

CPS Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency **Data Transparency Stakeholder Advisory Group** Meeting #23 Summary

Wednesday, November 12th, 2025, 4:00–5:30 PM
Virtual

Attendance

Facilitators & CPS Team

Felipe Perez (Facilitator), Jill Gottfred Sohoni (Facilitator), Sarah Cross (Camino Group), Joe Hoereth (UIC), Katina Kopsias (CPS), Ted Canji (CPS – Web/Design), Augusta Smith (CPS Exec), Lauren Brumett (CPS Exec), Lissette Romo (Spanish Interpreter),

Committee Members

Maurice Miles (Parent), Marcelina Pedraza (LSC), Micaelan Valesky (Community), Jaqueline Vargas (Parent), Erika Gonzalez (Parent), Kevin Shallcross (CPS Exec), Rogelio Aguilar (Teacher), Perriyana Clay (CAC), Jasmine Thurmond (CPS Exec), Sarah Amouipour (Teacher), Ryan Belville (CPAA), Claiborne Wade (Parent), Roman Ahmed (Community)

Meeting Materials

- [Agenda](#)
- [Slide Deck: Session 23 – Language Reviews](#)

Agenda

- Welcome & Objectives
- CPS Timeline Update
- Indicator Language Review
 - Proficiency
 - Growth to Proficiency

- English Learner Progress
- One-Year Dropout
- Early College & Career Credentials
- Close Out + Public Comment
- Office Hours / Independent Work Time

Meeting Notes

Welcome & Objectives

Facilitators welcomed members and reiterated that the purpose of Meeting 23 was to finalize language clarity across the five indicators currently under review. The group was reminded that this stage of CIDT work focuses on **precision, accessibility, and consistency of indicator definitions**, rather than final policy endorsement.

CPS Timeline Update

The CPS team provided a brief update on the overall CIDT timeline:

- The language-refinement phase is nearing completion.
- Indicator templates will be aligned with the updated CIDT frameworks.
- Future sessions will shift toward public-facing communication materials, survey design, and usability testing.
- CPS noted that internal teams (including Subject Matter Experts and OCCS) are reviewing edits concurrently with committee feedback.

A CPS staff member noted that some internal timelines may shift slightly depending on SME availability.

Indicator Language Review (Five Indicators)

Members reviewed the draft language for **five indicators**, with emphasis on improving clarity, accessibility, and ensuring the definitions are meaningful for families.

1. Proficiency

Themes Raised

- Need for clearer explanations of what “meets” and “exceeds” standards indicate.
- Importance of being explicit about *which* standardized assessments are used.

Member Feedback

- A parent emphasized that jargon should be eliminated to make the definitions readable without prior knowledge of testing systems.
- A teacher added that some families misunderstand proficiency categories; more examples or brief descriptions may help.
- A principal suggested including a short definition of state cut-scores rather than assuming familiarity.

2. Growth to Proficiency

Themes Raised

- This metric is more complicated than proficiency; it needs straightforward explanations.
- Members noted that growth should not sound punitive for students who begin farther from grade level.

Member Feedback

- A community representative noted that the phrase “on track to meet proficiency” could be softened to avoid implying student failure.
- A parent added that visual examples (e.g., “typical pathway,” “accelerated growth”) would support clarity.
- A CPS staff member confirmed that internal teams are reviewing whether these definitions can align with state terminology and growth models already in use.

3. English Learner Progress

Themes Raised

- Need to distinguish between English development and academic achievement.
- Ensure language remains inclusive of multilingual students and avoids deficit framing.

Member Feedback

- A parent shared that families often misunderstand ACCESS scores; the indicator text should clearly indicate what progress looks like.
- A teacher added that the multilingual journey is long and varied, and indicators should reflect growth, not just endpoint proficiency.
- A committee member noted that the Spanish translation must reflect linguistically appropriate terminology.

4. One-Year Dropout

Themes Raised

- Call for sensitivity in the language describing student disengagement.
- Need to explain how CPS calculates the one-year dropout rate.

Member Feedback

- A community member emphasized that conversations about dropout rates must acknowledge structural barriers students face.
- A parent added that the definition should address how re-engagement efforts factor into the data.
- A CPS team member confirmed that internal offices are reviewing standard definitions to ensure consistency across departments.

5. Early College & Career Credentials (ECCC)

Themes Raised

- Strong interest in ensuring families understand what the credentials represent.
- Requests for clarity around which credentials “count” (e.g., AP, IB, Dual Credit, industry certifications).

Member Feedback

- A parent noted that this metric is highly motivating for families exploring high-school options and should be easy to read.
- A school leader added that credential access varies widely by school; the language should avoid suggesting equivalence where opportunity differs.

- A CPS staff member clarified that SMEs are continuing to refine guidance to ensure this indicator accurately represents the breadth of CCR pathways.

Close Out + Public Comment

Facilitators thanked the group for the thoughtful feedback shared during the indicator review. A **CPS data lead** affirmed that the insights were strong and would directly inform next steps.

- Members were reminded to complete **all five indicator feedback forms**, as the district hopes to finalize language this year.
- A snapshot of prior indicators was reviewed:
 - 11 indicators have undergone language review.
 - Some indicators still have low numbers of written responses.
Members who participated in discussions but have not submitted forms were encouraged to do so..
- The full list of forms and links was posted in the chat.
- The committee will reconvene on **December 4**, ideally **in person**, with the location still to be confirmed. UIC partners are expected to lead a discussion on student focus groups at that meeting.

After addressing final questions, facilitators closed the formal meeting and opened independent work time, remaining available on the call until 5:30 PM for support.

Office Hours / Independent Work Time

Following the formal closeout, CPS staff remained available for optional office hours:

- Members asked follow-up questions about how future indicators will be displayed on the website.
- A few members reviewed draft definitions individually with staff.
- CPS reiterated that exit-ticket feedback will guide the next round of language refinement.