

CPS Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency

Data Transparency Stakeholder Advisory Group

Meeting #10 Summary

Thursday, February 13th, 2025, 9:00 AM–11:00 AM
Virtual

ATTENDEES:

Facilitators & Presenters:

Felipe Perez (Facilitator), Jill Gottfred Sohoni (Facilitator), Alejandra C. Sanchez (Coordinator), Joe Hoereth (UIC)

Committee Members and Attendees:

Ana Mosqueda (K1C), Claiborne Wade (Parent), Erika Gonzalez (Parent), Grace Chan McKibben (Community), Helena Swanson-Nystrom, Jacqueline Vargas (Parent), Jake Brekelbaum, Jasmine L. Thurmond (CPS Exec), Lori Torres Whitt (CTU), Marcelina Pedraza (LSC), Marcus Flenaugh (CAC), Melissa Sweazy (Principal), Maurice Miles (Parent), Nicole Turner (LSC), Perriyana Clay (CAC), Rogelio Ochoa (CTU), Ryan Bellville (CPAA), Tia Pruitt, Vanessa Espinoza (Parent)

Meeting Materials

- [Agenda](#)
- [Slides](#)
- Website Resources
 - [Balanced Assessment System](#)
 - [EdReports](#)
 - [Find What Works](#)
- [Aha Slides](#)
- [Feedback Form](#)

Overview Summary

During the meeting, participants discussed the implementation and feedback process for the new CIDT metrics, focusing on making them accessible, usable, and actionable for stakeholders. They explored the importance of parent and community engagement, emphasizing the need for clear communication and trust-building between schools and families. Additionally, the group considered

the criteria and process for endorsing data indicators, aiming to ensure broad representation and consensus among committee members. The committee also explored the structure of a survey facilitated by Joe from UIC to gather feedback on the metrics. The meeting concluded with a review of upcoming tasks and scheduling for future sessions.

Agenda

- Welcome and Intros
- New 1 Pager Feedback Summary + Stakeholder Learning Plan
- Review, discuss, and provide 2nd round feedback on High Quality Curriculum, Out of School Time and Balanced Assessment indicator page.
- Endorsement Process
- UIC Community Validation Approach
- CPS Updates: CIDT Launch, Media + What We're Hearing
- Public Comment, Next Steps, & Closeout

Key Activities and Discussions:

CIDT 1-Pager Distribution Strategies

- Committee members proposed a wide range of outreach strategies to share the CIDT 1-pager with stakeholders. These included:
- School-based efforts: distribution through principals, PACs, LSCs, and report card pickup nights
- Community-based ideas: using daycare centers, social media kits, flyers on school doors, and parent presentations
- Formal partnerships: collaboration with FACE specialists, Title I networks, and the Parent Mentor Network

Quotes from members:

- "Attach to LSC emails for distribution."
- "Create a social media kit for administrators, including email templates and graphics."
- "Present it at Parent Universities and Super Saturdays."

Indicator Feedback: Supporting the Shift

Members responded to the shift from focusing solely on outcomes to incorporating conditions, supports, and resources. Reflections included:

- **Language & Access:** Members requested simplified language, clear definitions, and mobile-friendly interfaces. Suggestions included glossaries, video tutorials, and FAQ-style content.
- **Navigation Challenges:** The current platform was seen as too complex to navigate. Members suggested making key data easier to find and accessible via search engines.
- **Parent Relevance:** Members discussed the importance of ensuring indicators reflect lived experiences and community priorities, like resource availability and student stress levels.

Notable reflections:

- "The average parent doesn't know these decisions are being made—this is a step toward real transparency."
- "Design the site so it can be navigated by a 7th or 8th grader."
- "Principals must create space for families to engage."

Endorsement Process

The group explored what it means to "endorse" an indicator and what process should be followed. Key points of consensus and variation included:

- **Consensus Model:** Most agreed that full unanimity was not necessary. A 2/3 vote or supermajority was frequently mentioned.
- **Rubric Use:** Members proposed scoring each indicator on accessibility, usability, and actionability. Some suggested using letter grades to guide decisions.
- **Transparency and Trust:** Adding names of endorsing stakeholders could build credibility with communities.
- **Alternative Terminology:** Some suggested "vetted" or "screened" may be more accurate than "endorsed," to acknowledge ongoing differences in opinion.

Quotes from members:

- "We need to make sure any parent who visits this site feels ready and equipped."
- "When you see another parent or teacher's name attached, you take it more seriously."
- "It's not just about whether the content is good—it's about whether families can internalize it."

UIC Survey Planning

Joe Hoereth presented the draft framework for the upcoming UIC community survey:

- Survey Blocks: Each indicator will be rated in blocks of 2–3 questions.
- Demographics: Zip code, race/ethnicity, age, gender, education level
- Open Response: One open-ended question will invite narrative feedback
- Proposed Timeline:
 - Survey fielding: March 17 – April 15
 - Data analysis: April 15 – May 9
 - Final summary: May 30

Feedback on the draft emphasized the need for:

- Plain language
- Easy navigation
- Equitable access across devices and literacy levels

Next Steps & Reminders

- Complete the AhaSlides survey about the UIC survey design
- Fill out the exit survey for today's session
- Reach out to Jill or Felipe with questions or follow-ups
- Upcoming meetings:
 - February 27 (Virtual): 4:30–6:30 PM
 - March 11 (Virtual): 4:30–7:30 PM