

**Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 N. Scoville
Oak Park, IL 60302
An Instruction Committee of the Whole Board
December 9, 2010**

An Instruction Committee meeting was held on Thursday, December 9, 2010, in the Board Room. Co-chair Dr. Lee opened the meeting at 7:38 a.m. Committee members present were Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy Leafe McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak Layman. Also present were Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Michael Carioscio, Chief Financial Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Christopher Thieme, IT Department.

Approval of November 11, 2010 Instruction Committee Minutes

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to accept the November 11, 2010 meeting minutes, as presented.

Update on District Improvement Plan (DIP) and School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Mr. Rouse provided an update on the School Improvement Plan, noting that this is Phase II of a four-phase process. All indicators will be assessed before assignments of the tasks are made, followed by determining what indicators and tasks would fulfill the obligations of those indicators. The latest version will be sent to the State on approximately December 17. West 40 felt the District's achievement targets were ambitious: Mr. Rouse looked for more West 40 input.

An indicator marked as being fully implemented means that nothing else has to be put into the SIP; however, the District will still have to sustain the objectives and indicators. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for copies of the items marked "fully implemented" in the Statement of Purpose and Bylaws for Operation portion which supported the evidence, particularly that of the Board of Education policy on the composition of the SIP Team. Mr. Rouse explained that the District choose the designation "fully implemented" because some of the items were not just related to SIP or to the SIP Team, some were related to such entities like DLT, BLT and IC, as well as parent groups that have bylaws. West 40 had supported expanding the group and had applauded the District's effort in this new process. The District looks at the research-based explanation, which gives a tone or flavor of what the State wants. West 40 will be asked if it has any concerns. Ms. Patchak-Layman continued that part of the state's intent is to have all things lined up sequentially from top to bottom, i.e., from Board of Education policy on down, because it falls under the topic of leadership. If the District submits as evidence written statements of purpose and mission statements for all teams, she assumed it was the SIP Team and subsets, and she could not find anything about them. Mr. Prale noted that the Superintendent has the authority to create committees and assign them to staff members to follow through on specific goals. On the issues of school improvement,

the District has never been asked by ISBE or West 40 to create that policy. He suggested requesting templates from West 40 of such a policy and bringing them forward to PEG. The Committee agreed.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that IF-08–Professional Development for Faculty was designated as being fully implemented. She asked if there were another part that spoke about the variety or the assessment of professional development to see if it had the desired outcomes. Is the professional development in place enough for SIP or is the state looking to see that it is targeted to specific concerns raised based on AYP. Mr. Rouse appreciated the question and responded that this template was being used to set up the framework. When the state asks about professional development, it is asking about a model for it. OPRFHS has a model in place, i.e., Monday morning collaboration, and four days per year are set aside for this, etc. Through SIP, the task will be to speak about that model in relationship to student achievement needs.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if professional development included an accountability measure. Mr. Prale reported that the Board of Education receives annually a report that details professional development. It includes sample reports from each of the Learning Teams and exit survey data to the professional development presented. Most research suggests that most robust professional development occurs in high performing schools; it is more correlative than causal. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the State is looking for classroom observations of indicators of effective teaching. Mr. Prale stated that references focused on a walk-through strategy and DLT was considering implementing that again in August 2011 to gain a quick statistical overview to what is being sought. Information is brought back to the entire faculty by the use of the Charlotte Danielson rubric and that information goes back to go back to the Professional Development Committee and the administration for future planning, e.g., goal setting, reflective feedback, reflection on own practices in the area of learning, and faculty concerns, in addition to RtI, CCAR, etc.

Dashboard Discussion

Mr. Carioscio and Mr. Thieme had researched dashboards from different schools and, using a PowerPoint demonstration, chose Harold K.L. Castle Foundation of Education as an example of what can be included and how it worked to show the Committee. Mr. Carioscio explained that the Board of Education would first have to determine the key indicators it wanted and then the District would explore if and where the data was being captured. Items to be included might be: OPRFHS' scores compared to state scores, e.g., graduation rates, AYP scores, post secondary success, etc. The biggest challenge would be determining what reports the Board of Education desired. Programs to access the information could be written in-house. Both Skyport and Data Warehouse are programs that the District owns and can populate with student information. Skyport has categories for teacher, administration, and family. Data Warehouse can create reports and while not yet a product, Skyward is working to make it function with Skyport.

The Skyport benefits include 1) Single login; 2) Widgets – prebuilt and customizable; 3) dashboard customized and tabulated; 4) Standards items – calendar, RtI, assessment (via Skyward); 5) Single database (designed for the Skyward sis); 6) Security (single URL with 128 bit SSL); 7) Cost (included in Skyward); and 8) revenue as it has an advertising option.

The suggested implementation timeline would be as follows:

Data Cleanup: May 1, 2011
Skyport Launch: August 1, 2011

The Board of Education members may have their own Skyward login which would enable them to go to a customized portal page that would display desired reports. Mr. Prale suggested that the data sets in the Institutional Excellence Document may be a starting point for collecting data. He cautioned that the idea of search limiters, if only two or three, might preclude a band of information such that even without identifiable information, someone might make a conclusion about a small group of students.

Dr. Millard and Dr. Lee stated the Board of Education should agree on the information it wanted to see and ask the Superintendent for a list of things the Board of Education would want. Mr. Finnegan asked that the formats be as transparent as possible as there were a number of initiatives in progress and that information should be accessible to those who are able to evaluate it.

Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that first the Board of Education should agree 1) if it wanted indicators related to the District's goals, and 2) what the indicators would be and what is implied by the goal. If the goal is predictability based on race on student achievement, what indicators would indicate the District was moving toward this goal. Would it be a reduction in the difference between White and African-American students on a test? What is the assumption? How would the school do that? What programs would be used to do reduce the gap? She wanted to see indicators on the bigger picture, e.g., a reading program, etc. Determine the programs to reduce the gap, set a goal, and then institute the programs. The Board of Education could have its own indicators and perhaps a subset of what the state wants tracked. For her, it was not just the educational part but also the administrative and management parts, e.g., budget, etc. What are all of the things that feed into a goal? Dr. Millard hoped to see that in the PEG discussion regarding the annual performance evaluation descriptors. Dr. Isoye felt the District should do an audit of the data systems, identify gaps assessment tools, etc., to identify the missing tools. This may fall into the discussion of whether the District should pursue a strategic plan. While his annual performance draft included looking at benchmarks, not a specific percentage number for one year.

Ms. Patchak-Layman found a helpful example of a dashboard in the Charlotte Mecklenburg School in North Carolina. It was set up for the district's goals with multigraphic indicators with green lights, red lights. There is a link to the specific information that went with the goal and the information was put into thumbnail sketches to quickly find information.

Dr. Lee suggested each Board of Education member put in writing to the Superintendent what he/she would like to see one year, two years and three years in a dashboard, acknowledging that all will not be feasible and then let the Superintendent develop a proposal as to what he believes is possible in those time periods.

Discussion ensued about that process. Dr. Millard encouraged Dr. Isoye receiving input for other stakeholders as well. Mr. Finnegan wanted a simple dashboard that tracked the District's goals to evaluate the Superintendent's performance. Ms. Patchak-Layman added that the other part of data was 360, getting the data and deciding how to use it. In terms of the District's overall performance, the Board of Education must decide the District's goals, i.e., year-long and longer-term. It is way to determine progress. Dr. Lee wanted to see the percentage of the entering ninth graders who were below grade level in reading skills and what did that percentage look like a year later, etc. Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted to have evidence as to the efforts that were made relative to the Board of Education goals. Dr. Lee concurred, but he wanted to see data relative to student academic performance/skills, e.g., how do the needs and the performance compare at this point in time, etc. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that might be a goal with specific activities under it. Another goal might be that everyone should go to college.

Dr. Isoye will work with Mr. Thieme, Mr. Carioscio, and DLT on a sample dashboard for the Superintendent's goals. He asked Board of Education members to send their dashboard requests to him with copy Ms. Kalmerton by the end of the year. At some point, Dr. Isoye will talk with the community about this but that would be combined with a long-term planning process and putting it in a coherent process. The discussions should position the District for five years or more as once the dashboard is set up so that trends can be tracked, it should not change.

Adjournment

The Instruction Committee meeting adjourned at 9:06 a.m. on Thursday, December 9, 2010.