

ESSA UPDATES

Dr. W. Bennett-Conroy

Assistant Superintendent of School Improvement

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

- **Student academic achievement:** For all schools, measures achievement on state assessments in English language arts (ELA), math and science. For high schools, this also includes social studies.
- **Student growth:** For elementary and middle schools, measures student growth on statewide assessments in ELA and math in grades 4-8 by comparing students' scores in the current year to the scores of students in the same grade, but from previous years.
- **Academic progress:** For all schools, measures overall student progress on state assessments in ELA and math against schools' long-term goals and measures of interim progress.
- **English language proficiency:** For all schools, measures the progress of English Language Learners in meeting their individual progress targets on state assessments.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

- **Chronic absenteeism:** For all schools, measures the percentage of students who miss 10 percent or more of the days they were supposed to attend school.
- **Graduation rates:** For high schools, measures the rate of graduation for individual cohort of students who first entered grade 9—4, 5, and 6 years ago.
- **College, Career and Civic Readiness:** For high schools, measures the percentage of students who achieve various type of diplomas and credentials and the degree to which students enroll and succeed in advanced courses or career and technical education programs.

INDICATORS WITH LEVEL I

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Benjamin Turner – 22

Cecil Parker – 8

Columbus – 5

Edward Williams – 6

Graham School – 5

Grimes – 1

Holmes – 5

Lincoln – 1

Pennington – 2

Traphagen – 3

HIGH SCHOOLS

- Mount Vernon High School – 13
- Thornton - 11

LEVEL I ADDENDUM

- Identify the subgroups performing at Level I for each accountability measure.
- Conduct a needs analysis for each Level I subgroup.*
- Provide information about the needs assessment that was conducted.
- Describe the components of the needs assessment.
- Describe the stakeholders involved in the needs assessment.

LEVEL I ADDENDUM

- Describe the additional support that the school requested the district to provide based upon the needs assessment.
- Describe the degree to which the district will provide the requested additional support.
- As applicable, describe why the district will not provide the requested resources completely.
- Describe any additional resources not requested by the school that will be provided by the district in order to address the indicator for which the school performed at Level I.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- State assessment data analysis
- Internal academic data analysis
- Attendance data analysis
- Discipline data analysis
- Behavior data analysis
- Teacher performance data analysis
- Parent engagement/participation data analysis
- Documents analysis
- Social-emotional learning school inventory
- Professional development practices self-assessment
- Family and community engagement school inventory
- Classroom observations
- Curriculum audit
- Parent surveys
- Teacher surveys
- Student surveys
- Student support staff surveys
- Principal interview
- Student support staff focus group
- Teacher focus group
- Parent focus group
- Student focus group
- Other

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- Briefly describe what the needs assessment indicated about the assets and needs of the specific subgroup(s) that performed at Level I for this indicator and how those findings inform the school's plan.
- Briefly describe how the school will address identified student needs to improve outcomes associated with the Level I designation for the specific group(s). Identify supports/resources (such as professional development for school staff) that the school has requested the district provide to support those efforts and whether the requested supports/resources reflect new supports or an expansion of existing supports.
- Please describe any additional supports/resources not requested by the school that be provided, including professional development for school staff, to address the indicator for which the school performed at Level I. Include a description of whether the requested supports/resources reflect new supports or an expansion of existing supports.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Administrators
- Teachers
- Other school leaders
- Student support staff (guidance counselors, social workers etc.)
- Paraprofessionals
- Specialized instructional staff
- School office staff
- Central office staff
- Parents/guardians
- Community members
- Students
- Homeless Liaison
- Neglected and delinquent transition liaison
- Attendance staff
- School security officers
- Partner organizations
- Institution of higher education
- Other

FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY

School Spending Data Enables Better Decisions, Better Results

Data in the hands of leaders helps them answer questions and informs action. Leaders—from state policymakers to community advocates—use data to understand how schools are performing, ensure that resources are meeting the needs of every child, and demand supports needed to build successful, well-resourced classrooms. When school spending data is presented side by side with student outcomes data, leaders can make better decisions about how to help students in the classroom.



THE PEOPLE

State and local leaders, from legislators to principals, are charged with using resources to support student success. They can't do this effectively without information about both school spending and student outcomes.



THE DATA

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) now requires states to put school-level financial information on report cards, but the value of this data goes beyond report cards. Leaders need school spending information that helps them understand what's happening at their schools and in their community in order to allocate resources wisely to ensure every student is getting the support they need.



THE RESULTS

When leaders have the information they need, they can make better decisions about how to allocate funding and resources, improving classrooms and outcomes for students everywhere.

BETTER DECISIONS SUPPORT SUCCESSFUL, WELL-RESOURCED CLASSROOMS

LEARN MORE

Visit dataqualitycampaign.org/fiscaltransparency to find additional resources that shine a light on how states can use school spending data to meet goals and support student success.

FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY

- Magnet versus neighborhood schools?
- Do some schools stand out as getting less or more than their share of funds? If so, why?
- Are district allocations for high-need students boosting spending at high-need schools?
- Special education versus gifted students?
- Are salary patterns driving uneven spending in ways that concern the district or the community?

FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY

- The top 1/3 of the highest performing versus the bottom 1/3 of the lowest performing schools?
- Is centralized spending lean and of high value? What share of dollars are centrally managed? Are leaders prepared to help the public understand what chunk of those dollars go to central-office functions versus services to schools?
- What student outcomes are the district getting at each school in return for its share of public dollars? Are some schools able to leverage dollars to do more for students than others with the same share?

FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY

- **Per Pupil Spending**
 - ✓ By Comparison
 - ✓ By School
 - ✓ By Personnel
 - ✓ By Funding Type

ILLINOIS' REPORT CARD SCHOOL LEVEL

Advanced School Comparison

Add/Remove Schools



Academic Progress

School Environment

School Finances

District Finances

Students

School Finances

Average FY 2019 expenditures per student at each school identified for comparison

2019

School	Total School Per-Pupil Expenditures (\$)	Source of Funds		Expenditure Type		District Avg Per-Pupil Expenditures (\$)
		State & Local Per-Pupil Expenditures (\$)	Federal Per-Pupil Expenditures (\$)	District Centralized Per-Pupil Expenditures (\$)	Site-Level Per-Pupil Expenditures (\$)	
Akin Comm Cons Elem School	\$18,000	\$17,455	\$545	\$8,128	\$9,872	\$18,000
A B Shepard High Sch (Campus)	\$20,076	\$19,023	\$1,053	\$5,602	\$14,474	\$20,984
Abe Lincoln Elem School	\$12,996	\$11,400	\$1,596	\$3,454	\$9,542	\$12,837
A F Ames Elem School	\$21,285	\$21,156	\$130	\$18,011	\$3,274	\$19,715
Adams School	\$10,750	\$9,913	\$836	\$3,705	\$7,045	\$9,485
Academy for Global Citizenship	\$12,381	\$11,912	\$469	\$832	\$11,550	\$12,665

ILLINOIS' REPORT CARD DISTRICT LEVEL

Advanced School Comparison

Add/Remove Schools



Academic Progress

School Environment

School Finances

District Finances

Students

District Finances

A table summary of some District Finance metrics shown to impact school environment.

2019 ↕

School	Instructional Spending per Student (\$)	Operational Spending per Student (\$)	Local Property Taxes (%)	Other Local Funding (%)	Evidence-Based Funding (%)	Other State Funding (%)	Federal Funding (%)	Avg. Teacher Salary (\$)	Avg. Admin Salary (\$)
AKIN COMM CONS ELEM SCHOOL	\$10,394	\$17,674	76.8	3.8	11.7	3.5	4.2	\$45,392	\$81,182
ACADEMY FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP	\$10,314	\$15,878	49.8	6.6	25	6.9	11.8	\$74,446	\$110,862
ABE LINCOLN ELEM SCHOOL	\$7,140	\$12,632	16.2	2.2	62.6	7.5	11.4	\$66,250	\$93,519
A B SHEPARD HIGH SCH (CAMPUS)	\$12,488	\$21,201	76.2	2.7	11.9	4.6	4.6	\$94,552	\$119,222
A F AMES ELEM SCHOOL	\$9,238	\$14,365	87.3	3.2	5.3	2.6	1.7	\$67,835	\$121,548
ADAMS SCHOOL	\$4,830	\$8,404	55.8	9.4	24.7	4.2	5.9	\$67,187	\$102,153

WHOLE CHILD TENETS

1. Healthy
2. Safe
3. Engaged
4. Supported
5. Challenged
6. Sustainability



Thank you!