

CPS Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency

Data Transparency Stakeholder Advisory Group

Meeting #11 Summary

Thursday, February 27th, 2025, 4:30pm–6:30pm
Virtual

ATTENDANCE

Facilitators & Project Team: Felipe Perez (Facilitator), Jill Gottfred Sohoni (Facilitator), Jeff Broom (CPS), Ted Canji (Web Production Manager, CPS), Katina(CPS), Ana Mosqueda(Kids First Chicago), Alejandra C. Sanchez (Coordinator)

Committee Members: Jaqueline Vargas (Parent), Jasmine L. Thurmond (CPS Exec), Maurice Miles (Parent), Erika Gonzalez (Parent), Claiborne Wade(Parent), Ryan Belville(CPAA), Marcelina Pedraza(CPS), Perriyana Clay (CAC), Vanessa Espinoza(Kids First Chicago), Leonor" Lori" Torres Whitt(CTU), Marcus Flenaugh(CAC), Michelle Velez(Teacher)

Special members:Rogelio Ochoa(CPS Teacher)Paula Bui(Translation support)

Meeting Materials

- [Agenda](#)
- [Slide Deck – Proficiency, Growth, & College Metrics](#)
- [Feedback Slides](#)

Summary

In the meeting, the committee explored the chronic absence indicator and evaluated a draft rubric designed to help vet CPS's accountability metrics. Members shared a wide range of feedback regarding accessibility, presentation, and clarity of data—emphasizing the need for simplified language and visual enhancements. The group discussed how indicators should be evaluated, what constitutes a vetted or endorsed indicator, and the importance of equity in interpreting absence data. Several participants highlighted the challenges schools face with attendance due to broader community conditions. Members affirmed that the review process should be inclusive, and the data presented in ways that empower families, educators, and community members to take meaningful action.

Agenda

- Feedback Review Process
- Chronic Absence Indicator Review
- Rubric Testing for the Vetting Process
- Consensus Building for Indicator Vetting
- Next Steps and Closing

Feedback Review Process

Facilitators explained the approach CPS uses to collect, preserve, and summarize feedback. Every individual comment submitted by members is stored in full and grouped thematically to support internal learning and indicator refinement. Members expressed appreciation for this transparent process and encouraged the team to send out thematic feedback summaries in advance of meetings so they can prepare more thoroughly.

Chronic Absence Indicator Review

After independent review of the chronic absence indicator, the committee reconvened to share feedback.

Language and Framing: One principal expressed concern that the term “chronic absence” felt deficit-oriented and recommended incorporating more asset-based language. A CAC member echoed that labels matter and shape public perception of school quality.

Data Complexity: Parents and community members noted that the tables and graphs were hard to read, especially for those without a data background. Several participants suggested adding visual summaries like color-coded graphs or icon-based explanations. There was consensus that visual simplicity would enhance accessibility for families.

Contextual Nuance: Participants raised concerns about the indicator’s lack of differentiation between excused and unexcused absences. A teacher shared that many students are absent due to mental health or family caregiving responsibilities, and those realities should be acknowledged in the data. Multiple members stressed the need to consider structural barriers—like school safety or housing instability—when analyzing attendance patterns.

Stakeholder Use: A CPS exec noted that this indicator could be particularly actionable if families understand how to use it to advocate for supports. Several parents requested more explicit guidance or FAQs on how to interpret chronic absence data.

Rubric Testing for the Vetting Process

The committee used a draft rubric to rate the chronic absence indicator along three dimensions: accessibility, usability, and actionability.

Usefulness: Most members found the rubric helpful for structuring their thinking and aligning expectations. A CAC member commented that this tool was essential for building shared standards and clarifying what makes an indicator “ready.”

Language and Calibration: Several members said the rubric itself needed plainer language. It wasn’t always clear what differentiated a “distinguished” rating from a “proficient” one. One teacher suggested having sample responses or anchor examples to guide scoring.

Scoring Approach: A few participants proposed that multiple committee members score the same indicator and then compare responses to reveal inconsistencies and spark discussion. One parent wondered whether all indicators would require the same criteria or if different rubrics might emerge depending on the metric type.

Overall, the rubric was positively received, with feedback centered on usability, clarity, and alignment.

Consensus Building for Indicator Vetting

Facilitators led a conversation on what “vetted” should mean in the context of this committee.

Definitions: Many members agreed that “vetted” should mean the indicator meets a minimum threshold for quality, clarity, and potential for public understanding. A few said it should also signal that the indicator reflects committee values, even if not every detail is perfect.

Concerns About Unanimity: Some members expressed concern that requiring full consensus could stall the process. A community representative proposed using a “majority agreement with documented concerns” model so that strong dissent can still be noted without halting approval.

Vetted vs. Endorsed: One CPS team member noted that vetting might mean the indicator is clear and usable, while endorsement would be a separate step related to whether the indicator should influence school accountability. Members were open to distinguishing between these levels of support.

Key Themes from Member Feedback

Language and Accessibility

- Multiple members flagged overly technical or jargony language.
- A principal and two parents suggested simplifying labels and terminology.
- A CAC member emphasized that acronyms should be spelled out.
- A CPS exec recommended including short data interpretations below graphs to aid understanding.

Data Presentation

- Members appreciated seeing multi-year trends but asked for clearer and more consistent visual displays.
- A community member noted the value of showing school-level data alongside district-wide averages.
- Color coding and other visual cues were proposed to highlight changes over time.

Equity and Context

- Parents emphasized that many attendance issues stem from systemic challenges like housing instability, school climate, or caregiving responsibilities.
- A teacher noted that the indicator risks penalizing schools serving students most in need.
- Members asked that data not be interpreted in isolation but always accompanied by contextual information or guiding narratives.

Next Steps and Closing

- Members will continue testing the rubric on additional indicators.
- CPS team will refine the rubric language and structure based on feedback.
- Thematic feedback summaries will be distributed before future indicator reviews.
- Committee members are encouraged to complete the exit survey and share final thoughts.

Facilitators closed by affirming the committee's continued role in shaping a more inclusive, transparent approach to measuring school quality. Members were reminded that the next session will take place in person on March 11.