

# Accountability Technical Advisory Group

Meeting #2 Summary

---

**19 DECEMBER 2024 | 1:00 PM | REMOTE**

## ATTENDEES

**A-TAG Members:** Nelson Gerew, Elaine Allensworth, Paul Zavitkovsky, Paula Barajas, Alahrie Aziz-Sims, Monica Bhatt, Cy Hendrickson, Pavlyn Jankov, Sara Kempner, Peter Leonard, Natasha Erskine

**CPS CIDT Implementation Staff:** Augusta Smith, Jeff Broom (unable to attend), Lauren Brumett, Vakeia Griffith

**Center for Assessment Staff:** Chris Domaleski, Erika Landl, Laura Pinsonneault

**Other:** Nicole Abreu Shepard (Raise your Hand), Sam Mathias (CPS, I&I)

## Meeting Materials

**All meeting materials are available on this A-TAG webpage:**

<https://sites.google.com/view/cidt-atag/home>

## AGENDA

### **Welcome, Meeting Norms and Transparency Expectations**

Laura opened the meeting and reviewed the plan for the day, after which August shared meeting norms for the group.

Transparency has been a guiding principle of the accountability redesign work since 2020, and Laura discussed not only this context, but also transparency expectations for CIDT implementation and the work of A-TAG. She clarified that meeting materials are available on the [A-TAG website](#), and that meetings are open for observation - pointing out that different offices within CPS will have staff attend A-TAG meetings. Finally, she referred to the district's [Accountability Redesign web page](#), and August noted the district's intention to continue to post relevant materials about CIDT implementation to this page. She then invited the group's feedback about these plans to support transparency. One participant suggested a contact list of

A-TAG members to draw attention to the fact that members are available to answer questions and promote clarity.

### **Revisiting Proposal Criteria**

#### *Addressing changes in proposal claims and review considerations since meeting #1*

The purpose of this agenda item was to collect recommendations for finalizing proposal review criteria prior to using the drafted review tool when the first proposals are ready. Laura started by reminding the group about the original 13 criteria that were shared and discussed in the November 1st meeting. She reiterated that the purpose and intended use - by CPS subject matter experts (SMEs), A-TAG members, and CPS leadership - of the criteria has not changed since November, but the structure and content of the criteria have changed as a result of the group's initial feedback. Specifically, the number of criteria was reduced, certain labels were removed, guiding questions were added to support the review and feedback process, and a review tool was developed to document individual and group feedback.

Laura walked through the five core claims and associated considerations. These considerations are meant to guide review and feedback, not constrain; there is not an expectation that all considerations must be addressed in order for a proposal to have provided sufficient evidence for review. She also walked through the review tool, which has separate tabs for individual feedback and group feedback on a given metric or indicator proposal. She then invited members to reflect not only on the content of the claims, but also on the review tool itself.

Chris offered some thoughts about the process for review, i.e., that when members have a proposal "in hand," they should address two key areas: 1) identifying any clarifying questions they may have; and 2) specifying how the proposal can be strengthened to better support a given claim.

#### *Capturing feedback on the proposal criteria and review tool*

The group took time for individual review of the criteria and tool, followed by small group discussion. Some members chose to put their individual feedback directly in the [draft review tool](#). Group notes were captured in [this notes document](#).

Back in the full group, members from each breakout room shared a summary of key takeaways from their discussion. All groups had a rich discussion about data collection and the costs and rewards of collecting and using new data. There was a desire to be clear about district supports,

as well as to call out possible negative unintended consequences. One group said it would be important to map out the roles and work of different users within a school in relation to specific metrics. There was a lot of discussion across groups and in the full group about the appropriate role of SMEs in developing these proposals given their varied background and areas of expertise. This impacts expectations for what the proposals will contain as well as expectations for the role of A-TAG members in supporting proposal development, review, and iteration. One member highlighted the importance of clear labels/names for metrics to mitigate confusion at the outset of data use.

### **Process and Structure**

The objective of this agenda item was to determine the process that will be used to evaluate metric and indicator proposals and provide feedback.

Erika started by summarizing the suggested proposal review structure and process, inviting members to provide feedback about reasonableness and appropriateness and to suggest modifications if recommended. August then provided an update on the work of SMEs, explaining that there are a number of metrics in progress. She said that the work has been transformative for many SMEs, who are reaching out to focus groups to inform and refine their proposals.

Returning to the review process, Erika proposed that the process should be effective, efficient, feasible, and standardized so that feedback for SMEs is constructive, clear, actionable, and feasible. This means the review process should involve: independent review, interaction with SMEs to address clarifying questions, group discussion, identifying of high priority recommendations, and follow-up (if needed) with SMEs. She highlighted how the review process (and tool) are designed to support each requirement.

In group discussion, members provided this feedback:

- Ensure the proposals address questions such as: Are these new data? What is the data collection burden? How will data collection impact teaching and learning? Laura clarified that some of the questions are addressed in the tool so providing feedback about their sufficiency will help. August noted that some of these considerations are being addressed in the process but would further examine these issues based on these recommendations.

- Another A-TAG member asked for an outline of the future meetings and the proposals that would be reviewed at each.
- It's important to make sure the right contributors are being asked to provide feedback in the proposal review process.
- When advisory group members provide feedback, it would be helpful to document the feedback. The proposal review tool would be useful for this purpose.
- SMEs may not be able to answer all the technical questions. A-TAG may need to provide advice and recommendations to support the process. Notwithstanding, some advisors emphasized the importance of the SMEs of knowing the data and being well-prepared to address a range of technical and implementation questions.
- There was a question about what kind of feedback would be most helpful from A-TAG - meta analyses, research?
  - A member mentioned that it may be helpful for SMEs to be able to reach out to A-TAG members with questions as they develop their proposals. An example is looking for the most recent research on certain topics.
  - A member suggested in the chat a Google doc with ongoing questions and A-TAG members can be tagged in that document.
  - Erika also pointed out that, when there is a proposal review schedule, A-TAG members could offer relevant research in advance of the SME development process, so that SMEs have that information as they start their work.
  - A member requested that any research shared for particular metrics be available to the full group.

### Wrap Up and Adjournment

Laura wrapped up the meeting by summarizing planning topics and activities for the January A-TAG meeting and asked the group to complete the meeting evaluation.

### Action Items

Task	Status
Share a contact list of A-TAG members with SMEs to draw attention to the fact that members are available to answer questions and promote clarity	SQMR will share the CIDT landing page with SMEs.

Note this reporting recommendation: clear labels/names for metrics will be important to mitigate confusion at the outset of data use.

This recommendation is documented for future work on dashboards/reports.