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Abstract
The Illinois State Recognition Program, otherwise known as Quality Review, has stringent rules for documenting compliance with requirements regarding information on student demographics, outcomes, assessment standards, expectations, plans for improvement, and reporting that information to the public in a meaningful way. This field study provides new formats for the scoring rubric and auditors' Interpretive Key for the state rules and regulations which make them easier to understand. In addition, it offers model forms for record-keeping so that preparing for an audit visit can be done efficiently, but it offers no solutions to the complex problem of generating change by altering the culture of a school.
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School reform efforts both nationally and at the state level have waxed and waned over the years. The current reform movement was sparked by the publication of "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform" (The National Commission on Excellence in Education [NCEE], 1983). The document was written by the 18 members of the commission created by then Secretary of Education T. H. Bell. Two of the charges Secretary Bell made to the commission were "assessing the quality of teaching and learning in our Nation's public and private schools, colleges, and universities" (p. 1) and "defining problems which must be faced and overcome if we are successfully to pursue the course of excellence in education" (p. 2).

The second paragraph of the report began with the now-famous statement that "[i]f an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war" (NCEE, 1983, p. 5). The commission found that "the way the educational process itself is often conducted" led to the decline in performance; it focused on "four important aspects of the educational process: content, expectations, time and teaching" (NCEE, 1983, p. 18). The report stated that both curriculum content and expectations for performance were much too low, that not enough hours or days were spent in school, and that teachers were poorly trained and paid.
The recommendations focused on markedly increasing the levels of all of the aforementioned areas. In addition, there was a call for increased leadership from administrators and public officials, for better fiscal planning and for greater financial support. Finally, the report stated a need for a clear program at the Federal level "to identify the national interest in education...[to] fund and support efforts to protect and promote that interest....[and to] ensure that the Nation's public and private resources are marshaled to address the issues discussed in this report" (NCEE, 1983, p. 32-33).

The report received extensive national exposure and discussion. At the state level, various legislatures promulgated reforms. One popular approach utilized Outcomes-Based Education (OBE), which changed the focus from what resources are put into the schools to what the end-product should look like. In general, states which have adopted OBE have created state goals or exit outcomes; local school districts are then accountable for demonstrating that they have assessed student performance relative to these outcomes. In Illinois there are thirty-four state goals for learning in seven Fundamental Learning Areas. These areas are: Language Arts, Mathematics, Biological and Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, Fine Arts and Physical Development and Health (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1, 1993, appendix D, p. 24-28).

The current legislation in Illinois relative to school reform specifies stringent requirements for reporting a district's school improvement efforts both to the State Board of Education and the local community (23 Ill. Adm.
Visits to local districts by state auditors to verify districts' efforts are also required. Unfortunately, self-studies and audit visits were instituted before the rules and regulations and the training of auditors were fully developed, so the experiences of districts with auditors differed wildly because procedures and questions were not standardized. Much emphasis in districts was placed on preparing for "The Visit," and the reasons for doing all the work got lost. Consequently, much of the reform movement (which is exciting and bodes well for productive change if given an opportunity to be developed) has been masked by anger and frustration that the state is yet again jumping on a bandwagon and that this, too, will fade into memory if only we wait long enough. This is unfortunate, indeed, because the thrust of the concepts behind this reform movement is powerful, and, in the author's opinion, addresses much of what we in public education ought to be doing for our clientele.

**Statement of the Problem**

The gathering and recording of information necessary to satisfy the reporting requirements for the Illinois State Recognition Program, otherwise known as Quality Review, pose a significant burden for school districts. The requirements are stringent, are not readily understood, and are intimidating to many people because of their complexity. This project seeks to make the rules for Quality Review more accessible and intelligible to teachers and administrators who have not had training in the subject.
Objectives

To meet the goal of accessibility, the author has undertaken three separate but related tasks. First, the scoring rubric which is used to establish a district’s point total in the auditing process has been rearranged into a format to make it easier to understand the specific requirements which must be met. Second, the Interpretive Key, which is used by state auditors to clarify and define the rubric, has also been rearranged into another format. This new format makes it much easier to understand how the Key relates to the rubric. Third, since the quality and format of the record-keeping which a district maintains play such a fundamental role in generating points during the auditing process, model forms have been developed with the belief that their use will maximize points. Fourth, the question of how the process of doing a self-study and preparing for an audit visit can be done efficiently must be considered.

Limitations of the Study

This field study differs from the usual in that it does not draw upon a panel of experts or involve surveys and questionnaires to determine local practices regarding a current topic. Nor will it be possible to field test this project in advance. Rather, the purpose of this study is to decipher and present in a useful format existing state documents so that practitioners may clearly understand requirements and expectations promulgated by the Illinois state legislature and interpreted by the Illinois State Board of Education. To that end, the field study focuses on two state documents in an effort to interpret them (in a "user-friendly" way) to administrators who
are already very busy, suspicious of the recognition process, and deeply interested in practical solutions.

Local administrators understand that teachers must be intimately involved in developing a district's self-study if it is to be successful, and they are placed in the position of having to interpret unwieldy, complex language to people who are equally busy, suspicious and practical. The author will deem this project successful if it eases the implementation of the recognition process for school personnel by delineating clearly and concisely the expectations of the state. If successful, this project will be of use to every public school system in the State of Illinois, including those which have already been through an audit.

A potential limitation of this study is that the rules and regulations have been altered more than once. The material in this project reflects the most recently available printed material from the State Board, as of the date of this study. It is likely that further refinements to the auditing process will take place over time. There may be changes made in the scoring rubric and, consequently, in the Interpretive Key, but there are no current indications that major changes will be made in the content of either document.

Many districts throughout the state have now undergone a Quality Review visit. It would be interesting to survey several of these districts to compare their experiences. One could ask how time and personnel were allotted to meet the requirements for the visit. One could look for a correlation between time spent and size of score. Small districts could be
surveyed to gain an accurate picture of what particular burdens the process placed on them because of limited personnel. The State Board of Education has issued a document showing how each district visited so far has fared on the various subsections of the rubric. It would be interesting to study whether certain sections were consistently scored either high or low. All of these topics would merit exploration, but they are beyond the scope of this study.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used in the narrative portion of this field study. Additional terms relative to the scoring rubric and Interpretive Key are included at the end of Appendix B.

The "State Board of Education" is the agency responsible for monitoring the public school system for the State of Illinois.

The "state recognition system" refers to the legislative and regulatory process developed by the State of Illinois for evaluating and accrediting the public school system. The legal designation is Public School Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1). The system has three major components: Compliance, which deals with health and safety and certification issues; State Assessment (IGAP) which deals with state developed and mandated achievement testing; and Student Performance and School Improvement, which is the subject of this field study, and is further defined below. When reference is made in this paper to the "state recognition system" only this third portion of the system is being considered.
The "Student Performance and School Improvement" section of the recognition system deals with generating information on student demographics, outcomes, assessment standards, expectations, plans for improvement, and reporting that information to the public in a meaningful way.

"Quality Review" is a shortened expression for the "Student Performance and School Improvement" section of the recognition system. It refers to the entire process of developing the required information for preparing for a "Quality Review visit." Such a visit is carried out by "state auditors" from the Illinois State Board of Education. The auditors examine the information a school has gathered on student demographics, outcomes, assessment standards, expectations, plans for improvement and reporting that information to the public.

The auditors use a "rubric" to evaluate the quality and extent of the information gathered by the school. This rubric, which has sixteen subsections, is contained in "Appendix E" of the 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1. For help in properly applying the rubric in a reliable and valid manner, the auditors are guided by "The Interpretive Key" which delineates in great detail the criteria for each point level in each subsection of the rubric.

"Outcomes Based Education (OBE)" is a model applied in Illinois and in other states which lists desired exit outcomes for students leaving the public school system at the end of twelfth grade. Critics of OBE find it limiting because they say the model mandates learning knowledge bits which are then assessed in ways which do not give an accurate picture of
what a student really knows. Supporters of OBE say they are delineating what broad, general skills students should have upon graduation from high school, and assert that assessment can be made meaningful. The author accepts Glatthorn's definition of OBE found at the beginning of the "Review of Literature and Research" section because it appears to closely mirror the state recognition system's definition implied by the rubric and Interpretive Key.
Chapter II
Rationale, Related Literature and Research

Rationale

This study was inspired by the author's belief that public school personnel ought to be able to articulate what their goals are for students, how those goals will be defined, taught, assessed, reported and revised in light of specific school populations. It was further inspired by frustration with the Illinois State Board of Education's printed rules and regulations relative to school reform because they are extremely difficult to read and understand. In an attempt to understand both the ideas behind outcomes based education and the state's approach to implementing it, the author undertook this study.

Review of the Literature

Fundamental elements of a school which fully embodies the tenets of outcomes based education include the following:

• A collectively endorsed mission statement that reflects commitment to success for all students and provides the means for translating that commitment into action.
• Clearly defined, publicly derived 'exit outcomes' that reflect changing societal conditions and that students must demonstrate before they leave school....
• A tightly articulated curriculum framework of program, course, and unit outcomes that derive from the exit outcomes. The
framework integrates knowledge and competence across domains and facilitates the accomplishment of outcomes.

• A system of instructional decision making and delivery that employs a variety of methods, assures successful demonstration of all outcomes, and provides more than one chance for students to be successful....

• A criterion-referenced and consistently applied system of assessment, performance standards, credentials, and reporting.

A system of instructional placement, grouping, and eligibility that facilitates individual progress.

• An ongoing system of program improvement that includes staff accountability, effective leadership, and staff collaboration.

• A data base of significant, visionary outcomes for all students, plus key indicators of school effectiveness, that is used and updated regularly to improve conditions and practices that affect student and staff success (Glatthorn, 1993, p. 354-355).

These characteristics of the OBE model were summarized by Glatthorn to demonstrate "typical participants and activities in developing curriculum." Exit outcomes were developed at the level of a state board of education, with suggestions by local school board members, as well as teachers and parents. Then at the district level committees would "allocate exit outcomes to programs" and teachers would deal with outcomes for "courses...units...and lessons" (Glatthorn, 1993, p. 361).
The allocation of responsibilities outlined above is fairly representative of what the Illinois rubric encourages districts to follow, except that the rubric has stronger emphasis on including community members at the local level. Points are given to schools which can demonstrate community involvement in developing outcomes, standards and expectations. Indeed, failure to document community involvement can lead to the withholding of points by the state.

The Illinois system is based on ideas which can be traced back to Ralph Tyler and his work on the Eight Year Study (Worthen & Sanders, 1988). This study was issued by the Progressive Education Association in 1942 (Wimpleberg & Ginsberg, 1987, p. 13). The study compared students educated in progressive high schools with those educated in conventional high schools (Worthen et al., 1988, p. 14-15). In 1967, Metfessel and Michael expanded Tyler's work into an eight step model which is essentially reflected in the Illinois rubric. Their steps are:

1. Involve the total school community as facilitators of program evaluation.
2. Formulate cohesive model of goals and specific objectives.
3. Translate specific objectives into a communicable form applicable to facilitate learning in the school environment.
4. Select or construct instruments to furnish measures allowing inferences about program effectiveness.
5. Carry out periodic observations using content-valid tests, scales, and other behavioral measures.
6. Analyze data using appropriate statistical methods.
7. Interpret the data using standards of desired levels of performance over all measures.
8. Develop recommendations for the further implementation, modification, and revision of broad goals and specific objectives (cited in Worthen et al., 1988, p. 65-66).

Implied in the rubric is the notion that reform will occur as a result of the self-study required of each building site. Each site must develop an annual School Improvement Plan based on findings from the previous year. However, neither the rubric nor the Interpretive Key speak to the issue of implementation of change.

Instituting reform is a remarkably complex task, and it is not surprising that strategies vary. "The most common strategy that reformers have used in this century to get students to know and do the right things is to change the curriculum" (Cuban, 1993, p. 182). Cuban argues that changing the curriculum arises from a desire to mold the next generation's values.

The process of defining the official school curriculum is one of the few public endeavors left that allows groups in a democratic society, continually pulled this way and that by highly prized but competing values, to debate what they want for the next generation....

Historically, curricular reform has been a battlefield of ideologies and symbols. What reformers want the schools to teach is symbolic of what they want the next generation to know. (Cuban, 1993, p. 183)
Cuban goes on to argue that there are really four curricula: the official one, which exists in the guides; the taught one, which comes from teachers once their classroom doors are closed; the learned one, which is what is absorbed by students in light of their own interpretations of their entire environments; and the tested one, which has some relationship to the official and taught curricula. His recipe for reform includes a formal acknowledgment of the existence and roles of these four curricula, combined "with efforts to build the capacity of teachers to create, use, and choose their own materials [so that schools] fuse curriculum and instruction" (Cuban, 1993, p. 184-85).

The role of local political needs in influencing change was underscored in a report which discusses three case studies of schools which adopted a specific strategic planning process known as SPERI (Strategic Planning for Educational Reform and Improvement). While there is no precise definition of the term, there are "several themes underlying strategic planning...which represent key principles and beliefs" (D'Amico, 1988, p. 2). These themes are, "[w]e can influence the future....Today's trends can help us anticipate the future....Today's decisions can help us realize the future scenario that is best for us" (D'Amico, 1988, p. 2).

Strategic planning involves several stages. First, there is "planning to plan" during which key individuals identify desired goals. Second, there is research, which "begins with the development of hypotheses about current status and future possibilities." Data are then gathered to support
or refute the hypotheses. Third, a mission statement is developed. Fourth, several scenarios are developed; they can range from accepting the status quo to suggesting radical change. Intended and unintended consequences are discussed, as are likely responses to each scenario. Ways and costs of implementing each scenario are discussed. The last step is to choose a scenario "along with the policies and tactics needed to realize that [scenario] within the context of the mission [statement]." Details of actually implementing the strategic plan are developed through the use of action plans. Process is considered extremely important, and it is expected that the strategic plan will be revised as new considerations arise (D'Amico, 1988, p. 3-5).

In the three case studies presented by D'Amico, the basic process outlined above was not followed in as rational and tidy a manner as the SPERI facilitators had designed. The three clients felt the process was successful for them because it caused them to examine important local issues and to establish priorities. From the point of view of the SPERI facilitators, however, their system required more flexibility than they had originally anticipated. They identified four local factors as most important and influential. The first was what the "history of prior attempts to plan and carry out improvement projects" had been for participants, for that history had a major impact on attitudes. The second was what "priority...the planning process has for all concerned." The third was how much the participants trusted each other because that affected the level of communication. The fourth was the "degree to which either the planning
The theme of building teams whose members trust each other and who are willing to set aside their history and the status quo to think differently about solving problems is a recurrent one in the literature on effective change. A model from the business world is Demingism, named for W. Edwards Deming, famous for his influence on the restructuring of post-war Japanese industry (Holt, 1993a, p. 384). Demingism focuses on the culture of the workplace; collaboration among all levels of employees is essential. Process is all-important in improving the quality of the product. "Hence, Deming rejects proposals for improving schooling by formulating higher standards and enforcing them with performance assessments. For goals in themselves are meaningless; method alone counts, and the improvement of method does not yield to bureaucratic simplicities" (Holt, 1993b, p. 329).

If one accepts that OBE is focused on making "judgments about people not in terms of who they are and the context in which they think and act, but in terms of their measured performance in response to some specified task," then it is easy to be negative about this approach (Holt, 1993b, p. 329). If, however, one looks at the Illinois system holistically an argument can be made that Deming's principles and the state system can coexist in profitable ways. The state goals for learning are broadly stated and focus on skills such as reading, writing, speaking and thinking in
flexible, divergent ways. It is up to the local level to generate specific outcomes and meaningful assessment techniques. As written, the state system does not require a lockstep approach to obtaining preordained bits of knowledge to be measured in only standardized test formats. It is possible to apply the state system in such a manner, but it is not required. Such an approach is quite limiting, because it conveys the message to the public and professionals alike that the ability to measure, to compare, and to rank is what education is all about. It is not! Education is about learning how to deal with uncertainty and ambiguity. It is about learning how to savor the quality of the journey. It is about inquiry and deliberation. It is about becoming critically minded and intellectually curious, and it is about learning how to frame and pursue your own educational aims. It is not about regaining our competitive edge. (Eisner, 1992, p. 723)

The author's fourth objective in undertaking this field study was to consider the question of how the process of doing a self-study and preparing for an audit visit can be done efficiently. There is no simple answer to this question because a proper self-study must be done in the context of a long-term examination of the school. Deming's ideas on developing the culture of the school have great merit, and should be implemented. This requires time, expertise, a knowledgeable leader, and team building. Building staffs will have to be willing to live with uncertainty, ambiguity, problems, a commitment of resources, sustained effort, and a willingness to balance site control with district-wide needs (Fullan & Miles 1992, p. 749-750).
In the interest of efficiency, there are mechanical things which can be done. Careful documentation of all meetings is crucial because point totals are affected by the presence or absence of such records. A model form used for all meeting minutes can increase the quality of minutes, as can the use of a checklist for evaluating minutes. Examples of such forms are included as Appendices C through E. A systematic filing system can be set up, based on the numbering system of the rubric, so that any paperwork pertaining to a subsection can be filed properly and retrieved easily.

Building leaders and teams must be familiar with the rubric and Interpretive Key so that the requirements for desired point levels for each subsection are clearly understood. A list of desired goal points developed by David E. Bartz based on his teaching and consulting experience (see Appendix C) should be carefully examined (D. E. Bartz, personal communication, February 17, 1994). A building team should mark their building's current point status for each subsection and then refer to the rubric and Key to understand what further steps, if any, are needed to increase points. A timeline can then be developed and responsibilities assigned to team members. The SPERI approach outlined previously should be considered as a guide for steps to take in developing these timelines. In addition, Fullan et al. offer practical information to guide the team's thinking. Knowing in advance the kinds of problems to be confronted can help team members analyze their own "maps of change" (Fullan et al., 1992, p. 745) and may well make the process of finding solutions less difficult. The broader question, beyond the scope of this field
study, is whether or not those solutions will become institutionalized, thereby changing the culture of the school in a significant and lasting manner.

Research Review

No data based research studies were examined for this study because the author's focus was on creating a useful format for state rules and regulations.

Uniqueness of the Study

If reform is to actually occur in public education in Illinois it will require systematic efforts in all seven areas outlined in the rubric. The concepts embodied in the rubric have great merit, but the strategies used to implement these concepts will be what determines the amount of substantive change which occurs. If the mechanics of the recognition system remain the focus because they are difficult to understand (as they are currently presented) then this reform effort will likely sputter and fail as energy is wasted seeking to understand those mechanics instead of channeling efforts into the challenge of implementing meaningful change.

This study provides a format which is clear and easy to follow and which makes sense to people regardless of their familiarity with the requirements of Quality Review. This format allows people to focus their time and energy on the fundamental questions of how to improve public schools.
Chapter III
Design of the Study

General Design of the Study

To meet the first and second objectives the rubric will be arranged in a format which makes it easy to understand what is required for each point value in each subsection. It will also be easy to understand the progressive nature of the requirements because of the format. The Interpretive Key will be arranged so that the auditors' guidelines will be correlated to each point value for each subsection in a manner which is visually easy to follow. The Interpretive Key expands on the rubric; the purpose of this new format is to make it clear to building teams what auditors are looking for in the documentation for each subsection. Operational definitions will be arranged so that their progressive nature will be obvious. (An example would be a comparison of the requirements for "informal" versus "formal" documentation of efforts.)

To meet the third and fourth objectives model forms will be generated to facilitate proper documentation of information. Such forms should increase the efficiency of building teams because these forms will be simple to use; if filled out completely they will satisfy documentation requirements at the "formal" level. They will be created in template form for installation on a computer to further increase efficiency. The fourth objective will, therefore, be viewed primarily from a mechanical viewpoint rather than from the viewpoint of implementing fundamental cultural changes in a building site. Ideally, a building engaged in self-study will begin to alter its
climate and culture, but it cannot be assumed that the Illinois plan, in and of itself, will foster fundamental change.

Sample and Population

This study did not use a sample and population.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

This study did not use data collection and instrumentation.

Data Analysis

This study did not use data analysis.
Chapter IV

Results

This study differs from the norm in that data collection and analysis were not used. The reformatted rubric and Interpretive Key are included as Appendices A and B, respectively. Model forms designed to expedite the record-keeping process are included as Appendices C through E. Because of the nature of these materials, APA format was not used; to do so would have created unnecessarily unwieldy pages. The purpose of the study was to create materials which could be used by practitioners as they worked on school improvement issues, not to satisfy an arbitrary style manual format.

Appendix A, the reformatted scoring rubric, was developed by the author as a user's guide to a document published by the Illinois State Board of Education in June, 1993. The document, "Illinois Public School Accreditation Process Information Sheet" (ISBE, June, 1993) included proposed amendments to the State Board's rules for Recognition and Supervision of Illinois Public Schools. Section 1, Appendix E of the ISBE document is titled "Evaluation Criteria--Student Performance and School Improvement Determination," which is the actual scoring rubric districts are required to use in their self-study as they prepare for accreditation. Revisions to this document were issued in November, 1993 (ISBE, November, 1993) but the changes were not extensive. Those revisions from November have been included in the author's Appendix A, referred to as the "User's Guide to the Scoring Rubric for the Illinois Public School Accreditation System" (Ostergren, 1994).
The format of the ISBE document is difficult to follow; the reader must flip back and forth to understand the requirements for varying point totals. The author arranged the rubric in table form to make it easier for the reader to understand the hierarchy of requirements for increasing points in each category. As one reads the table from left to right one notices that some phrases are in italics. The italics indicate that there is an increase in requirements relative to what is in the box directly to the left. For example, "[e]vidence exists that..." may increase to "[c]ompelling evidence exists that..." which is a significant increase in the requirement. The author broke the requirements down into subsections and assigned capital letters (A through E) to each of these subsections. As the complexity of requirements increased for higher point values more subsections tended to be added.

The language from the ISBE document was retained as much as possible; to save space some sentences were truncated. It was the intent of the author to accurately reflect the official language of the ISBE, but the reader is advised to refer to the actual state document if (s)he has any questions regarding requirements, definitions of terms, or complete language.

Appendix B, the reformatted Interpretive Key, was developed by the author so the reader could compare the requirements from the rubric with the information used by state auditors to award actual points to a district. The text used came from the "Interpretive Key for the Evaluative Criteria Used for the Student Performance and School Improvement
Determination" (ISBE, December, 1993). The cover page for this document states that "...evaluative criteria for student performance and school improvement were developed to respond to the need to validly, reliably and fairly make a determination on a school following an audit by quality review specialists" (ISBE, December, 1993). The Interpretive Key is difficult to read because it has extensive text with no headers or footers on the pages so that the reader must keep track of which component and point value are being discussed. Each page is divided in half vertically; on the left side the text from the scoring rubric is given and on the right side there is text to clarify the meaning of the left side.

Appendix B of this study, referred to as the "Combined Rubric and Interpretive Key for the Illinois Public School Accreditation System" (Ostergren, 1994) is designed so the reader can again follow the hierarchy of requirements for various points. Long boxes with single borders were used to contain information copied directly from the author's "User's Guide." The capital letters used to label subsections were retained for easy reference. Italics were omitted in the boxes because side-by-side comparisons are not possible in this portion; such comparisons can be easily made by referring back to the "User's Guide."

Once again the language from the ISBE document was retained as much as possible; the author edited some unwieldy language and shortened some text without sacrificing meaning. However, the reader is again advised to refer to the actual state document if (s)he has any questions regarding requirements, definitions of terms, or complete
language. Operational definitions are included at the end of Appendix B. These definitions are important because they carry specific meaning for determining points.

Appendix C, the "Checklist for Point Accumulation" is designed to give a realistic picture of point totals which a district could accumulate in preparing for a Quality Review visit. The subsections of the scoring rubric are listed with a short description of what is required to gain the "goal" point for each subsection. Accumulating these "goal" points would allow a district to receive a "Meets" classification for a Quality Review visit prior to October 1, 1995. The points listed in the column under "G" are a reasonable goal for most districts. The reader should study the scoring rubric and Interpretive Key, focusing in particular on the requirements for the suggested point values given here to help determine the current status of his/her district. A check mark should be put in the appropriate boxes. Some points are much more difficult to generate than others; this survey of a district's current status can help to focus efforts where they are most needed and most likely to be productive.

The Interpretive Key includes operational definitions which are crucial to understand. Operational definitions used in the checklist have been put in quotation marks.

A blacked-out box in the point column indicates that that subsection does not have three or four points possible. Some subsections have up to six points theoretically possible, but the requirements are so stringent that the
author made the decision to not take space on the checklist for those points. To save space in the checklist the following abbreviations have been used:

LO: Learning Outcomes
SGL: State Goals for Learning
FLA: Fundamental Learning Areas

This checklist is intended to serve only as a guide to help district personnel focus their thinking and channel their efforts. The "goal" points are the suggestion of David E. Bartz of Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, and are based on his teaching and consulting experience. Dr. Bartz shared these point totals in an Educational Administration class on assessment which the author took in Fall, 1993. The author applied the point totals to the checklist format with the intent of providing a reasonable framework to groups of people who are involved in helping their districts to enact the reforms intended by the new State Recognition Program and to prepare for a visit from the state auditors. This checklist has no official standing, but does have practical application.

Appendix D is a template for minutes of committee meetings to be installed on a computer. It includes all the elements necessary to meet the requirements of formal and systematic recordkeeping. Appendix E is a checklist to be applied to meeting minutes, to ensure that they are complete.
Chapter V
Summary and Recommendations

Summary

School reform is a complex undertaking which will require much time and effort on the part of school personnel and the communities they serve. The seven components of the Illinois program commonly known as Quality Review require districts to carefully consider their population, paying attention to subgroups within that population. Districts must describe their desired learning outcomes in defined curriculum areas. They must establish standards of performance and expectations for attaining those standards. They must devise varied assessment procedures which are reliable, valid, and non-discriminatory. They must examine their students' performance on a yearly basis, determine likely reasons for the failure to meet standards on the part of some and plan ways to improve the performance of those students who fall below the standards. Finally, they must communicate their plans to their communities in meaningful ways.

The public school accreditation process requires districts to meet complicated requirements to demonstrate that they are, indeed, working toward reform of their programs. These requirements are contained in a scoring rubric devised by the state, and further explicated in an Interpretive Key used by state auditors to help ensure reliable and valid scoring of districts' efforts. The state documents, as written, are difficult to understand, even with specific training. Therefore, the author chose as
her Field Study project the task of presenting official information in a more easily accessible format.

The author's formats for the scoring rubric and Interpretive Key allow practitioners to gain a clear understanding of the hierarchy of the requirements of the rules and regulations which govern the Quality Review process in Illinois. Keeping accurate records of meetings and activities is crucial in documenting a district's efforts at reform. The author developed model forms which will help practitioners to keep clear records in an efficient manner. These forms should help decrease time school personnel will need to spend on mechanical issues as they pursue ways to change their schools' programs.

Recommendations

School personnel who will be involved in Quality Review issues must familiarize themselves with the seven components which are outlined in the rubric. They must understand the operational definitions so they can engage in the activities necessary to meet the requirements of the state. They must keep excellent records of their deliberations and actions. They should have a clear understanding of their district's status relative to the various components so that they use their time effectively by focusing on the areas of greatest need as defined by an assessment of their current status.
References


Appendix A

User's Guide to the Scoring Rubric for the Illinois Public School Accreditation System
1. Analysis of Existing Conditions

1.1 Description of student population; identification of significant groups; attendance variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Little or no evidence demographic information kept on student population of school for purpose of identifying significant groups to be monitored.</td>
<td>A. Limited demographic information exists on student population of school.</td>
<td>A. Demographic information of total population of school maintained, indicating # and % of students at each grade who are in sp. ed, Ch. 1, gifted or vocational ed or who have limited English proficiency. Information also kept by gender, SES, racial/ethnic or other groups which warrant description.</td>
<td>A. Demographic information of total population of school maintained, indicating # and % of students at each grade who are in sp. ed, Ch. 1, gifted or vocational ed or who have limited English proficiency. Information also kept by gender, SES, racial/ethnic or other groups which warrant description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Gender, race/ethnicity, SES, or other groups which warrant description or emerge as result of data analysis identified.</td>
<td>B. Groups which warrant description or emerge as result of data analysis whose performance data will be disaggregated identified.</td>
<td>B. Same as 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Student attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates are maintained. Graduation and dropout rates maintained for high schools. No evidence that these performance indicators are consulted when considering factors which may affect student learning.</td>
<td>C. Student attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates are maintained. Graduation and dropout rates maintained for high schools. These performance indicators are informally consulted when considering factors which may affect learning.</td>
<td>C. Student attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates are maintained. Graduation and dropout rates maintained for high schools. These performance indicators are formally and systematically consulted when considering factors which may affect learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Demographics
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D. Rationale for selection of identified groups within the population documented based on formal and systematic identification procedures.
1. Analysis of Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 Perceived student needs derived from staff and/or community and community characteristics which may affect student learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 POINT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A. Little or no evidence of inquiry regarding needs of students related to learning outcomes (LO) as perceived by staff and school community or on community characteristics which may affect learning. | A. Evidence exists of information regarding needs of students related to LO as perceived by staff and school community occasionally and informally collected. | Option 1
A. **Compelling** evidence exists of information regarding needs of all students related to LO as perceived by staff and community collected formally and systematically. **AND**
A.1 Evidence exists of informal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning. **OR** | A. Compelling evidence exists of information regarding needs of all students related to LO as perceived by staff and community collected formally and systematically. |
| **1.2 Perceived Student Needs** | **page 3** | **Option 2**
B. Evidence exists of informal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning. | **Option 2**
B. Evidence exists of information regarding needs of all students related to LO as perceived by staff and community elicited occasionally and informally. **AND**
B.1 **Compelling** evidence exists of **formal** inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning. | B. Compelling evidence exists of formal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning. |
<p>| 12 Perceived student needs derived from staff and/or community and community characteristics which may affect student learning |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Little or no evidence of inquiry regarding needs of students related to learning outcomes (LO) as perceived by staff and school community or on community characteristics which may affect learning.</td>
<td>A. Evidence exists of information regarding needs of students related to LO as perceived by staff and school community occasionally and informally collected.</td>
<td>Option 1 A. <strong>Compelling</strong> evidence exists of information regarding needs of <em>all</em> students related to LO as perceived by staff and community collected <em>formally and systematically</em>. AND A.1 Evidence exists of <em>informal</em> inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning. OR</td>
<td>A. Compelling evidence exists of information regarding needs of all students related to LO as perceived by staff and community collected formally and systematically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Perceived Student Needs</strong> page 4</td>
<td>B. Evidence exists of informal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning.</td>
<td>Option 2 B. Evidence exists of information regarding needs of all students related to LO as perceived by staff and community elicited occasionally and informally. AND B.1 <strong>Compelling</strong> evidence exists of <em>formal</em> inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning.</td>
<td>B. Compelling evidence exists of formal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Learning Outcomes, Standards, and Expectations

### 2.1 Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Learning outcomes (LO) have not been developed.</td>
<td>A. Comprehensive LO aligned with some State Goals for Learning (SGL) exist for some fundamental learning areas (FLA) for at least 2 grades for a 1-8 attendance center, or for at least 1 grade for an attendance center with fewer than 8 grades.</td>
<td>A. Comprehensive LO aligned with <em>all required</em> SGL exist and are written in <em>all</em> FLA for at least 2 grades for a 1-8 attendance center, or for at least 1 grade for an attendance center with fewer than 8 grades.</td>
<td>A. Comprehensive LO aligned with <em>all the</em> SGL exist and are written in <em>all</em> FLA for at least 2 grades for a 1-8 attendance center, or for at least 1 grade for an attendance center with fewer than 8 grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Process for developing LO is informal and limited in participation of school staff and in communication with students, parents and school community.</td>
<td>B. Same as 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Process for developing LO includes systematic review cycle and includes participation of school staff and communication with students, parents and school community in the deliberative process. <em>Both the rationale for this process and rationale for resulting LO are evident.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Some alignment of the curriculum with LO.</td>
<td>C. Same as 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. There is formal and systematic alignment of the curriculum with LO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.1 Learning Outcomes**
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D. LO address the content of SGL. LO are broader in focus than a learning objective. LO probe range and depth of thinking skills appropriate to SGL and are amenable to assessment.
2. Learning Outcomes, Standards, and Expectations

### 2.1 Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 POINTS</th>
<th>6 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Comprehensive LO aligned with <em>all the</em> SGL exist and are written in <em>all</em> FLA for at least 50% of the grades at the attendance center.</td>
<td>A. For elementary, middle schools and junior high schools. Comprehensive LO aligned with <em>all the</em> SGL exist and are written in <em>all</em> FLA for all grades. For high schools, LO aligned with the SGL are written in all FLA. There is comprehensive coverage of all SGL in all FLA throughout the scope of the HS program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Same as 4: (Process for developing LO includes systematic review cycle; includes participation of staff and communication with school community; rationale for process and LO must be evident.)</td>
<td>B. Same as 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. There is formal and systematic alignment of the curriculum with LO.</td>
<td>C. There is formal and systematic alignment of the curriculum with LO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. LO address the content of SGL. LO are broader in focus than a learning objective. LO probe range and depth of thinking skills appropriate to SGL and are amenable to assessment. <em>Some LO integrate FLA when appropriate and reflect problems and tasks outside the classroom.</em></td>
<td>D. LO address the content of SGL. LO are broader in focus than a learning objective. LO probe range and depth of thinking skills appropriate to SGL and are amenable to assessment. <em>Learning outcomes integrate FLA when appropriate and reflect problems and tasks outside the classroom.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Learning Outcomes
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2. Learning Outcomes, Standards, and Expectations

### 2.2 Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Standards for the school do not exist for LO.</td>
<td>A. Standards exist for some LO stated in a manner which tells if a student is included in the expectation group, i.e., the % of students expected to achieve the LO</td>
<td>A. Standards for all LO exist and are written as a cut-score on single assessment instrument or procedure or on items from single assessment instrument or procedure.</td>
<td>A. Standards for all LO exist in all FLA and are written as cut-scores or minimum criteria on a variety of assessment instruments or procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Process for setting standards**

- B. Process for setting standards is formal and consultative. Both rationale for process and rationale for standards are evident.

---

2.2 Standards

Points awarded for Learning Outcomes, 2.1, are three (3) or more.

Points awarded for Learning Outcomes, 2.1, are four (4).
### 2. Learning Outcomes, Standards, and Expectations

#### 2.2 Standards

| 5 POINTS                                                                                           | 6 POINTS                                                                                                                                 |
|                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                      |
| A. Standards for all LO exist in all FLA and are written as cut-scores or minimum criteria on a variety of assessment instruments or procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO | A. Same as 5                                                                                                                             |
| B. Process for setting standards is formal and consultative. Rationale for process includes consultation of previous performance data and rationale for standards are evident | B. Same as 5                                                                                                                             |
| C. Points awarded for Learning Outcomes, 2.1, are five (5).                                       | C. Points awarded for Learning Outcomes, 2.1, are six (6).                                                                            |

**2.2 Standards**
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2. Learning Outcomes, Standards, and Expectations

### 2.3 Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Expectations have not been established.</td>
<td>A. Expectations exist for LO in some FLA in the form of % of students expected to achieve LO.</td>
<td>A. Expectations exist for each LO in each FLA in the form of % of students expected to achieve LO.</td>
<td>A. Same as 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are two (2) or more.</td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are three (3) or more.</td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are four (4) or more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3 Expectations**  
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C. There is a process for establishing expectations and a rationale for this process.  
C. There is a formal, systematic and consultative process for establishing expectations and a rationale for this process.
3. Assessment Systems

3.1 Coordination of assessment instruments and procedures with learning outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Little or no evidence that LO are assessed by assessment instruments and procedures.</td>
<td>A. LO in all required FLA are assessed by assessment instruments and procedures administered at least at benchmark grades.</td>
<td>A. LO in all FLA are assessed by a variety of assessment instruments and procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO administered at least at benchmark grades.</td>
<td>A. All LO in all FLA are assessed by a variety of assessment instruments and procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO administered at least at benchmark grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are two (2) or more.</td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are four (4) or more.</td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are five (5) or more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The rationale for choosing or developing each instrument or procedure is evident.</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. The rationale for choosing or developing each instrument or procedure is evident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Coordination of Assessment with Outcomes
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3. Assessment Systems

### 3.2 Validity of Assessment Instruments and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Little or no evidence that assessment instruments and procedures are valid measures of the LO.</td>
<td>A. Claims for content validity documented for all instruments and procedures to measure achievement of LO.</td>
<td>A. Claims for content validity documented for all instruments and procedures to measure achievement of LO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Evidence of instruments and procedures sufficient to measure all LO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Evidence that assessment instruments and procedures measure complex knowledge and skills beyond specific tasks or questions. Results provide accurate information for making judgments about students' progress toward achieving LO.</td>
<td>C. <em>Compelling</em> evidence that assessment instruments and procedures measure knowledge and skills beyond specific tasks or questions to provide accurate information for making judgments about students' progress toward achieving LO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Assessment Systems

3.3 Reliability of assessment instruments and procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Little or no evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Reliability claims documented for assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that instruments and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instruments and procedures used to set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standards for achievement of all LO in all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LO in all AL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Reliability claims documented for assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instruments and procedures used to measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>achievement of all LO in all FLA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Reliability of Assessment

B. Evidence that instruments and procedures are administered, scored, and interpreted in uniform manner.

B. Formal procedures documented for administration, scoring, and interpretation of all assessment instruments and procedures in uniform manner.
3. Assessment System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. No evidence that instruments and procedures used to set standards for LO are nondiscriminatory regarding ethnic/racial or gender differences or student disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. *Evidence provided for claims of nondiscrimination regarding ethnic/racial or gender differences or student disabilities for all assessment instruments and procedures used to set standards for achievement of LO.*

3.4 Nondiscrimination of Assessment
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4. Analysis of Student Performance Data

4.1 Data sufficiency for decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Insufficient data to make decisions regarding student progress for each LO.</td>
<td>A. Limited data available for the most recent academic year based on results from valid, reliable and nondiscriminatory assessment instruments and procedures. Data used to make decisions regarding student performance relative to LO, including that of any groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis.</td>
<td>A. <em>Data</em> available for the most recent academic year based on results from a <em>variety</em> of valid, reliable and nondiscriminatory assessment instruments and procedures. Data used to make decisions regarding student performance relative to <em>each</em> LO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. These data for the school are used to establish current and prior years’ student performance in all FLA.</td>
<td>B. Historical data trends on student performance data for each LO have been established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Data Sufficiency
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4. Analysis of Student Performance Data

4.2 Compilation and analysis of assessment data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Little or no systematic collection, comparison or weighting of assessment data nor indication of % of students who met standards for LO for FLA.</td>
<td>A. Systematic collection, comparison or weighting of assessment data with indication of % of students who met standards for some but not all LO for all FLA.</td>
<td>A. Systematic collection, comparison or weighting of assessment data with indication of % of students who met standards for all LO for all FLA.</td>
<td>A. Same as 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Process for identifying strengths and weaknesses of student performance relative to all LO for total population and for groups identified for data disaggregation is evident.</td>
<td>B. Formal process for identifying strengths and weaknesses of students relative to all LO for total population and for groups identified for data disaggregation is evident.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Compilation and Analysis of Data

C. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are two (2) or more.  
C. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are four (4) or more.  
C. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are four (4) or more.
5. Evaluation of Student Performance and School Programs

5.1 Evaluation of student performance by standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2** POINTS</th>
<th>3** POINTS</th>
<th>4** POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Little or no evidence that student performance in meeting standards for LO is improving over time in FLA.</td>
<td>A. Evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in some FLA.</td>
<td>A. Evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in each FLA for the student population and for groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis.</td>
<td>A. Evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in each FLA for the student population and for groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are two (2) or more.</td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are three (3) or more.</td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are four (4) or more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Points awarded for Data-Sufficiency, 4.1, are two (2) or more.

C. Points awarded for Data-Sufficiency, 4.1, are three (3).

**Point values 2 through 6 will be doubled in calculating the total points for a school.**
5. Evaluation of Student Performance and School Programs

5.1 Evaluation of student performance by standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5** POINTS</th>
<th>6** POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Compelling evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in each FLA for the student population and for groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis.</td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are three (3) or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are five (5) or more.</td>
<td>B. Points awarded for Standards, 2.2, are five (5) or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Points awarded for Data-Sufficiency, 4.1, are three (3).</td>
<td>C. Points awarded for Data-Sufficiency, 4.1, are three (3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Student performance in meeting standards for LO has been maintained relative to those standards for LO where improvement was not evidenced.</td>
<td>D. Student performance in meeting standards for LO has been maintained relative to those standards for LO where improvement was not evidenced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Evaluation of Student Performance by Standard
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* *Point values 2 through 6 will be doubled in calculating the total points for a school.
5. Evaluation of Student Performance and School Programs

5.2 Program evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Little or no evidence of program evaluation based on student performance on LO.</td>
<td>A. Evidence of program evaluation that identifies probable causes for students' failures to meet standards for LO (if applicable).</td>
<td>A. Evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for students' failures to meet standards for LO (if applicable).</td>
<td>A. Compelling evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for students' failures to meet standards for LO (if applicable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. No evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for failure of students, in groups identified for disaggregate data analysis, to meet standards for LO (if applicable).</td>
<td>B. Evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for failure of students in groups identified for disaggregate data analysis to meet standards for LO (if applicable).</td>
<td>B. Compelling evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for failure of students in groups identified for disaggregate data analysis to meet standards for LO (if applicable).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Program Evaluation
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C. Consideration given to proposals for what can be done to better identify probable causes for students' failure to meet standards for LO.
### 6. Establishing New Expectations and Program Improvements

#### 6.1 Annual review of expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Expectations which exist for school not subject to annual review.</td>
<td>A. Expectations which exist for school subject to annual review and revision based on student performance data and data trends for the school.</td>
<td>A. Expectations which exist for school subject to annual review and revision through systematic, formal and consultative process utilizing student performance data and data trends for the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.1 Annual Review of Expectations**
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### 6. Establishing New Expectations and Program Improvements

#### 6.2 Activities planned to increase student performance to meet new or existing expectations and consideration of changes in demographics or instruction in establishing expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A. Little or no evidence that changes in curriculum, instruction, staff development, organizational structure, etc., will be implemented to improve achievement of students in meeting standards for LO or to effect other improvements in student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B. Little or no evidence of planned strategies for improving performance of students who have not met LO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C. Little or no evidence of planned strategies for improving student attendance, truancy, graduation rates or the climate of the school to enhance instructional efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D. Changes are not systematic and are not directed by student performance data for the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.2.1 Additional Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E. Informal consideration given to possible changes in demographics and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F. Formal consideration given to possible changes in demographics and instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Reporting to the Public

7.1 Regular communication is conducted with the school board, parents of students, and local media on student progress towards meeting the standards for achieving learning outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. No evidence of regular communication with school board, parents of students, and local media on student progress towards meeting the standards for achieving LO.</td>
<td>A. Information describing how students of the school are being served and how well they are achieving relative to standards available.</td>
<td>A. Available information describes how students of the school are being served and how well they are achieving relative to standards.</td>
<td>A. Information describing how students of the school are being served and how well they are achieving relative to standards for LO is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Some audiences are addressed.</td>
<td>B. All audiences are addressed; <em>timetables are established for releasing information to audiences.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Same as 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Partial information is presented in some reports.</td>
<td>C. Information is complete in reports to <em>all</em> audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Same as 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1 Reporting to the Public

page 21

D. Procedures in place to help audiences understand the information provided. | D. *Systematic procedures* in place to help audiences *interpret and* understand the information provided.
Appendix B

Combined Rubric and Interpretive Key

for the Illinois Public School Accreditation System
1.1 Demographics

1. Analysis of Existing Conditions

1.1 Description of student population; identification of significant groups; attendance variables

1 POINT

A. Little or no evidence demographic information kept on student population of school for purpose of identifying significant groups to be monitored.

A school with a score of 1 is in accord with the rules and regulations in effect until October 1, 1995.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient for a 2 will receive a 1.

Note that verbal testimony with regard to this process, while important for clarification, is not acceptable for any point beyond a score of 1 on any criteria item. A meeting may have taken place and decisions may have been made, but if there is no documentation, a school cannot be credited with the process.

2 POINTS

A. Limited demographic information kept on student population of school.

Data is presented as numbers and percentages for the district, the school and at each grade level for gender, ethnicity, program/service inclusion, and free/reduced lunch (for district and school).

If data is incomplete with regard to any of the above a school can score no higher than a 2.

Example: Data on gender and ethnicity presented for grade levels at the school and for the district, but program/service information is presented only at district and school level. Demographic information is limited, and the score cannot be higher than 2.
1.1 Demographics

2 POINTS

B. Gender, race, SES, or other groups which warrant description or emerge as result of data analysis identified.

If school has identified groups for which they may disaggregate data, documented by having statistical data indicated in student profile, but:

a) has neither an evidenced commitment to disaggregate for any of these identified groups, nor
b) has written rationale for determining which groups should be subject to disaggregation, then the score cannot be higher than 2.

C. Student attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates are maintained. Graduation and dropout rates are maintained for high schools. No evidence that these performance indicators are consulted when considering factors which may affect student learning.

Indicators for school and district for attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates and graduation rates for high schools for most recent complete academic year documented.
1.1 Demographics

3 POINTS

A. Demographic information of total population of school maintained, indicating number and percent of students at each grade who are in special education, Chapter 1, gifted or vocational education or who have limited English proficiency. Information also kept by gender, SES, racial/ethnic or other groups which emerge as a result of analysis.

Requirements for a 4 are maintained here for a 3. Refer to A under 4 points for specific information.

Data presented as numbers and percentages for district, school and each grade level for gender, ethnicity, program/service inclusion, and free/reduced lunch for district and school.

Data presented as numbers and percentages for any groups which the school identifies as significant relative to student learning. (Schools are not required to create these groups, but if they do, these categories should be described at all grades and for the school.)

3 POINTS

B. Groups which warrant description or emerge as result of data analysis whose performance data will be disaggregated identified.

Requirements for a 4 are maintained here for a 3. See B under 4 points.

A school will either document:
1) the groups they intend to disaggregate for the coming academic year or
2) the groups they currently disaggregate, depending on the time the Quality Review visit takes place.

If school personnel are using a computer program for data management affording personnel the ability to disaggregate for any of the fields identified the school should state this capacity. They are not required to indicate for which groups they will disaggregate.
1.1 Demographics

3 POINTS
C. Student attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates are maintained. Graduation and dropout rates are maintained for high schools. These performance indicators are informally consulted when considering factors which may affect learning.

Indicators for school and district for attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates and graduation rates for high schools for most recent complete academic year are documented.

School personnel must document an informal process that was followed to consult these indicators to decide if:

1) the information can be of use in determining student groups which will be disaggregated for data analysis and
2) if direct school action is needed to improve these performance indicators.

The requirements for a 4 on maintaining and consulting other educational indicators are maintained for a 3 but it is not required that the consultation be formal or systematic. Refer to C under 4 points for specific information.

3 POINTS
D. Rationale for selection of identified groups within the population documented.

Any group identified must have a rationale provided for its selection. It is not required that the identification be either formal or systematic. It is reasonable to disaggregate at least for gender and for students in state and/or federal programs which dedicate funds to address a factor which may affect student learning. The rationale for these program/service groups is provided by criteria for state and federal identification of these students as eligible for special instructional services.

When a computer program is used which allows disaggregation for any identified field it is expected that research will be conducted on all groups. However, only groups which data analysis shows as meriting special
study will be reported (noting the populations identified by state and/or federal programs should usually be reported). Therefore, if, as will be the more frequent case in the future, a school has the capacity to disaggregate by any field, a rationale for determining which groups to report must be developed.

3 POINTS
If the number of students in the school, or resource program or in a resource program at a reported grade level is so small that individual monitoring of progress is more practical and effective then the school should inform the Quality Review team that these conditions exist.

Student academic performance should be a basis for determining which groups will be disaggregated. This performance can be referenced by looking at state data, norm referenced data, local assessment or other sources.

Requirements for a 4 are maintained here for a 3 but it is not required that the identification be either formal or systematic. Refer to D under 4 points for specific information.

4 POINTS

A. Demographic information of total population of school maintained, indicating number and percent of students at each grade who are in special education, Chapter 1, gifted or vocational education or who have limited English proficiency. Information also kept by gender, SES, racial/ethnic or other groups which emerge as a result of analysis.

Data presented as numbers and percentages for district, school and each grade level for gender, ethnicity, program/service inclusion, and free/reduced lunch (for district and school); and for any groups which the school identifies as significant relative to student learning. (Schools are not required to create these groups. However, should they establish this category it should be described at all grades and for the school.)
1.1 Demographics

4 POINTS

B. Groups which warrant description or emerge as result of data analysis whose performance data will be disaggregated are identified.

A school will either document:
   a) the groups they intend to disaggregate for the coming academic year or  
   b) the groups they currently disaggregate, depending on the time the quality review visit takes place.

If school personnel are using a computer program for data management affording personnel the ability to disaggregate for any of the fields identified the school should state this capacity. They are not required to indicate for which groups they will disaggregate.

C. Student attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates are maintained. Graduation and dropout rates are maintained for high schools. These performance indicators are formally and systematically consulted when considering factors which may affect learning.

Indicators for school and district for attendance, truancy, mobility, retention and expulsion rates and graduation rates for high schools for most recent complete academic year documented. School personnel must document a process that was followed to consult these indicators to decide if:
   a) the information can be of use in determining student groups who will be disaggregated for data analysis and
   b) if direct school action is needed to improve these performance indicators.

D. Rationale for selection of identified groups within the population documented based on formal and systematic identification procedures.

Any group identified must have a rationale provided for its selection. It is reasonable to disaggregate at least for gender and for students in state and/or federal programs which dedicate funds to address a factor which may
1.1 Demographics

4 POINTS
affect student learning. The rationale for these program/service groups is provided by criteria for state and federal identification of these students as eligible for special instructional services.

When a computer program is used which allows disaggregation for any identified field it is expected that research will be conducted on all groups. However, only groups which data analysis shows as meriting special study will be reported (note that populations identified by state and/or federal programs should usually be reported). Therefore, if, as will be the more frequent case in the future a school has the capacity to disaggregate by any field, a rationale for determining which groups to report must be developed.

If the number of students in the school, or resource program or in a resource program at a reported grade level is so small that individual monitoring of progress is more practical and effective then the school should inform the Quality Review team that these conditions exist.

Student academic performance should be a basis for determining which groups will be disaggregated. This performance can be referenced by looking at state data, norm referenced data, local assessment or other sources.

The rationale must be documented in the School Improvement Plan; it must follow a formal and systematic identification procedure as explained in the operational definitions.
1.2 Perceived Student Needs

1. Analysis of Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 Perceived student needs derived from staff and/or community and community characteristics which may affect student learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 POINT

A. Little or no evidence of inquiry regarding needs of students related to LO as perceived by staff and community or on community characteristics which may affect learning

A school with a score of 1 is in accord with the rules and regulations in effect until October 1, 1995.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient for a 2 will receive a 1.

2 POINTS

A. Evidence exists of information regarding needs of students related to LO as perceived by staff and community elicited occasionally and informally.

Evidence is presented that information on student needs is collected following an informal process.

Needs of students must be elicited occasionally. "Occasionally" does not require an annual process but the process must be conducted often enough so that the data on students has relevance for the school.

If the results of the process are not clearly stated or are determined to be too cursory to assist in understanding of community characteristics, a score of 2 is not warranted.
1.2 Perceived Student Needs

2 POINTS

B. Evidence exists of informal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning.

Evidence is presented that information on community characteristics is collected following an informal process. If the results of the process are not clearly stated or are determined to be too cursory to assist in understanding of community characteristics, a score of 2 is not warranted.

3 POINTS  (Option 1)

A. Compelling evidence exists of formally and systematically collected information regarding needs of all students related to LO as perceived by staff and community.

A.1. Evidence exists of informal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning.

This option requires that the collection of information on student needs must be of the same quality as that required for 4 points. Refer to the next page for specifics. AND

Information on community characteristics is evident and uses an informal process.

If results of the process are not clearly stated or are too cursory to assist in understanding the student population, a score of 3 is not warranted. OR (See next page for Option 2.)
1.2 Perceived Student Needs

3 POINTS (Option 2)

B. Evidence exists of information regarding needs of all students related to LO as perceived by staff and community representatives is elicited occasionally and informally.

B.1 Compelling evidence exists of formal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning.

Information on student needs is collected following informal process and is occasionally elicited. "Occasionally" does not require an annual process but the process must be conducted often enough so that the data on students has relevance for the school.

If results of the process are not clearly stated or are determined to be too cursory to assist in understanding community characteristics, a score of 3 is not warranted. AND

This option requires that collection of information on student needs be of same quality as required for 4 points. Refer to the next page for specifics.
1.2 Perceived Student Needs

4 POINTS

A. Compelling evidence exists of formally and systematically collected information regarding needs of all students related to LO as perceived by staff and community.

Various factors affect student success in school. Needs and areas of concern will vary from school to school. Issues which may be addressed include: home-school communication; school security and student comfort level within school environment; positive discipline on part of adults in and out of school; availability of adult counseling; provision of basic physical needs; school attendance and tardiness; effective study habits in and out of school; after-school supervision; relevant homework; out of class study help; mutual adult and peer respect; sense of self-determination; motivational incentives; cultural reinforcement.

The school must be able to document:

a) a formal and systematic process is followed;

b) results provide information of depth and breadth with regard to student needs from all constituent groups in the school's community.

Options for data collection include: surveys, focus groups, interviews and observations, and student performance data.
4 POINTS

B. Compelling evidence exists of formal inquiry to explain how community characteristics may affect learning.

Community characteristics which affect student success will vary from school to school. Areas of concern can be identified, but not all will be studied with equal emphasis. Issues which may be addressed include: community's economic health; community's ability/willingness to financially support the school district; adult involvement in school's activities; availability of school after instructional hours; community's expectations for school's curriculum and cultural reinforcements for same; instructional resources of community; presence of deleterious social influences.

Aggregate result of the collection strategies should evidence:
   a) that formal process is followed;
   b) that results provide information of depth and breadth with regard to community characteristics from all constituent groups in school's community.

Options for collection of information include: surveys, focus groups, interviews and observations.
2. Learning Outcomes, Standards, and Expectations

2.1 Learning Outcomes

1 POINT

A. Learning outcomes (LO) have not been developed.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient for a 2 will receive a 1.

2 POINTS

A. Comprehensive LO aligned with some State Goals for Learning (SGL) exist and are written in some fundamental learning areas (FLA) for at least 2 grades for a 1-8 attendance center, or for at least 1 grade for a MS/JHS, HS or primary attendance center with fewer than 8 grades.

Comprehensive LO (or objectives) must be established for at least one SGL for at least one grade for students attending a school for seven or fewer years and for two grades if the school is more than seven years. See operational definitions for comprehensive.

Some LO can be assessed at one grade and the balance at another.

In a four year school LO must be developed so that SGL are addressed at least once in the scope of the curriculum. In an eight year school the SGL are addressed at least twice in the scope of the curriculum.

B. Process for developing LO is informal and limited in participation of school staff and in communication with students, parents and school community.

The requirements for a 3 are maintained here for a 2. Refer to the next page for specific information.
2.1 Learning Outcomes

2 POINTS

C. There is some alignment of the curriculum with LO.

The requirements for a 3 are maintained here for a 2. Refer to the next page for specific information.

3 POINTS

A. Comprehensive LO aligned with all required SGL exist and are written in all FLA for at least 2 grades for a 1-8 attendance center, or for at least 1 grade for a MS/JHS, HS or primary attendance center with fewer than 8 grades.

LO for all required FLA must be established for at least one grade if the school serves students for seven or fewer years.

LO (or objectives) for all FLA required in 1994-95 and thereafter.

Some LO can be assessed at one grade and the balance at another

In a four year school LO must be developed so that SGL are addressed at least once in the scope of the curriculum. In an eight year school the SGL are addressed at least twice in the scope of the curriculum.

B. Process for developing LO is informal and limited in participation of school staff and in communication with students, parents and school community.

School staff must conduct informal process to develop LO which need to be communicated in some fashion to students, parents and community. LO may be adopted before this communication occurs.
2.1 Learning Outcomes

3 POINTS
C. There is some alignment of the curriculum with LO.

For a LO to be claimed for a grade or instructional group it must be part of the school's curriculum. This requires that classroom instruction and student evaluation exist which address some LO. Acceptable evidence can be curriculum guides, lesson plans, assessment copies and descriptions. "Some" means one or more LO are aligned with the curriculum.

4 POINTS
A. Comprehensive LO aligned with all the SGL exist and are written in all FLA for at least 2 grades for a 1-8 attendance center, or for at least 1 grade for a MS/JHS, HS or primary attendance center with fewer than 8 grades.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

LO must be established for at least one grade for the school if the attendance center is a high school, middle school, junior high school or a primary attendance center with fewer than eight grades, two grades if it is a 1-8 attendance center.

LO may be distributed across the grades, so that some outcomes are assessed at one grade and the balance at another.

In a four year school, LO must be developed so that SGL are addressed at least once in the scope of the curriculum; in an eight year school, the SGL are addressed at least twice in the scope of the curriculum.
2.1 Learning Outcomes

4 POINTS

B. Process for developing LO includes systematic review cycle and includes participation of school staff in communication with students, parents and school community in the deliberative process. Both the rationale for this process and rationale for resulting LO are evident.

The requirements for a 6 are maintained here for a 4. Refer to B under 6 points for specific information.

C. There is formal and systematic alignment of the curriculum with LO

The requirements for a 6 are maintained here for a 4. Refer to C under 6 points for specific information.

D. LO address the content of SGL. LO are broader in focus than a learning objective. LO probe range and depth of thinking skills appropriate to SGL and are amenable to assessment.

The four required characteristics of a LO must be present for all stated outcomes. Learning objectives are not acceptable to this definition of a LO.

5 POINTS

A. Comprehensive LO aligned with all the SGL exist and are written in all FLA for at least 50% of the grades at the attendance center.

LO may be distributed across the grades, such that some outcomes are assessed at one grade, the balance at another. In a four-year school, it would be required that LO be developed so that SGL are addressed at least twice in the scope of the curriculum.

The four required characteristics of a LO must be present for all stated outcomes. Refer to D under 4 points for the characteristics.
2.1 Learning Outcomes

5 POINTS

| B. Process for developing LO includes systematic review cycle and includes participation of school staff and communication with students, parents and school community in the deliberative process. Both the rationale for this process and rationale for resulting LO are evident. |

The requirements for a 6 are maintained here for a 5. Refer to B under 6 points for specific information.

| C. There is formal and systematic alignment of the curriculum with LO. |

The requirements for a 6 are maintained here for a 5. Refer to C under 6 points for specific information.

| D. LO address the content of SGL. LO are broader in focus than a learning objective. LO probe range and depth of thinking skills appropriate to SGL and are amenable to assessment. Some LO integrate FLA when appropriate and reflect problems and tasks outside the classroom. |

For a score of 5, it is required that the school be at least beginning to experiment with interdisciplinary LO. LO which combine SGL within a FLA are not considered interdisciplinary.

While a token interdisciplinary outcome will not qualify a school for a score of 5, multiple interdisciplinary outcomes involving most of the FLA or an interdisciplinary outcome which is extensive in its integration of FLA and fully implemented into the instructional set may qualify a school for a 5. This is also true of LO that are relevant to tasks and problems encountered outside the classroom.
2.1 Learning Outcomes

6 POINTS

A. For elementary, middle schools and junior high schools comprehensive LO aligned with all the SGL exist and are written in all FLA for all grades. For high schools, LO aligned with the SGL are written in all FLA. There is comprehensive coverage of all SGL in all FLA throughout the scope of the high school program.

Note the explanation for comprehensive in the Operational Definitions section.

Alignment with state goals is established by documenting which state goals are the basis for a LO.

A score of 6 requires that comprehensive LO in all FLA are established for all grades. This means either:

a) a separate set of LO is established for each grade level
b) LO are established for all grades at the school or district level with standards set for each grade level or

For high school or schools that do not demarcate educational progress by grades, the school must evidence:

a) an extensive core curriculum is based on a) interdisciplinary or b) disciplinary and interdisciplinary LO developed from the SGL, and
b) standards for these outcomes are prominent throughout the high school instructional program.

B. Process for developing LO includes systematic review cycle and includes participation of school staff and communication with students, parents and school community in the deliberative process. Both the rationale for this process and rationale for resulting LO are evident.

LO are reviewed systematically.

The consultative process with students, parents and community must occur before LO are adopted or revised and approved by proper authority.
6 POINTS
The level of participation of each of these groups is relevant to the impact LO will have on their lives as well as the capacity of the group to participate. Communication must at least involve publication of the outcomes in a forum broad enough to give each of the above groups exposure to the LO. It is imperative that opportunity be provided whether through a meeting or written communication, for any person to be able to have her/his opinion heard about the proposed LO.

Note that two rationales are required:
1) rationale for the process that was used to determine the LO
2) rationale for the LO as they are finally stated.

C. There is formal and systematic alignment of the curriculum with LO.

The formal and systematic alignment of the curriculum with LO requires that before a LO can be claimed for a grade level or instructional group, it must be evidenced as a part of the curriculum of the school. This requires that classroom instruction and student evaluation are in place to address the LO. Acceptable evidence can be curriculum guides, lesson plans, assessment copies and descriptions.

D. LO address the content of SGL. LO are broader in focus than a learning objective. LO probe range and depth of thinking skills appropriate to SGL and are amenable to assessment. LO integrate FLA when appropriate and reflect problems and tasks outside the classroom.

The four characteristics of the LO are explained in other documentation (cf. Learning Outcomes, Standards and Expectations, 1994). The school must be at least extensively experimenting with interdisciplinary LO (multiple interdisciplinary outcomes, all FLA involved). LO which combine SGL with a FLA are not considered interdisciplinary. A token interdisciplinary outcome will not qualify a school for a score of 6. This is also true of LO that are relevant to tasks and problems encountered outside the classroom.
### 2.2 Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1 POINT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Standards for the school do not exist for LO.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2 POINTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**A. Standards for school exist for some LO, and are stated in a manner which tells if a student is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included in the expectation group, i.e., the percentage of students who are expected to achieve the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This level was set by the administrators' committee for the 1985 reform and will be in effect until October 1, 1995.

This score is an implied standard in accord with the old Learning Assessment Plans. If LAPs are correctly completed by the school, indicating the test that is being used and a stated expectation of achievement of the learning objective, the school will warrant a 2 if it can indicate what is used as a determinant of achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3 POINTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**A. Standards for all LO exist and are written as a cut-score on single assessment instrument or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure or on items from single assessment instrument or procedure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standards for all required LO are stated as a cut-score on one assessment instrument or procedure or items from the test.

Section 2.1, Learning Outcomes, must be scored at 3 or more.
2.2 Standards

3 POINTS

B. Process for setting standards is formal and consultative. Both rationale for process and rationale for standards are evident.

The process is formal and consultative, but there is no requirement that previous performance data are consulted.

4 POINTS

A. Standards for all LO exist in all FLA and are written as cut-scores or minimum criteria on a variety of assessment instruments or procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

B. Process for setting standards is formal and consultative. Both rationale for process which includes consultation of previous performance data and rationale for standards are evident.

All requirements for a 6 are maintained here for a 4 with the exception that Section 2.1, Learning Outcomes, can be scored at a 4. (See the next two pages for a discussion of the requirements for a score of 6.)
2.2 Standards

5 POINTS

A. Standards for all LO exist in all FLA, written as cut-scores or minimum criteria on a variety of assessment instruments or procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO.

B. Process for setting standards formal and consultative; rationale for process includes consultation of previous performance data and rationale for standards are evident.

All requirements for a 6 are maintained for a 5 with the exception that Section 2.1, Learning Outcomes, can be scored at a 5. (See the next two pages for a discussion of the requirements for a score of 6.)

C. Points awarded for Learning Outcomes, 2.1, are five (5).

6 POINTS

A. Standards for all LO exist in all FLA, written as cut-scores or minimum criteria on a variety of assessment instruments or procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO.

For each LO, there exists at least:

a) 2 assessment instruments or procedures of different kinds.

b) Each assessment instrument or procedure has a cut-score or minimum criteria stated as a percentage or as a proportion of the total points. These scores are then combined in some fashion to indicate whether a student has achieved the LO. Although there is no requirement for school personnel to set an "exceeds" level for standards, it is encouraged as effective practice.

c) The assessments must be constructed to address the breadth (scope of content) and depth (content specificity) of the LO. Where the collection of assessments contains omissions, (e.g., there is no assessment which requires students to evaluate reading when it is included as part of the stated outcome), it is not a sufficient standard for the outcome.
6 POINTS
LO and standards have a reciprocal relationship. Outcomes, instruction and assessment are integrated at each grade level. The more extensive the use of outcomes in the educational system, the higher the point total in standards.

"Variety"
a) means that for each standard, students are assessed by multiple tasks distinctly different in content and the students' processing of information or demonstration of a skill.
b) can enhance the validity claim for sufficiency of sampling and generaliability of assessment results.
c) does not require that all standards be constructed with at least one complex-generated response, but
d) most commonly includes at least one complex-generated response.
e) generally does not mean assessments constructed exclusively of forced choice/short answers. (For example, anchoring standards on a) a commercially produced norm referenced test which has been translated to a criterion reference report and b) a locally produced criterion reference or textbook chapter forced choice/short answer test would not establish a set of standards which have variety in their assessment design.

B. Process for setting standards formal and consultative; rationale for process includes consultation of previous performance data. Rationale for standards is evident.

Process for setting standards is formal and consultative and rationale for setting the standards is documented.

Rationale for the process is documented and includes the consultation of previous performance data which include:
a) how students in past academic years have performed relative to this standard;
b) how students have performed on the IGAP test, if relevant to the learning outcome;
c) how students have performed on other assessments relevant to the learning outcome,

C. Points awarded for Learning Outcomes, 2.1, are six (6).
2.3 Expectations

1 POINT
A. Expectations have not been established.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS
A. Expectations exist for LO in some FLA in the form of per cent of students expected to achieve LO.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and will be in effect until October 1, 1995.

Expectations must be stated for some LO, "some" being one or more but there is no requirement that the process or rationale be documented.

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are two (2) or more.

3 POINTS
A. Expectations exist for each LO in each FLA in the form of per cent of students expected to achieve LO.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

For each stated LO and standard there is a projection of the percent of students expected to meet the LO for the grade or instructional group for the current academic year.
2.3 Expectations

3 POINTS

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are three (3) or more.

C. There is a process for establishing expectations and a rationale for this process.

The process for establishing expectations does not have to be formal, systematic or consultative.

4 POINTS

A. Expectations exist for each LO in each FLA in the form of per cent of students expected to achieve LO.

For each stated LO and standard there is a projection of the percent of students expected to meet the LO for the grade or instructional group for the current academic year.

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are four (4) or more.

C. There is a formal, systematic and consultative process for establishing expectations and a rationale for this process.

Refer to the operational glossary for definitions of formal, systematic and consultative.
3. Assessment Systems

| 3.1 Coordination of assessment instruments and procedures with learning outcomes |

1 POINT

A. Little or no evidence that LO are assessed by assessment instruments and procedures.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS

A. LO in all required FLA are assessed by assessment instruments and procedures administered at least at benchmark grades.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and is in effect until October 1, 1995.

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are two (2) or more.

Given the required level for standards, it is not required that all LO be assessed at the benchmark year each academic year. (In accord with the requirements of the 1985 reform, schools were permitted to assemble a group of learning objectives and assess only 25% of these objectives in any given year. Thus, if a school has stated LO and is assessing some of these outcomes (0<some<all), it receives a 2.)
3.1 Coordination of Assessment with Outcomes

3 POINTS

A. LO in all FLA are assessed by a variety of assessment instruments and procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO administered at least at benchmark grades.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

3 POINTS

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are four (4) or more.

C. The rationale for choosing or developing each instrument or procedure is evident.

The rationale can be attached to the copy or description of the assessment. If common rationale is used for selection of a group of assessment instruments or procedures, this should be referenced in an attached statement.

There is no need to establish evidence of clear diversity in assessment instruments and procedures.

4 POINTS

A. All LO in all FLA are assessed by a variety of assessment instruments and procedures that address the scope, content, and specificity of the LO administered at least at benchmark grades.

The assessment system can refer to
a) the system that is being implemented in the current academic year or
b) the system that was in place in the previous cycle.

The school can document that a variety of assessment instruments and procedures are administered to students by having available for inspection copies or descriptions of all assessment instruments and procedures used to measure student achievement of LO (indicators or dimensions of a standard).
3.1 Coordination of Assessment with Outcomes

4 POINTS

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are five (5) or more.

C. The rationale for choosing or developing each instrument or procedure is evident.

The rationale can be attached to the copy or description of the assessment. If common rationale is used for selection of a group of assessment instruments or procedures, this should be referenced in an attached statement.

D. Assessment instruments and procedures are clearly diverse in type for all standards for LO.

The requirement for diversity in assessment is more rigorous than the requirement for variety explained in Section 2.2, Standards.

"Diversity" means that more than one type of assessment is used in the construction of the standard. Types of assessment for a standard must not be exclusively forced choice/short answer in this design.

Diversity does not require that more than 2 assessments be employed for each standard, but attention must be given to ensure that the range and depth of the content and thinking skills of the LO are fully addressed. Thus, in appropriate cases, more than 2 assessments are used to set a standard.
3.2 Validity of Assessment Instruments and Procedures

1 POINT

A. Little or no evidence that assessment instruments and procedures are valid measures of the LO.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS

A. Claims for content validity documented for all instruments and procedures to measure achievement of LO.

This level was set by the administrator's committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and is in effect until October 1, 1995. This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

B. Evidence of instruments and procedures sufficient to measure all LO.

This level was set by the administrator's committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

C. Evidence that assessment instruments and procedures measure complex knowledge and skills beyond specific tasks or questions. Results provide accurate information for making judgments about students' progress toward achieving LO.

The requirements for a 3 are maintained for this level, but it is not required that the evidence be compelling. See the next page for discussion of "validity."
3.2 Validity of Assessment

3.2 Validity of Assessment Instruments and Procedures

1 POINT
A. Little or no evidence that assessment instruments and procedures are valid measures of the LO.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS
A. Claims for content validity documented for all instruments and procedures to measure achievement of LO.

This level was set by the administrator's committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and is in effect until October 1, 1995. This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

B. Evidence of instruments and procedures sufficient to measure all LO.

This level was set by the administrator's committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

C. Evidence that assessment instruments and procedures measure complex knowledge and skills beyond specific tasks or questions. Results provide accurate information for making judgments about students' progress toward achieving LO.

The requirements for a 3 are maintained for this level, but it is not required that the evidence be compelling. See the next page for discussion of "validity."
3.2 Validity of Assessment

3 POINTS

A. Claims for content validity documented for all instruments and procedures to measure achievement of LO.

Claims for content validity are established by having a panel of three or more people with expertise relevant to the content determine whether the assessment is content valid to the stated outcome, is a sufficient sample and is generalizable to the outcome.

If the test is commercially produced, it remains a requirement that the local school or school district indicate that the test has been screened to determine if it has validity for the stated outcome.

B. Compelling evidence of instruments and procedures sufficient to measure all LO.

There are uniformly three dimensions that are looked at for validity:
a) The content of the assessment is of direct relevance to the LO;
b) The assessment contains a sufficient sample of student work to be included in a determination of whether the student has achieved the outcome (e.g., when only 2 or 3 multiple choice items are used to measure an outcome, it cannot be determined to be a sufficient student performance although it may be acceptable for a learning objective);
c) The assessment is constructed so that the results of the assessment will indicate a general attainment of the outcome. (Questions specific to the point of triviality or performances which are not representative of a general class of activites relevant to a LO are not generalizable.)
3.2 Validity of Assessment

3 POINTS

| C. Compelling evidence that assessment instruments and procedures measure knowledge and skills beyond specific tasks or questions to provide accurate information for making judgments about students’ progress toward achieving LO. |

To establish compelling evidence the panel must use statistical information of student performance from a pilot to support the case for validity. Note that any instrument or procedure used as part of the assessment system must have a validity claim. Therefore, if tests are being administered which currently do not have validity claims established, the decision must be made whether to establish validity claims and include these instruments and procedures in the assessment system or remove the assessment from the system until it is reviewed.
3.3 Reliability of Assessment

1 POINT
A. Little or no evidence that instruments and procedures are reliable.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS
A. Reliability claims documented for assessment instruments and procedures used to set standards for achievement of all LO in all required FLA.

This level was set by the administrator's committee as required for the 1985 reform and will be in effect until October 1, 1995.

B. Evidence that instruments and procedures are administered, scored, and interpreted in uniform manner.

The requirements for a score of 3 are maintained for this level; however, it is not required that the procedure for administration, scoring and interpretation be formal. See the next page for a discussion of the requirements for establishing inter-rater reliability for performance assessment.

It is noted that it is not possible to give a school a score in validity that exceeds its score in reliability since reliability is a subset of validity. It is possible however to give a score in reliability that is higher than the score in validity.
3.3 Reliability of Assessment

3 POINTS

A. Reliability claims documented for assessment instruments and procedures used to measure achievement of all LO in all FLA.

Reliability claims are established through evident standardized procedures and statistical information. In forced choice/short answer assessment, reliability will need to be established. Attention should be given to the *Assessment Handbook* (ISBE, 1994) on methods for determining reliability for internal consistency.

For commercially produced tests, the publisher may provide a reliability claim. However, there must be an authority at the school who has read and interpreted the significance of this claim.

B. Formal procedures documented for administration, scoring, and interpretation of all assessment instruments and procedures in uniform manner.

For each performance assessment, inter-rater reliability must be established. School personnel must show a) a scoring rubric has been developed which clearly indicates the range of scores possible for the assessment; b) the people who will score the assessment have been properly trained in use of the scoring rubric; c) a significant percentage of the performances are scored by two raters to determine rater reliability (the smaller the number of cases, the larger the percentage of performances that will need to be scored). The results of the match of these scores are evident.

Information in the *Assessment Handbook* (ISBE, 1994) details application of the requirement to various complex-generated-response assessments.

For a score of 3, it is required that formal procedures are documented for the administration, scoring and interpretation of all assessment instruments and procedures.
### 3.4 Nondiscriminatory assessment instruments and procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 POINT</strong></td>
<td>A. No evidence that instruments and procedures used to set standards for LO are nondiscriminatory regarding racial or gender differences or student disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

| **2 POINTS** | A. Evidence provided for claims of nondiscrimination regarding ethnic/racial or gender differences or student disabilities for all assessment instruments and procedures used to set standards for achievement of LO. |

This level was set by the administrator's committee as required for the 1985 reform and will be in effect until October 1, 1995.

This level was set by the administrator's committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

To establish a claim of nondiscrimination regarding racial or gender differences or student disabilities it is required that a school at least assemble a panel (3 or more) or people who have an evidenced sensitivity to ethnic/racial or gender differences or student disabilities to review assessment instruments and procedures to ensure that the assessment will not be unfair to any of the above groups. The consultation of statistical information from a pilot is advisable but not required.
2 POINTS
For commercially produced tests, it is possible that the publisher will provide a claim of nondiscrimination. However, there must be an authority at the school who has read and interpreted the significance of this claim. It is also required that the school personnel evidence accommodations that are provided for students with identified learning disabilities.
4. Analysis of Student Performance Data

### 4.1 Data sufficiency for decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 POINT</strong></td>
<td>A. Insufficient data to make decisions regarding student progress for each LO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no requirement with regard to this criteria item in the 1985 reform. Thus, if a school receives a 1, it is in accord with the rules and regulations in effect until October 1, 1995.

| **2 POINTS** | A. Limited data available for the most recent academic year based on results from valid, reliable and nondiscriminatory assessment instruments and procedures. Data used to make decisions regarding student performance relative to LO, including that of any groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis. |

If the assessment for a LO is based on only one assessment instrument or procedure or if only some LO are assessed with valid, reliable and nondiscriminatory assessment instruments and procedures, the data are limited to these results.

If the school does not report data on each indicator or dimension, data are limited. It is required for a 2 that identified groups have data recorded.
4.1 Data Sufficiency

2 POINTS

B. These data for the school are used to establish current and prior years' student performance in all FLA.

A school cannot make historical comparisons of student results but will be using the data collected in the current assessment to establish historical data.

Note that a school may have instruments and procedures that meet the sufficiency criteria for validity but will not produce a data set sufficient or adequate to make a decision about student performance. Sufficiency relative to validity is with reference to the instruments and procedures; sufficiency in this item refers to the data on student performance.

3 POINTS

A. Data available for the most recent academic year based on results from a variety of valid, reliable and nondiscriminatory assessment instruments and procedures. Data used to make decisions regarding student performance relative to each LO.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995. The data set is based only on the assessments that have been administered. It is required that only valid, reliable and nondiscriminatory assessments be used and that all LO have been assessed.

B. Current and prior years' student performance data for each LO have been established.

The data set is presented so that the performance of the total student population and groups identified for disaggregate data analysis for each indicator or dimension of a standard as well as performance on the standard are available for review. Historical data trends on student performance for each LO will be available as the school improvement process is put in place. It is possible, however, to use data from sources related to the LO to set up some comparisons.
3 POINTS

C. Data set for school is sufficient in: (1) description of student performance on each assessment dimension of a standard; (2) description of student performance in meeting standard for each LO; (3) including data for groups identified for disaggregate data analysis for most recent academic year. All students in school in at least benchmark grades or instructional group accounted for.

While IGAP data can be used to assist in understanding student trends or as a corroborating indicator, the design of this system requires that the data be collected so that comparisons can be made a) on a year-to-year basis on the same LO and standards for differing instructional groups and b) for the same instructional group over a period of time (i.e., a group of students at 4th grade, 6th grade, 8th grade) on the same or related LO.

The IGAP cannot be used as a part of the assessment set for a standard.
4.2 Compilation and Analysis of Data

4.2 Compilation and analysis of assessment data

1 POINT
A. Little or no systematic collection, comparison or weighting of assessment data nor indication of per cent of students who met standards for LO for FLA.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS
A. Systematic collection, comparison or weighting of assessment data with indication of per cent of students who met standards for some but not all LO for all FLA.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and will be in effect until October 1, 1995.

Although the requirements for collection, comparison and weighting are the same, it is required that the school evidence this system for some (o<some<all) LO in each required FLA.

There is no requirement for identification of strengths and weaknesses.

C. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are two (2) or more.
4.2 Compilation and Analysis of Data

3 POINTS

A. Systematic collection, comparison or weighting of assessment data with indication of per cent of students who met standards for all LO for all FLA.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

The requirements for a 4 are maintained here for a 3. See the next page for a discussion of collection, comparison and weighting of data.

B. Process for identifying strengths and weaknesses of student performance relative to all LO for total population and for groups identified for data disaggregation is evident.

It is not required that the process be formal.

C. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are four (4) or more.

4 POINTS

A. Systematic collection, comparison or weighting of assessment data with indication of per cent of students who met standards for all LO for all FLA.

*Systematic collection* means that assessment data is keyed into the assessment system as an indicator for a standard.

*Systematic comparison* means placing the student performance against the stated cut-score.
4 POINTS

*Systematic weighting* means that the student performance data on an assessment is weighted for its significance as an indicator of a standard (weighting occurs when the assessments are combined to make a determination of whether a student has achieved the LO, i.e., met the standard).

B. Formal process for identifying strengths and weaknesses of students relative to all LO for total student population and for groups identified for data disaggregation is evident.

A formal process for identifying strengths and weaknesses can be done by use of expectations and the use of historical data.

C. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are four (4) or more.
5. Evaluation of Student Performance and School Programs

5.1 Evaluation of student performance by standard

1 POINT

A. Little or no evidence that student performance in meeting standards for LO is improving over time in FLA or evidence indicates that improvement has occurred over time in only some FLA.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS

A. Evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in each FLA at least for the total population.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and is in effect until October 1, 1995.

The evidence presented indicates improved student performance for at least one LO in one FLA for the assessed population and identified student groups.

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are two (2) or more.

C. Points awarded for Section 4.1, Data-Sufficiency, are two (2) or more.
5.1 Evaluation of Student Performance

3 POINTS

A. Evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in each FLA for the student population and for groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis.

The requirements for a 3 are the same as for a 4, noting the changes in the prerequisites on Standards and Data Sufficiency. See the next page for these requirements.

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are three (3) or more.

C. Points awarded for Section 4.1, Data-Sufficiency, are two (2) or more.

4 POINTS

A. Evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in each FLA for the student population and for groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

The evidence presented must indicate improved student performance (assessed population and identified student groups) for at least one LO for each FLA.

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are four (4) or more.

C. Points awarded for Section 4.1, Data-Sufficiency, are three (3).
5.1 Evaluation of Student Performance

5 POINTS

A. Compelling evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in each FLA for the student population and for groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis.

The compelling evidence for this score is that student improvement has occurred in each FLA. More than one outcome for each FLA must evidence improvement.

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are five (5) or more.

C. Points awarded for Section 4.1, Data-Sufficiency, are three (3).

D. Student performance in meeting standards for LO has been maintained relative to those standards for LO where improvement was not evidenced.

Requirements for a 6 are maintained here for a 5 with the exception that Section 2.2, Standards, can be at 5. See the next page for a discussion of acceptable forms of evidence for demonstrating that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time.
5.1 Evaluation of Student Performance

6 POINTS

A. Compelling evidence that improvement in student performance in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time for a majority in each FLA for the student population and for groups in the student population identified for disaggregate data analysis.

It is emphasized that compelling evidence is established when quality review specialists are certain that improved student performance in each FLA has occurred over time. The responsibility of school personnel in this case is to present as strong a case as possible to indicate this improvement.

B. Points awarded for Section 2.2, Standards, are five (5) or more.

C. Points awarded for Section 4.1, Data-Sufficiency, are three (3).
5.1 Evaluation of Student Performance

6 POINTS

D. Student performance in meeting standards for LO has been maintained relative to those standards for LO where improvement was not evidenced.

Use of IGAP data or other outside references is appropriate as supporting evidence of improvement, but the data indicated by the school improvement process presented as the percentage of students who met standards will be the central determinant of the claim for improved student performance.

Among acceptable forms of evidence are comparison of a cohort's performance on the same or similar LO for one year to the next and the comparison of one instructional group with another instructional group on the same LO and standards in the following academic years or the average of the performance of these groups. Trend lines are also a legitimate presentation. "Over time" can be a comparison of the current year with the prior year or with prior years of performance. The intention is to give schools as much latitude as possible in presenting their case for improved student learning.

Note that for a 6, school personnel must establish a convincing portrait that student improvement is taking place for the majority of LO for the total population and for the groups identified for data disaggregation. On the balance of LO, student performance does not significantly decline over time.
5.2 Program Evaluation

1 POINT

A. Little or no evidence of program evaluation based on student performance of LO.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS

A. Evidence of program evaluation that identifies probable causes for students' failures to meet standards for LO (if applicable).

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and will be in effect until October 1, 1995.

B. No evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for failure of students, in groups identified for disaggregate data analysis, to meet standards for LO (if applicable).

It is not required that the program be formal nor that program evaluation take place for students identified for data disaggregation. If program evaluation is taking place at the school, the school is scored at a 2.

3 POINTS

A. Evidence of formal program evaluation for the school exists that identifies probable causes for failure of students to meet standards for LO (if applicable).

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.
### 5.2 Program Evaluation

**3 POINTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for failure of students in total population and for failure of students in identified groups in student population to meet standards for LO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Requirements are the same as for a 4. However, there is no requirement that school personnel are actively involved in research to better determine factors which lead to student failures to meet learning outcomes.

**4 POINTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Compelling evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for students’ failures to meet standards for LO (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Evidence must be compelling that program evaluation is formal for the assessed population and identified student groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Compelling evidence of formal program evaluation that identifies probable causes for failure of students in groups identified for disaggregate data analysis to meet standards for LO (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In addition to conducting inquiry on causes for those outcomes where student performance was determined to be weak, school personnel are actively involved in trying to isolate factors for refined study. Use of action research through special studies (using techniques such as quasi-experimental designs and case study) is evident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Consideration given to proposals for what can be done to better identify probable causes for students’ failure to meet standards for LO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6. Establishing New Expectations and Program Improvements

### 6.1 Annual Review of Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 POINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Expectations which exist for school not subject to annual review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Expectations which exist for school subject to annual review and revision based on student performance data and data trends for the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and will be in effect until October 1, 1995. This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

There is no requirement that a formal, systematic and consultative process be evidenced. The requirement that the school consult previous performance data, whether this data be produced by the school improvement process or from other sources, is maintained.
6.1 Annual Review of Expectations

3 POINTS

A. Expectations which exist for school subject to annual review and revision through systematic, formal and consultative process utilizing student performance data and data trends for the school.

The process for review of expectations can be conducted after the data set for a LO is complete for the academic year. The process must be systematic, formal and consultative and must use the performance of students relative to the LO and standard and the performance of the instructional group subject to the LO in the coming year on related assessment.

It is not a requirement that expectations be revised, but they must be reviewed.
6.2 Activities to Increase Performance and Change

6.2 Activities planned to increase student performance to meet new or existing expectations and consideration of changes in demographics or instruction in establishing expectations

1 POINT

A. Little or no evidence that changes in curriculum, instruction, staff development, organizational structure, etc., will be implemented to improve achievement of students in meeting standards for LO or to effect other improvements in student learning.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

B. Little or no evidence of planned strategies for improving performance of students who have not met standards for LO.

C. Little or no evidence of planned strategies for improving student attendance, truancy, graduation rates or the climate of the school to enhance instructional efforts.

2 POINTS

A. Evidence that changes in curriculum, instruction, staff development, organizational structure, etc., for the school will be implemented to improve achievement of students in meeting standards for LO or to effect other improvements in student learning at the school.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and is in effect until October 1, 1995.

Evidence must be provided that improvement is planned for the coming year.
6.2 Activities to Increase Performance and Change

2 POINTS

B. No formally planned strategies for improving performance of students who have not met LO. There is no documentation or documentation does not establish evidence that students who did not meet the standards for the academic year are being directly served with additional instructional activities designed to improve performance.

C. Evidence of planned strategies for improving student attendance, truancy, graduation rates or the climate of the school to enhance instructional efforts. Requirements for a score of 3 are maintained here for a 2. See note for C and D under 3 points.

D. Changes are not systematic and are not directed by student performance data for the school. There is no documentation or documentation does not establish evidence that students who did not meet the standards for the academic year are being directly served with additional instructional activities designed to improve performance.

E. Informal consideration given to possible changes in demographics and instruction. Requirements for a score of 3 are maintained here for a 2.
6.2 Activities to Increase Performance and Change

3 POINTS

A. Compelling evidence that changes in curriculum, instruction, staff development, organizational structure, etc., for the school will be implemented to improve achievement of students in meeting standards for LO or to effect other improvements in student learning at the school.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

The requirements for a 4 are maintained here for a 3. It is not required, however, that the improvements be directed by the program evaluation conducted in Section 5-2, Program Evaluation. (That requirement states that for a score of 4, the changes that are implemented are directly relevant to the evaluation conducted in Section 5.2, Program Evaluation and thus are systematic.)

B. Evidence of planned strategies for improving performance of students who have not met LO.

Strategies for improving performance of students who did not meet standards do not have to be formal. Changes in demographics and instruction are informally considered. Evidence of improvement relative to other educational indicators or school climate is provided.

C. Evidence of planned strategies for improving student attendance, truancy, graduation rates or the climate of the school to enhance instructional efforts.

D. Changes are not systematic but are developed with consultation of student performance data for the school.

E. Informal consideration given to possible changes in demographics and instruction.
6.2 Activities to Increase Performance and Change

4 POINTS

A. Compelling evidence that changes in curriculum, instruction, staff development, organizational structure, etc., for the school will be implemented to improve achievement of students in meeting standards for LO or to effect other improvements in student learning at the school.

The evidence is compelling that changes will be implemented to improve the instructional program of the school. For a score of 4, the changes that are implemented are directly relevant to the evaluation conducted in Section 5.2, Program Evaluation, and thus are systematic.

B. Evidence of formal, planned strategies for improving performance of students who have not met LO.

Strategies for improving the performance of students who did not meet standards do not have to be for each student who did not meet the standard. Rather, the strategies can be applied to the group of learners who did not meet the standard. These strategies are formally developed.

C. Compelling evidence of formal planned strategies for improving student attendance, truancy, graduation rates or the climate of the school to enhance instructional efforts.

If a school has no particular problems with attendance, truancy, or graduation rates, attention can be given to other indicators of student needs as reported in Section 1.2, Perceived Student Needs. It is expected that even the very best educational institutions will give continual attention to the improvement of the school's instructional climate.
6.2 Activities to Increase Performance and Change

4 POINTS

D. Changes are systematic and are directed by student performance data for the school.

E. Formal consideration given to possible changes in demographics and instruction.

Changes in the profile of the student population or in the delivery of instruction are given formal consideration.
7. Reporting to the Public

7.1 Reporting to the Public

Regular communication is conducted with the school board, parents of students, and local media on student progress towards meeting the standards for achieving LO

1 POINT

A. No evidence of regular communication with school board, parents of students, and local media on student progress towards meeting the standards for achieving LO.

Any school that does not have documentation sufficient to warrant a score of 2 will be scored at 1.

2 POINTS

A. Information describing how students of the school are being served and how well they are achieving relative to standards available.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations for the 1985 reform and will be in effect until October 1, 1995.

B. Some audiences are addressed.

Although reports to the public are produced, the information provided is not complete. At least one of the three identified audiences is addressed and information on at least one LO is presented in some format. Percentiles or grade equivalencies are accepted as a reporting function for a score of 2. Improvement activities must be included in the report.
7.1 Reporting to the Public

2 POINTS

C. Partial information is presented in some reports.

There is no requirement that interpretive services be provided.

3 POINTS

A. Available information describes how students of the school are being served and how well they are achieving relative to standards for LO.

This level was set by the administrators' committee as required for rules and regulations effective October 1, 1995.

B. All audiences are addressed; timetables are established for releasing information to audiences.

C. Information is complete in reports to all audiences.

D. Procedures in place to help audiences understand the information provided.

The requirements for a 4 are maintained here. However, the support services provided for interpretation are not systematic, and there is no documentation of training of contacts for providing further information. See the following section for a discussion of audiences, timetables, and contact people.
7.1 Reporting to the Public

4 POINTS

A. Information describing how students of the school are being served and how well they are achieving relative to standards for LO is available.

The report to the public provides a complete description of student performance relative to the comprehensive LO. The information is consistently represented as the percentage of students who met the LO. It also indicates the activities being promoted in the academic year to help students improve in performance on LO. (See Section 6.2, Activities to Increase Student Performance (School Improvement Plan), for more information on activities planned to improve performance.)

4 POINTS

B. All audiences are addressed; timetables are established for releasing information to audiences.

A timetable is evidenced which indicates when a report is scheduled to be released to an identified audience.

C. Information is complete in reports to all audiences.

The reports to the three identified audiences should be available for review, i.e., parents, the school board, and the local media. The reports should include information on the total population and groups identified for disaggregate data analysis.

D. Systematic procedures in place to help audiences interpret and understand the information provided.

People are identified to be the contacts for explaining reports or parts of a report. Interpretive sessions or literature has been made available to the audiences. These contact people are advertised as available for additional questions. Contact people are provided with training sufficient to provide accurate and meaningful interpretation to the school board, parents, and the local media.
Operational Definitions

Comprehensive: All dimensions of a SGL are addressed with regard to scope, content, specificity, skills and thinking required.

Example: A SGL states that students will be able to understand and analyze events, trends, personalities and movements shaping the history of the world, the U.S., and Illinois. If LO state that students should be able to identify and understand significant events and personalities in world history but the LO do not address trends and movements or focus specifically on U.S. and Illinois history then the LO are not comprehensive to all that the goal asks students to know and be able to do.

Consultative: Conducted in a manner which solicits input from staff, students, parents and community.

Diverse Assessment: More than one type of assessment is used in constructing a standard. Assessments must not be exclusively forced choice/short answer (e.g., multiple choice, true/false, matching, fill in the blank) and must be appropriate to the range and depth of the content and thinking skills of LO.

Evidence: The documented information on which a judgment or conclusion may be based, establishing the likelihood or probability that a claim is credible.

Verbal information and clarification are an important part of a quality review, but cannot be a basis for evidence. There must be actual documentation for a claim containing sufficient information so that a quality review specialist or any reasonable person would accept that the claim is valid.

Example: To show that LO exist for a benchmark grade the school would need to:
   a) show documentation of the stated LO
   b) show how the LO was developed
   c) show what State Goals are relevant to the LO
   d) show through documentation how this LO is realized in the curriculum of the school.
**Compelling Evidence:** This level requires that a high likelihood or probability is established, removing uncertainties or doubts on the part of the evaluator. Compelling evidence is demonstrated when:

a) documentation is thorough  
b) when available, corroborating indicators (evidence presented from other supporting sources) are presented to substantiate the claim.

**Formal:** This level requires following a purposeful, regulated and documented pattern of activity or form. Written information must show:

a) the criteria for how participants in the activity were selected  
b) that a method for deliberation is established prior to action on the issue and has been approved by appropriate authorities before the process begins  
c) a timetable for action  
d) minutes of how the process was implemented either through committee meetings or other activities  
e) a statement of results of the work of the participants which has been reviewed and approved by appropriate authorities.

An *informal* process will involve, at a minimum:

a) a description of activity by school personnel  
b) documented deliberation on the issue presented  
c) a statement of outcome of the deliberation on the part of the participants.

Written information on this *informal* process should then include:

a) a list of the participants who were involved in the activity  
b) minutes or a summary of the activities that took place  
c) a statement, either included with the minutes or summary or as a separate document of the decisions that were made as a result of the activity
**Methods of Assessment:** Instruments and procedures used to measure student performance in meeting standards for LO. The assessments must relate to a LO, identify a particular kind of evidence to be evaluated, define exercises that elicit that evidence, and describe systematic scoring procedures.

Assessments are classified as **forced choice/short answer** or **complex generated response**.

*Forced choice/short answer:* Students must select correct responses from a range of alternative responses provided and/or provide a word or short phrase to answer a question or complete a statement.

*Complex generated response:* Students must provide evidence of specific knowledge or skills in a non-forced choice exercise. Examples include an essay, performance, product or other type of presentation.

**Students:** Those pupils whose performance is assessed.

**Systematic:** Integral to the process for implementing and monitoring improvement in a school and/or student performance and occurring at least annually.

A systematic procedure involves at least:
- a) that decision making is based on data from the school improvement and student performance system. IGAP and norm-referenced testing and other sources are significant information but the data produced through the school improvement and student performance system are the primary reference for student performance and decision making.
- b) that the process takes place at least annually. Example: If in each academic year attention is given to what student groups will be disaggregated in data analysis using data from the previous year, the process is systematic.
Appendix C
Checklist for Point Accumulation

Date: ____________________       School______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Subsection</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Demographics: use state form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Perceived Student Needs: information on student needs gathered &quot;occasionally&quot; and &quot;informally&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning Outcomes: comprehensive LO aligned with all required SGL (includes Fine Arts) for benchmark grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Standards: standards for all LO written as cut score on variety of assessment instrument/procedures (NOTE: PRE-REQUISITE FOR 2.3, 3.1, 4.2, 5.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Expectations: written for each LO in each FLA as percent of students expected to achieve LO (SEE 2.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Coordination of Assessment With LO: LO in all required FLA assessed at least at &quot;benchmark grades&quot; (SEE 2.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Validity: assessment instruments give accurate information about student achievement of LO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Reliability: assessment instruments used in uniform manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Nondiscrimination: assessment instruments non biased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Data sufficiency: enough to make decisions for each LO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Compilation/Analysis of Data: done on &quot;systematic&quot; basis for all LO for all FLA (SEE 2.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Evaluation of Student Performance: improvement in meeting standards for LO has occurred over time in each FLA (SEE 2.2 and 4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Program Evaluation: evidence of probable causes for students' failures to meet standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Annual Review: expectations reviewed/revised on annual basis according to data trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 School Improvement Plan: changes for improvement planned, but not in &quot;formal&quot; or &quot;systematic&quot; manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Communication: information presented to community with all audiences addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Point Totals 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOES NOT MEET</th>
<th>DOES NOT FULLY MEET</th>
<th>MEETS</th>
<th>EXCEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNTIL 10/1/95</td>
<td>16-26</td>
<td>27-31</td>
<td>32-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER 10/1/95</td>
<td>16-40</td>
<td>41-49</td>
<td>50-64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

MINUTES OF THE __________________________
COMMITTEE

DATE: ___________ TIME: ___________ to ___________

LOCATION: __________________________

PARTICIPANTS:

• STAFF MEMBERS:

• PARENTS/COMMUNITY:

• OTHER (specify):

SUMMARY OF DELIBERATIONS/ACTIVITIES:

OUTCOME(S) OF DELIBERATIONS:

DECISIONS MADE BASED ON DELIBERATIONS/ACTIVITIES

Next Meeting
Date: __________________________
Location: __________________________
Time: __________________________
Appendix E

EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR COMMITTEE MINUTES

Evaluator_____________________________ Date_____________________

Committee title________________________________________________

Meeting date_________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section names</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants: staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents/community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of deliberations/activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome(s) of deliberations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made based on deliberations/activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about next meeting: date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location

time

Comments/Suggestions

Minutes revised by____________________________________________________

Date______________________________