




Illinois State Board of Education

100 North First Street • Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001
www.isbe.net

Darren Reisberg
Chairman

Dr. Carmen I. Ayala
State Superintendent of Education

TO: The Honorable JB Pritzker, Governor
The Honorable John J. Cullerton, Senate President
The Honorable William E. Brady, Senate Minority Leader
The Honorable Michael J. Madigan, Speaker of the House
The Honorable Jim Durkin, House Minority Leader
The Honorable Darren Reisberg, Chairperson, State Board of Education

From: Dr. Carmen I. Ayala 
State Superintendent of Education

DATE: April 4, 2019

RE: Professional Review Panel Recommendations

Pursuant to its obligations under 105 ILCS 5/18-8.15, the Professional Review Panel submits recommendations to the Governor, General Assembly, and State Board of Education. The Chairperson has submitted the attached correspondence.

If you have any questions or comments, you may contact Amanda Elliott, Co-Director, Legislative Affairs at 217-782-6510 or aelliott@isbe.net.

cc: Secretary of the Senate
Clerk of the House
Legislative Research Unit
State Government Report Center

Michelle Turner Mangan, Ph.D.
Chair
Professional Review Panel
Michelle.Mangan@cuchicago.edu

March 22, 2019

Via Email

The Honorable John J. Cullerton, Senate President
The Honorable William E. Brady, Senate Minority Leader
The Honorable Michael J. Madigan, House Speaker
The Honorable Jim Durkin, House Minority Leader
The Honorable JB Pritzker, Governor
The Honorable Darren Reisberg, Chairperson, State Board of Education
The Honorable Carmen I. Ayala, Ph.D., State Superintendent of Education

Dear Senator Cullerton, Senator Brady, Representative Madigan, Representative Durkin, Governor JB Pritzker, Chairman Reisberg, and Dr. Ayala,

The legislatively created [Public Act 100-0465] Professional Review Panel (PRP) met on Monday, March 18th in Springfield at the Illinois State Board of Education building. It is my duty as the elected Chair of the PRP to inform you of the motions that passed. The first two recommendations are options for legislative action regarding Regional Safe Schools, Truant Alternative Optional Education Programs, and Alternative Learning Opportunity programs. The last two recommendations are included to keep you apprised of progress being made towards our duties in the areas of the 5 year evaluative study and commitment to embedding equity within our work.

First Regional Office of Education (ROE) Funding Recommendation

The PRP approved the recommendation of the ROE Funding proposal as presented with the understanding that appropriation amounts for FY 2020 are sufficient so as to not impact or diminish the amount of tier funding available to all organizational units. This recommendation will sunset on June 30, 2020.

Recommendation:

1. Modify the EBF state statute to allow **Regional Safe School** and **Truant Alternative Optional Education Programs** to receive **Tier Funding** effective with the FY 2020 budget cycle to include:
 - a) Setting a local effort to 10% ⇒ Mirrors Lab Schools
 - b) Establishing a Low Income Count of 50% ⇒ State average
 - c) Using a March Enrollment Count ⇒ Addresses the fact that programs grow throughout the year. ROE/ISC will receive the funding for these students/not the home school enrollment account with a phase of FY20 – Current year enrollment

- only, FY21 – Current year or two year average enrollment (highest of), and FY22 and ongoing – Current year or three year average enrollment (highest of)
2. Eliminate the **Hold Harmless Base Funding Minimum** for Regional Safe School, Truant Alternative Optional Education and Alternative Learning Opportunity Programs once they no longer continue
 3. Continue **studying** the following items:
 - a) **Alternative Learning Opportunity Program** funding,
 - b) **EBF elements** in relation to **RSSP, TAOEP, and ALOP**, and
 - c) **Truancy alternatives** for students no longer in the public education system.

Second ROE Funding Recommendation

The PRP approved the recommendation that the supplemental bill in the General Assembly (SB 185) be amended to add additional dollars to account for heightened needs on the part of existing students within existing programs as well as encourage a higher supplemental appropriation. In the absence of other legislative action to address the Regional Offices of Education, the Panel recommends the supplemental appropriation.

[For reference: SB 185 (Lightford) - For fiscal year 2019, to calculate grant amounts to the programs operated by regional offices of education, the State Board shall calculate an amount equal to the greater of the regional program's best 3 months of average daily attendance for the 2017-2018 school year or the average of the best 3 months of average daily attendance for the 2015-2016 school year through the 2017-2018 school year, multiplied by the amount of \$6,119.]

Equity Recommendation

The PRP approved the recommendation for the following procedures to be in place for all recommendations brought forward within the PRP. An impact statement will be reported from the Equity Committee to the Panel after reviewing each recommendation through an equity lens.

1. Before PRP committee recommendations are brought to the full panel, the Equity Committee will view them through an equity lens to avoid possible adverse effects.
2. Identify elements that close racial achievement gaps and provide systemic support for implementation of EBF to stakeholders.
 - Professional Development (PD) is an important element to aid implicitly biased views and culturally relevant pedagogy. Embedded PD is the most effective. Utilize approved providers vetted by ISBE.
3. Evaluative Study: Disaggregate student achievement and other student outcome measures by race.
 - Use the Odden-Picus Adequacy Index and Horizontal weighted equity measure to assess adequacy and equity statewide.
4. Annual Spend Plan: Include racial achievement gap as part of goals for achieving student growth and state education goals.

Evaluative Study Recommendation

The PRP approved the recommendation of the Evaluative Study Committee for the Evaluative Study research design proposal:

I. Background & Purpose

1. Legislative charge: “Within five years of after the implementation of this section, the Panel shall complete an evaluative study of the entire Evidence-Based Funding model, including an assessment of whether or not the formula is achieving State goals. The Panel shall report to the State Board, the General Assembly, and the Governor on the findings of the study.”
2. We recommend it to be part of an informative and corrective accountability system, which is a more effective way for schools to change their practices.
3. Who monitors and comes back to close the loop once the evaluation is completed and shared with the legislature? Is this the only evaluative study the PRP is responsible for, or is it every 5 years?
4. Intended users are:
 - a. Primary Audience
 - Illinois State Board of Education
 - Illinois General Assembly
 - The Governor’s Office
 - b. Secondary Audience
 - School District Administrators
 - School Boards
 - c. Other Stakeholders

II. Theoretical foundations of school finance reform and organizational change

1. Changing the school culture in supportive, research-based ways can increase student performance. (see Michael Fullan’s books)
2. Money matters in how you spend it (see [For Each & Every Child](#) report, CTBA [Money Matters](#) report)

III. Research questions to guide the evaluation

1. Did growth in student achievement and other student outcome measures occur from the baseline 2017-18 school year through the 2021-22 school year in Illinois public schools?
 - a. Student Outcome Measures (broken down by racial & low-income subgroups):
 - i. Reduced disciplinary rates,
 - ii. Reduced truancy rates,
 - iii. Increased 4- and 5-year graduation rates,
 - iv. Increased attendance rates
 - v. Dropout rates
 - vi. SAT with all reported subgroups
 - b. [ISBE Goals](#) (including closing achievement gaps in racial & low-income subgroups)
 - i. Growth in 3rd grade reading scores,

- ii. Growth in 5th grade math scores,
 - iii. Growth in 9th grade students on track to graduate, and
 - iv. Growth in college & career ready high school graduates.
2. How faithful was the implementation of the EBF model in Illinois public schools from the 2017-18 to 2021-22 school years?
- a. Which EBF elements did districts use to change staffing for their schools?
 - b. Which EBF per pupil elements did districts change (i.e., gifted, instructional materials, assessment, student activities, maintenance and operation, and central office)?
 - c. If they did not follow the model, how much went to other funds? This is to set the evaluation within the context of how under-funded the districts have been & how the money may be filling past holes. List specific funds.
 - i. Did districts change their practices in transferring dollars between funds?
 - ii. Did districts maintain EBF dollars in operating funds or move some of those dollars to other funds? If so, how were these dollars spent?
 - d. Is the EBF model being used to resource all students including those at safe schools, alternative learning opportunity programs, and truancy programs?
3. Did changes in school-level expenditures predict changes in student achievement and other outcome measures?
- a. Take into account that the EBF model is not fully funded.
 - b. Which of the elements had the greatest impact in the most districts?
4. Among schools that improved, what systemic and organizational change elements were used to improve student performance and close opportunity gaps?
- a. What foundational supports (e.g., leadership, curriculum, etc.) were needed to set the stage for successful change with the EBF elements?
 - b. How did administrators use the research to allocate resources?
 - c. How did administrators connect resource allocation to student outcomes?
 - d. Why did districts choose to postpone or not implement certain elements?
 - i. How did specific formula elements become more or less important, depending on the context of the school?
 - ii. What were the challenges to systemic and organizational change?
 - e. Are there alternative elements outside the EBF model that affected student outcomes?

IV. Mixed methods research design

1. Quantitative – inferential statistics (regression analyses)
 - a. Compare 2017-18 school year base line student performance and expenditure data by school with change in performance and expenditure data over 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22 school years.
 - i. Take into account percent of Adequacy Target when analyzing, since it isn't fully funded.
 - b. Over these 4 years, compare those who improved vs under-performed in districts/schools with similar demographics.
 - c. See example of changes in [school-level uses of resources in Arkansas](#) after school funding change. (These are strictly descriptive statistics about the adequacy elements & are not tied to student performance.)
 - i. Clearly delineate which elements were not implemented because of lack of funding.
 - d. See pp 58-60 of [Comprehensive Review of State Adequacy Studies](#)
2. Qualitative – These case studies are the stories of how the increased funding was used to improve student performance and close achievement gaps.
 - a. See examples of case studies from Part II of Illinois School Finance Adequacy Study (attachment), Appendix C of the [Washington Successful Districts Study](#), and numerous examples of [case studies of improving schools](#) by Odden and Picus.
 - b. This is more than just the individual EBF elements. It would get at more of the systemic change necessary for comprehensive school reform.

V. Sample

1. Highlight schools in Tier 1 districts, since they received the most EBF money, but capture whole picture as well for context.
2. School-level data is necessary to assess whether the new funding formula and distribution is meeting state goals.
3. For quantitative analyses, all schools in Illinois will be included.
4. For qualitative analyses, a sample of schools will be selected based on their success in closing the achievement gap. Total number to be determined.

VI. Data collection

1. Quantitative data sets
 - a. ISBE data sets (student achievement & outcome measures)
 - b. AFR
 - c. EIS
 - d. Annual Spend Plan
 - i. Adequacy Gap Analysis Tool – proposed revisions
 - Four columns: (1) Adequacy target from the state for each element; (2) Actual staffing; (3) Difference between 1 & 2; (4) proposed changes

based on Difference column and student learning needs

- FTEs and dollar amounts would be pre-populated from the state in the first column.
- Current actual staffing would be pre-populated from EIS data. Possible partnership with Forecast5 to allow access to their 5Sight tool.

e. Timeline: baseline 2017-18 school year & then 4 school years of implementation to compare spending in EBF elements and student achievement and other student outcome measures.

f. Who will collect this data?

- i. This may be facilitated through IASBO/Forecast 5 to lessen workload for ISBE for first 5-year study and then if General Assembly extends this to additional studies, plan for a more sustainable model.

2. Qualitative case studies

a. Conduct interviews with principals and focus groups with teachers to address systemic change.

b. Think about including 5 Essentials survey data – safety, feelings of inclusion, etc as part of the story in how we are going to close the racial achievement gap.

c. Timeline: interviews and focus groups would take place in year 2021.

d. Who will collect this data? Will take a minimum of 40 hours of data collection, plus time for travel and scheduling. Number of case studies will be determined based on population of Tier 1 districts that improved student achievement and other outcomes. Then can multiply each by half a day to determine total number of data collection hours. Travel and time writing up case studies would also be figured into the cost. Total budget needs to be estimated. Then would need General Assembly's approval and allocation of funds through ISBE. Then could put out an RFP.

VII. Data analyses

1. Quantitative Analyses

a. We could start with pulling together academic colleagues to try and create details of the data analysis plan (e.g. writing regression equations, etc)

b. For actual analyses, could try to go through CTBA, setting up a separate fund raising trust for this explicit purpose.

2. Qualitative Analyses

a. Outside evaluators needed. (See above.)

3. Final report due August 31, 2022. Will be tight turn around getting data on 2021-22 school year. Need to map out the different data sets' availability.

It is my honor to serve as the leader of the Professional Review Panel. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding these approved recommendations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michelle Turner Mangan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michelle" being the most prominent.

Michelle Turner Mangan, Ph.D.
Chair, Professional Review Panel
708-209-3493
Michelle.Mangan@cuchicago.edu

CC:

Representative Will Davis, Member, Professional Review Panel
Representative Avery Bourne, Member, Professional Review Panel
Senator Andy Manar, Member, Professional Review Panel
Senator Chuck Weaver, Member, Professional Review Panel
Cameron Mock, Member, Professional Review Panel
Susan Harkin, CSBO, Vice Chair, Professional Review Panel