (Facilitator), Jill Gottfred Sohoni (Facilitator), Alejandra Sanchez (Coordinator)

Committee Members: Berenice Pond (CPS Exec), Chay King (Teacher), Marcie Pedraza (LSC), and Sarah Amoiupour (Teacher).

Agenda:

Welcome + Introductions	10 min
Session 1/2 Refresh + Follow-Ups: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Agreements - 5 min• Committee Transparency - 5 min	10min
RAPID Decision Making Process	5 min
What are the School Data Indicators?	10 mins
Indicator Review Protocol + Rubric	20 mins
Next Steps & Closeout	5 min

Meeting Deck:

[Here](#)