CPS Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency
Data Transparency Stakeholder Advisory Group
Student Focus Group Meeting #3 Summary

Tuesday, May 6th, 2025, 4:30–6:30 PM
Virtual via Zoom

To incorporate student voices, we created a separate focus group for students. We collaborated with Mikva Challenge, an organization focused on empowering, informing, and engaging youth to become active citizens who promote justice and equity.

To protect privacy, students have been identified by school and grade level, rather than by name.

Attendance

Facilitators & Presenters: Felipe Perez (Facilitator), Sarah Cross (Facilitator), Ximena Novoa (Mikva Facilitator/Coordinator), Alejandra C. Sanchez (Facilitator/Coordinator)

Student Committee Members:

- Hancock HS | Gage Park – Junior
- Back of the Yards HS | Back of the Yards – Junior
- Simeon HS | Auburn Gresham – Sophomore
- Roosevelt HS | Albany Park – Junior

Meeting Materials

- Agenda
- Presentation: *MIKVA Session 3 – Indicator Review*
- School Profiles Site
- Exit Feedback Form (Google Form)
- Indicator Feedback Forms (Google Forms) for:
    - Graduation Rate
    - Student Proficiency
    - Out of School Time
    - Growth to Proficiency

Objectives

By the end of the workshop, students:

1. Reviewed and provided feedback on the new **Graduation Rate** page.
2. Reviewed and provided feedback on the **Student Proficiency** page.
3. Reviewed and provided feedback on the **Out of School Time** indicator.
4. Reviewed and provided feedback on the **Growth to Proficiency** indicator.

Welcome & Introductions

Facilitators opened the session with a welcome and introductions, inviting each participant to share their school, neighborhood, and the last movie they watched. Sarah Cross was introduced as a new facilitator.

Facilitators reviewed the committee's purpose: to ensure that CPS school quality data is **accessible, usable, and actionable**. Students were reminded that their role is to provide honest feedback so the data tools reflect what matters most to students and families.

Overview of Indicator Review Process

Facilitators explained the indicator feedback protocol:

1. **Introduction** to the metric and objectives.
2. **Individual review** of the metric using the CPS School Profiles site.
3. **Reflection** on guiding questions through a Google Form.
4. **Discussion** to share observations and ideas.
5. **Final feedback** submission.

Key discussion prompts included:

- What are you hoping to find?
- Is the language clear and understandable?
- Is the layout and navigation easy to use?
- Do the graphs and tables help you make sense of the data?
- Did you find what you were looking for?

Indicator Reviews & Feedback

A. Graduation Rate

Students explored graduation data for their schools and discussed how the information was presented.

Feedback Themes:

- The page was generally easy to navigate, and the language was clear.
- A participant shared that more context about factors influencing graduation rates—such as student mobility, transfer rates, and available supports—would be helpful.
- Several students said they wanted to know whether the data included students with special circumstances.
- A participant noted that graduation rates were an important factor when choosing a high school.
- Some suggested adding a short statement explaining why graduation rates matter for school quality.

B. Student Proficiency

Students reviewed SAT performance and other test score data.

Feedback Themes:

- Multiple participants asked how proficiency is defined and what benchmarks are being used.
- Some students questioned the relevance of test scores as a measure of learning, saying they don't always reflect teaching quality or student ability.
- A participant asked whether students with IEPs or 504 plans were included in the data.
- Several noted that schools vary in how much they emphasize SAT preparation, making comparisons uneven.
- Several students noted that while they reviewed SAT scores when choosing a school, they didn't always understand what the numbers meant.

C. Out of School Time

This indicator focused on enrichment and extracurricular programs.

Feedback Themes:

- Some participants misunderstood the term "Out of School Time" and suggested using a clearer label such as "Enrichment & Activities."

- Students wanted a “last updated” timestamp to know how current the program lists were.
- Multiple participants were interested in knowing how programs are funded and whether funding disparities between schools are reflected.
- Students suggested including a contact person or sign-up link for each program listed.

D. Growth to Proficiency

This metric measures student progress toward proficiency over time.

Feedback Themes:

- Students appreciated clear explanations of terms like “effect size” and “typical growth.”
- Several liked that the measure values improvement even if a student is not yet proficient.
- A participant asked if the data accounts for differences in students’ starting points (e.g., entering CPS mid-career or in later grades).
- Questions were raised about the intended audience for the metric—whether it is primarily for students, parents, or school leaders—and what actions it should inform.
- Some said this metric might be more useful than raw test scores in showing how well a school supports learning.

Feedback Collection & Closeout

Students completed indicator feedback forms and the exit ticket. Facilitators thanked them for their engagement and noted that their input will directly inform how CPS presents and explains school quality data.

The session closed with a preview of a possible future meeting at BUILD.

Conclusion

This meeting underscored the value of student voices in refining CPS’s Continuous Improvement and Data Transparency framework. Participants offered practical suggestions to improve clarity, context, and usability across multiple indicators, ensuring the final tools will better serve students, families, and the broader CPS community.