

CPS Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency Data Transparency Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #17 Summary

**Wednesday, June 11th, 2025, 4:30–7:00 PM
Virtual (Zoom)**

Attendance

Facilitators & Project Team:

Jill Gottfred Sohoni (Circle Root Collaborative Facilitator), Felipe Perez (Camino Group Facilitator), Sarah Cross (Camino Group), Alejandra C. Sanchez (Camino Project Manager), Jeff Broom (CPS Exec), Ted Canji (CPS), Katina Kopsias (CPS), Joe Hoereth (UIC), Christopher Hays (CPS), Micaelan Valesky (Kids First Chicago)

Committee Members:

Grace Chan McKibben (Community), Jaqueline Vargas (Parent), Jasmine L. Thurmond (CPS Exec), Maurice Miles (Parent), Erika Gonzalez (Parent), Claiborne Wade (Parent), Michelle Velez (Teacher), Marcelina Pedraza (CPS), Rogelio Aguilar (CPS), Lori Torres Whitt (CTU)

Special Members:

Paula (Translation)

Meeting Materials Shared

- [Participant Slides](#)
- [Agenda](#)
- [CPS UX Recommendations Slide Deck](#)
- [Feedback Link](#)

Objectives:

The Transparency Committee will:

- Review, discuss, and make recommendations regarding new CIDT tool features, including the dashboard, stakeholder profile filter, and comparisons
- Provide feedback on the CPS color scheme and logo for CIDT
- Help finalize the UIC Community Engagement Survey and Focus Groups approach.
- Discuss our summer and fall calendar and objectives
- CELEBRATE how far we've come!

1. User Experience Design: Goals and Pain Points

Christopher Hays, CPS UX researcher, introduced updates to the CIDT tool rooted in community feedback and user research.

Key Themes:

- **Readability Issues:** Too much jargon; reading level is ~10th–11th grade. Goal: 6th-grade reading level.
- **Navigation Problems:** Users struggled to find key info; menus and page flow were confusing.
- **Charts Lacked Context:** Visualizations were difficult to interpret without labels or explanations.
- **Response to Feedback:** CPS added "Got it" tips, a simplified left menu, plain-language alternatives, improved search, and role-specific user profiles.

Feedback Highlights:

- Reduce clicks and improve wayfinding.
- Offer translations and in-person training for less tech-savvy families.
- Clarify acronyms and metric definitions.

2. Dashboard Design and Metric Prioritization

Participants reviewed dashboard examples and discussed how to balance simplicity with depth across 25 metrics.

Feedback:

- **Prioritized Metrics:** Culture/climate, test scores, attendance, out-of-school offerings, SEL data, arts/music programs.
- **Customization Urged:**
 - Users should be able to "star" metrics for easy return.
 - Different views needed for families choosing schools vs. those already enrolled.
 - Elementary and high school needs differ.

Concerns emerged that boiling each metric down to one number risks oversimplification—especially for dual-language schools where proficiency trends differ.

3. Tailored Dashboards by User Type

Breakout groups addressed what dashboards should look like for parents vs. principals.

Parent-Focused Dashboard:

- Simplified filters and side-by-side comparisons.
- Most important metrics: student performance, enrichment opportunities, curriculum, SEL indicators.

Principal-Focused Dashboard:

- Use cases include tracking absenteeism, EL progress, CIWP goal alignment, and trends across networks.
- Interest in customizable views and quarterly goal-setting dashboards.

4. Comparison Tools

Participants strongly supported comparison features.

Feedback:

- Side-by-side school comparisons (2–3 schools max).
- Filters similar to Zillow or Expedia (e.g., program offerings, school type, location).
- Users want transparency when data is missing or self-reported (e.g., language or extracurricular programs).
- Preferences for a table view and the ability to select which metrics to compare.

5. Visual Design: Color Scheme and Logo

Jeff Broom shared an updated color scheme avoiding red-yellow-green to steer clear of “stoplight” implications.

Feedback:

- Participants approved of the accessibility-tested palette.
- Support for color schemes aligning with state cut scores but with user-friendly terms.

Logo Review:

- Most supported retaining the current CIDT logo (equal sign with stick figures).

- Some openness to refreshing the logo in the future, but rebranding was seen as costly and unnecessary at this time.
- A name change was discussed but viewed as impractical due to board policy implications.

6. Community Engagement Strategy

Joe Hoereth (UIC) outlined a two-track engagement plan: a **districtwide survey** for broad input and **focus groups** for deeper insight.

Discussion:

- Focus groups will allow users to test the tool in real time.
- Participants appreciated the combination of broad and deep input collection.
- A live simulation was conducted where attendees explored the tool from the perspective of their role (e.g., parent, principal).
- Participants noted:
 - Some scrolling was needed but navigation was mostly manageable.
 - The tool is helpful for both school choice and improvement.
 - Some concern around outdated data (e.g., language programs) was raised.

7. Closing Reflections and Next Steps

Joe Hoereth emphasized the value of real-time, hands-on input for guiding design improvements.

Key Takeaways:

- Tool improvements must prioritize accessibility, customization, and role-based relevance.
- Comparison tools and dashboard tailoring are central to user satisfaction.
- Continued attention to translation and digital literacy is needed.

Next Steps:

- A summer meeting is scheduled for **July 18** to support execution of the survey and focus groups.
- The committee will review new indicators launching in Fall 2025 and support outreach and marketing efforts.

- Participants were encouraged to complete the exit survey and continue offering input via email.
- A follow-up recap and action items will be sent out.