



Board of Education | City of Chicago

May 14, 2025 Agenda Review Committee Follow-Ups

Agenda Review Committee (ARC) follow-ups are shared publicly so that members of the public can view responses to issues that directly impact the CPS community in advance of the Board’s consideration at regular Board meetings. Follow-ups are unanswered questions asked by Board Members during a public meeting. See the May 2025 ARC follow-ups and responses below.

Item Description	Follow-Up Question	District Response	Responding Department																																																								
<p>Agenda Item 1: Amend Academic Calendar</p>	<p>How has parent teacher conferences and participation for parents with high school and elementary school students been impacted?</p>	<p>Report Card Pick Up attendance appears to be negatively impacted at the High School level when RCPU is scheduled for different days. There is overall stronger attendance reported for HS when conferences are scheduled for the same day for both ES and HS. The data for the past few years is included below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="768 971 1772 1240"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Year-to-Year Comparison</th> <th colspan="2">Grade Level Averages</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Academic Year</th> <th>Quarter/Term</th> <th>Attendance</th> <th>Date of Conferences</th> <th>Conference Grade Level</th> <th>K-8</th> <th>9-12</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SY25</td> <td>Q3</td> <td>62.72%</td> <td>Tuesday, April 1, 2025</td> <td>Both</td> <td>75.19%</td> <td>55.12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SY25</td> <td>Q1</td> <td>63.48%</td> <td>Monday, November 4, 2024</td> <td>Both</td> <td>75.40%</td> <td>34.93%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SY24</td> <td>Q3</td> <td>62.76%</td> <td>Wednesday, April 10, 2024 ES Thursday, April 11, 2024 HS</td> <td>Separate Days</td> <td>76.53%</td> <td>29.78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SY24</td> <td>Q1</td> <td>63.26%</td> <td>Thursday, October 26, 2023</td> <td>Both</td> <td>76.81%</td> <td>54.06%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SY23</td> <td>Q3</td> <td>63.03%</td> <td>Wednesday March 29, 2023</td> <td>Both</td> <td>75.93%</td> <td>30.61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SY23</td> <td>Q1</td> <td>63.18%</td> <td>Monday, November 21, 2022</td> <td>Both</td> <td>75.96%</td> <td>30.82%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year-to-Year Comparison					Grade Level Averages		Academic Year	Quarter/Term	Attendance	Date of Conferences	Conference Grade Level	K-8	9-12	SY25	Q3	62.72%	Tuesday, April 1, 2025	Both	75.19%	55.12%	SY25	Q1	63.48%	Monday, November 4, 2024	Both	75.40%	34.93%	SY24	Q3	62.76%	Wednesday, April 10, 2024 ES Thursday, April 11, 2024 HS	Separate Days	76.53%	29.78%	SY24	Q1	63.26%	Thursday, October 26, 2023	Both	76.81%	54.06%	SY23	Q3	63.03%	Wednesday March 29, 2023	Both	75.93%	30.61%	SY23	Q1	63.18%	Monday, November 21, 2022	Both	75.96%	30.82%	<p>Office of Teaching & Learning</p>
Year-to-Year Comparison					Grade Level Averages																																																						
Academic Year	Quarter/Term	Attendance	Date of Conferences	Conference Grade Level	K-8	9-12																																																					
SY25	Q3	62.72%	Tuesday, April 1, 2025	Both	75.19%	55.12%																																																					
SY25	Q1	63.48%	Monday, November 4, 2024	Both	75.40%	34.93%																																																					
SY24	Q3	62.76%	Wednesday, April 10, 2024 ES Thursday, April 11, 2024 HS	Separate Days	76.53%	29.78%																																																					
SY24	Q1	63.26%	Thursday, October 26, 2023	Both	76.81%	54.06%																																																					
SY23	Q3	63.03%	Wednesday March 29, 2023	Both	75.93%	30.61%																																																					
SY23	Q1	63.18%	Monday, November 21, 2022	Both	75.96%	30.82%																																																					
<p>Agenda Item 4: Various Vendors for EdTech & Digital Resources</p>	<p>Could we see the key performance indicators for specific vendors?</p>	<p>The ed tech scope in the RFQ does not list any KPIs and instead we opted for specific guidelines outlined in a service level agreement clause. Verbiage below. The thinking is that the pool represents such a diverse offering of products and services to meet a diverse set of needs that KPIs would be too restrictive and cause confusion in the contracting process. <i>(see next page)</i></p>	<p>Office of Teaching & Learning</p>																																																								

Item Description	Follow-Up Question	District Response	Responding Department
<p><i>Continued</i> Agenda Item 4: Various Vendors for EdTech & Digital Resources</p>	<p><i>Continued</i> Could we see the key performance indicators for specific vendors?</p>	<p><i>Continued</i> Service Level Agreement Terms The Board has defined a set of common, minimum Service Level Agreements (SLA). All companies participating in this RFQ are measured based on the following SLAs which will be reviewed on a quarterly basis with the Board's project manager and are subject to change.</p> <p>District Account Manager A Service Provider is required to assign at least one account manager to handle all District needs. The account manager will be the main point of contact for the district and will handle triaging support, sales, setup and integration conversations.</p> <p>District Training Requirements Service Provider is required to End User with application, use of the features and other Software required with using and accessing the Software and the Services. The Service Provider will recommend training options.</p> <p>Escalation Process Issues that are not resolved through standard support and help desk services will be escalated by the District to the Service Provider's Account Manager assigned to the District.</p> <p>Data Exchange Process Service Providers will agree to have the exchange of student data handled at the centrally with a Board approved data broker. Currently the district utilizes two data brokers; Clever for school site sharing and Identity Automation (Rapid ID) for enterprise/district level integrations. The Board may change the data broker requirements as needed.</p>	

Item Description	Follow-Up Question	District Response	Responding Department
<p>Agenda Item 9: Authorizing Special Education Services to Non-Public Facilities</p>	<p>Is there an increase in student need for special education services and can you provide any data on this trend over the last 3 years?</p>	<p>Currently 63 students are placed in 33 different residential settings. Of the 63 students, 18 are placed in out-of-state facilities. The safety and well-being of students is a top priority for CPS. The District follows all State and District policies and guidelines as it places students in facilities outside of Chicago or the State, working to ensure these facilities meet a comprehensive set of criteria and standards which are maintained during placement to best serve CPS students.</p> <p>The District also works hand-in-hand with families to identify placement(s) that are able to meet the students' individualized educational needs. When there is an issue or concern, CPS works closely with all parties, including the placement facility and families, to support the safety and wellbeing of the student. CPS' student-centered approach and regular contact with families and facilities to monitor student progress and ensure IEP compliance allow the District to maintain oversight and proactively address any concerns.</p>	<p>Office of Students with Disabilities</p>
<p>Agenda Item 9: Authorizing Special Education Services to Non-Public Facilities</p>	<p>How do we know that out-of-state facilities are properly meeting their standards for students with disabilities? Is there a rating system?</p>	<p>All facilities contracted by CPS—whether ISBE-approved or approved pursuant to ISBE's emergency and student-specific approval process—are required to meet strict legal and safety standards outlined in their agreements with the district. Each facility must ensure that its staff is credentialed in accordance with the licensing requirements of their respective states. Prior to working with CPS students, all personnel must undergo and pass comprehensive background checks, including criminal history screening and clearance through state and national sex offender registries. Additionally, each facility must confirm that it is appropriately licensed, accredited, or otherwise approved to operate educational and therapeutic programs for students with disabilities. These credentials must remain valid and in good standing for the full duration of the contract.</p>	<p>Office of Students with Disabilities</p>
<p>Agenda Item 9: Authorizing Special Education Services to Non-Public Facilities</p>	<p>Are there students who need services, applied, and that we are not able to help?</p>	<p>There are currently eight students who are waiting for a residential placement.</p>	<p>Office of Students with Disabilities</p>

Item Description	Follow-Up Question	District Response	Responding Department
Agenda Item 10: Authorize Renewal Various Vendors Network Servers	For FY24 how many cameras were replaced? What percentage of the CPS system was replaced?	The Office of Safety and Security deployed 115 school-based servers and 5 central office servers through the ITS Server Contract. As part of ongoing camera modernization efforts – funded separately from server costs—approximately 4,000 cameras were either newly installed or replaced outdated analog models with low image quality. This work is part of a districtwide initiative to enhance camera coverage, improve image quality, and ensure all schools operate on a standardized, unified system.	Office of Information and Technology Services
Agenda Item 10: Authorize Renewal Various Vendors Network Servers	What is the percentage of CPS schools in 2024 that actually used this service?	The newly purchased servers enabled the new installation or upgrade of antiquated camera systems at 20% of CPS schools.	Office of Information and Technology Services