

**OAK PARK and RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL
201 N. Scoville Ave., Oak Park, Illinois 60302**

**BOARD OF EDUCATION
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
Thursday, December 9, 2010
7:30 AM
Board Room**

A G E N D A

- | | | |
|------|--|--------------------------------|
| I. | Call to Order | Dr. Ralph H. Lee |
| II. | Approval of Minutes | Dr. Ralph H. Lee |
| III. | SIP Update | Nate Rouse |
| IV. | Dashboard Discussion | Mike Carioscio
Chris Thieme |
| V. | Additional Instructional Matters for
Committee Information/Deliberation | Dr. Ralph H. Lee |

Docket: Differentiated Instruction

Copies to: Instruction Committee Members, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Chair
Board Members
Administrators
Director of Community Relations and Communications

Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 N. Scoville
Oak Park, IL 60302
An Instruction Committee of the Whole Board
November 11, 2010

An Instruction Committee meeting was held on Thursday, November 11, 2010, in the Board Room. Co-chair Mr. Finnegan opened the meeting at 7:36 a.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy Leafe McCormack, and Sharon Patchak Layman. Also present were Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Lauren M. Smith, Director of Human Resources; Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Micheline Piekarski, Food Service Director; Tina Halliman, Director of Special Education; and Christy Harris and John Massena of Concert Tour Association.

Approval of October 14, 2010 Instruction Committee Minutes

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to accept the October 14, 2010 meeting minutes, as presented.

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

Mr. Isoye presented the Instruction Committee members with the latest draft of the DIP. He reminded them that previously OPRFHS, as a single school district, had to provide only a SIP. That is not the case this year, however. The DIP was presented to Citizens' Council for its review and comment and Mr. Rouse will present it to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) Team. The Board of Education will be asked to approve this at the regular November Board of Education meeting and to submit of a form signed by the Board of Education president, the Superintendent, and the Principal, assuring the District is looking at its work as being research based. The DIP provides the framework of the SIP. The SIP Team will carve out the indicators, divide that work among its members, and then write the text to complete the SIP. He also planned to bring forward a draft of the SIP at the November Board of Education meeting. Committee members were encouraged to contact the administration directly with any further questions as this is a fast moving project. Mr. Isoye stated that after working with the West 40 representatives, an extension was received to submit the report.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked about the evidence of instruction and the level of development and their descriptions within the DIP. Mr. Isoye noted that this document is designed for school districts with multiple buildings: the state wants to see that support is being provided in the different areas/venues. Mr. Rouse added that when something is marked fully implemented, no further evidence has to be provided.

Ms. Patchak-Layman referred to #2, "District Sets District School and Student Subgroup Achievement Targets" where the evidence says that the District has accepted the state's

target. The school has not set its own benchmark targets for its students or school or varied the achievement for any of the conversations about defining success for the students. Many of these sections were answered in the current terminology. While the evidence says that the Board of Education has provided uniform vision for school improvement, she has not seen that as fact. There are varying ideas among the Board of Education members as to what constitutes school improvement. She asked how the District came to full implementation and how was the evidence decided? Mr. Isoye responded that it was marked full implementation because while there are differences of opinions, there was consensus on closing the achievement gap. He did not want to add a strategic plan to this document, even though there has been discussion about that. This is a living document and may be amended based on the Board of Education's direction. Regarding student achievement, he used the template that the state provided on how Districts are to benchmark. From his previous work in creating DIPs, he found that if he strayed from the language the state used, his work was returned. The state is interested in knowing how the District is operating relative to the PSAE. The SIP, however, will be more specific as to the types of achievement benchmarks in areas such as reading and math. Dr. Lee did not believe it was possible to deal with Ms. Patchak-Layman's issues in this context as this document is one where the proper words have to be inserted at the proper time. It is a way to document the activity. While he felt it would accomplish some good things, it will not address her issues. He believed that to be the case because the Board of Education has yet to clearly state its policy on reading and math skills. The Board of Education's present de facto policy is to "sit and wait" to see how things will develop.

Mr. Finnegan reiterated that this was a living document with a timeline/deadline that the District must meet, the details of which will be discussed at a later date. Mr. Rouse, as the SIP's Process Manager, stated that the SIP Committee consists of 20 to 25 people that must address 79 indicators. After this form is completed, smaller groups will continue with this work, e.g., DLT, BLT, IC, etc.

Ms. Patchak-Layman inquired as to whether this document would have a preamble explaining that it is a working document and may or may not be what is actually occurring because of past performance. It is important for the community to know that this plan will mean more than the previous plans and that something different will happen. Mr. Rouse, too, hoped that the community would see this as being different, e.g., talking with Citizens' Council, having conversations about common core standards in history, science, math, and English, etc. The District wants to challenge itself. The concerns raised are the reason for the state changing the SIP template and the close monitoring of it.

Review of Course Proposals

Mr. Prale and Ms. Hill reviewed the final course proposals for the Academic Catalog 2011-12. The courses that had not made it through final cut included the honors option for the composition course, Digital Music, and College Admissions Preparation, etc. College Admission Prep was deleted because the data showed that students taking this course did not improve their test scores and it would be better to provide them with alternative support in their courses.

The course outline for Business Education's Sports Entertainment and Marketing was provided in response to Mr. Allen questions last month. Mr. Allen was still disappointed. His question had to do with the proposal relative to the combining of activities that would happen in the class and whether it met the class description in the *Academic Catalog*. Mr. Allen continued that his objection to the Sports Entertainment and Marketing Course was the depth of work put into the proposal, as the rationale was not descriptive, e.g., where did the demand originate from, did it satisfy any need, or to which Board of Education goal was it aligned? He did not know how this help racism as it portended that all women enrolled in the course would drop out. Mr. Prale had misunderstood Mr. Allen's question thinking it was about justification of the name change relative to sports marketing rather than efficiency of the proposal. The new Business Education Division Head Ms. Roodhouse supplied the information relative to the course title change per Mr. Prale's request.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked about the differentiation in the Women's Voices, Anthropology class, etc. Could differentiation occur in other classes so that students could receive more than the basic instruction offered, depending on the depth and breadth of the student interest or skill level? Mr. Prale responded that there are always enrichment opportunities in a course, but an honors option could only be available when planned for, it was reflected in the catalog, and the course outline was presented to students. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that a number of courses have syllabus such as keyboarding that indicate what the course should accomplish, but students receive no variation of work targeted to their knowledge base. Mr. Prale stated that the computer proficiency course has different placement options and other courses could meet this requirement. Students may test out of the class entirely at different times during their high school career if they can demonstrate a level of skill.

Ms. Patchak-Layman appreciated the rationale and the descriptor under Women's Literature as she felt there was much advantage to having regular and AP students in one class so that all can participate in the conversation. Because it is important for students in this school to have more opportunities to be together and if this model works, she would like to see this model go forward in other classes. She was concerned, however, with the present model of having to wait until teachers propose the differentiation. Mr. Prale stated that if the Board of Education wanted to have differentiation in a keyboarding class, etc., the teacher could be approached. Another example would be whether Computer App and Computer App A could occur in the same period since both of these models already run. Should a core class have the AP option, i.e., American History, how would students be prepared and what options would be available if they decide not to go forward with it. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that the Board of Education pursue this direction. Mr. Prale stated that it would also become a part of the counseling curriculum to match the course with the student's expectation of the course. Students choose to take courses based on previous recommendations/experiences. Yes, there is a predetermined set of ideas as to course outcomes and teachers must prepare for that in effect. He felt there was a match between student course placement and teacher expectation. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the high school has three targeted class levels (basic, regular, and honors) and a percentage of students fit those levels. However, the gap students are ill served by classes that have a straight syllabus and cannot push it to get the most out of those classes. Mr. Finnegan suggested bringing a discussion on differentiated course models to another meeting.

The Acting 2B and 2A was not accepted because an additional course in the Catalog Acting Portfolio Audition already existed in the sequence.

Digital music was not brought forward because of its cost compared with other anticipated expenditures in the music department. Ms. Roodhouse also said the facility could be created on a smaller scale with the present number of computers and the software is included in this year's budget, thus making it possible for students to move through a sequence. Grant money will also be explored for the other costs if/when more students express an interest.

Mr. Prale stated that approximately 20 students were expected to enroll in Calculus 3, Investigative Research, and Bio Medical, all advanced classes, some of which might run every other year. Middle school students who take advanced math often enroll in more advanced levels in their senior year. If the registrations do not rise to the expected level, the courses will not run. Investigative Research would likely run at a minimum of 18 registrations: some of the activities that would lead to it would include Project Lead The Way, the Percy Julian Symposium, independent research, and summer science step up, credit recovery and a bridge to AP Bio courses.

Discussions about adding music, etc., into the GPA have now occurred with the members of Instructional Council, the Physical Education Department, members of the previous Philosophy of Grading Committee, Dr. Spight, and associate schools. This change will be included in the proposals brought forth to the Board of Education at its regular November meeting.

A suggestion was made to invite Ms. Halliman to this meeting to explain the need for developing separate courses for Special Education students rather than enrolling them in existing regular education courses. This question was specifically about creating a separate African-American Studies Class for SED students. Ms. Halliman stated that these students, while having an average to above average academic ability, have social emotional needs, e.g. mental health issues such as severe anxiety or severe depression, etc., and per the IEPs, these students warrant smaller environments. These students must be taught by a certified Special Education teacher. The District tries to develop ways to give these students the same opportunities as regular education students. She noted that Mr. Vance will teach this section to make sure the class is mirroring the regular education class.

OPRFHS offers twenty sections of REI classes, many more than offered in other high schools. Typically these classes are only offered in the core classes, but OPRFHS offers a variety of classes. The majority of students in REI classes are identified as Learning Disabled (LD), but some are Emotionally Disabled (ED). Of the more than 500 students identified as Special Education, roughly 299 or approximately 70% of these students can access these classes. The District tries to mainstream LD students into regular education classes. Mr. Prale suggested inviting Dr. Halliman to address any additional issues to a meeting in the spring and sharing any additional questions with either Mr. Isoye or Mr. Prale.

Additional Information

Dr. Lee reflected on the state's annual highlighting of reading and math skill levels, i.e., AYP. NCLB was originally structured so that it was literally impossible to meet its goals

and the District's response to that has been that it is obviously faced with an impossible challenge. He continued that the Board of Education has a de facto policy of being hands-off relative to basic educational policy, e.g., and asked if there should be a policy as to whether there was any unacceptable reading skill level for a student graduating, etc.? He believed the Board of Education should discuss whether it should attempt to set the most basic tenets of educational policy. Mr. Isoye noted that his research does not show any boards of education that have done so. Mr. Prale stated that these types of tenets (policy) usually re-state the state's graduation requirements, which OPRFHS has.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that sometimes policies read that students will be equipped to do a job or go to college and the administrative practices reflect that or that students will take "x" number years of English and be able to read at a set rate. Ms. Patchak-Layman reflected that national conversations have occurred about setting goals with the communities knowing that when a student graduates he/she will be able to do "x." When asked what the pros and cons to such a policy might be, Mr. Prale responded as follows. The pros would include accountability which could lead to productivity, e.g., improved reading levels, etc. The cons would include be how to effectively differentiate for students who will never arrive at standards.

Mr. Rouse stated that the assurance document required by the SIP addresses the District's planning, including the strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards. He felt that they addressed the issues raised by Dr. Lee. The expectation is that the District must align its curriculum to the standards. Mr. Isoye continued that Race To the Top also changed the level of accountability, so much so that the country is moving toward a national trend of Core Standards, and 38 states have now approved them. The Core Standards will look at content and readiness skills more robustly than in the past. They will be the footprint into the future in accountability for most states in the terms of assessment. Discussions about standards continue to evolve. Schools must understand differently and District 200 is learning as quickly as possible, even though information is created and changed daily.

Ms. McCormack was unsure how to answer the question of policy without an idea of a policy, as the specificity of the language may make a difference. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that a preliminary discussion occurred at last PEG meeting about this topic. Part of the discussion is about a content-based policy; should the discussion continue in the Instruction Committee as to what types of things should go into the policy, and then should it go to the PEG Committee to work on the specifics of the language. She suggested asking the questions and then determining how the responses would be included in a policy. The responsibility rests with the administrative procedures that go with it, e.g., delineating the responsibility and actions for it, etc. There was consensus for Ms. Patchak-Layman and Dr. Lee to work on a shell of a policy to the Committee of the Whole.

Initially, Mr. Isoye concurred with Mr. Prale that there is a level of action that comes with this type of policy. However good the intended consequences for students are, many exceptions would have to be made for those students who had done their best but had not met the set level, e.g., students who had transferred into the District, etc., thus causing a need for op-out options to graduate which would dilute the policy and send a different

message. Some policies have more depth than others: some are more managerial in nature and some are more instructionally oriented. He suggested that the Board of Education consider the administration's workload and to consider this as a goal if it wanted to pursue this. While understanding the benefits of such a policy, he acknowledged the significant deficits stated previously. Dr. Lee stated that he believed that these things could be dealt with, but not easily or quickly.

Ms. Patchak-Layman recently read an article in the *Wednesday Journal* on records sharing with Districts 90 and 97 and asked how the District planned to change its methods for placing freshman students in classes. Mr. Isoye noted that conversations with the feeder schools, who are working with their attorneys on this issue, were occurring. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the parents might be part of the transition planning and Mr. Prale stated that no conversations have occurred about that. Mr. Rouse, however, stated that parents have always been involved as they have always had the opportunity to challenge the District's placements or recommendations.

Dr. Lee attended a Triton College Community Advisory Board meeting where it was reported by the president of Triton that only thirteen percent of the students enrolled at Triton had not needed additional help in reading and that only sixty-two percent of its incoming students had not needed additional help in math. He felt that Triton's data could be helpful to OPRFHS. Ms. Hill responded that OPRFHS and Triton are planning a data sharing session. Triton's data comes from the Compass Test, which, too, is an ACT product.

Mr. Finnegan summarized that future Instruction Committee discussions should include 1) differentiated learning model in core courses, 2) further discussion on Special Education students and work opportunities, 3) explicit board policy on standards and rolling curriculum into that.

Adjournment

The Instruction Committee meeting adjourned at 9:18 a.m. on Thursday, November 11, 2010.

Oak Park and River Forest High School
District 200
201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Board of Education
FROM: Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal
DATE: 12/3/10
RE: SIP Update

BACKGROUND (From 11-12-10 memo)

As we begin SIP planning for the 2010-11 School year, there are several changes in the way in which we are required to fulfill this requirement. First and foremost, the template for submitting our SIP is significantly different. ISBE has given us a “mandated opportunity” to use a reporting system entitled *Rising Star*, which requires us to include strategies and activities that support the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards and ensures alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with the Illinois Learning Standards. *Rising Star* is a navigational tool that provides a structure for improving performance and it is built using indicators of effective practice. It helps schools build and sustain momentum. The 79 indicators of effective practice of the school and classroom are organized into the categories of 1) Continuous Improvement, 2) Learning Environment, 3) Educator Quality, and 4) Teaching and Learning.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The *Rising Star* Program is a response to the need for accountability. This new system asks schools to look at a continuous improvement model that can be changed periodically, with formal visits every two years. The attached documents represent the draft work of the committee thus far. The Continuous Improvement Framework for Schools using *Rising Star* breaks the SIP into 4 Phases which are 1) SmartStart, 2) SmartPlan, 3) SmartAction, and 4) SmartCheck. Each Phase represents a critical component of the plan, which speaks to indentifying critical needs, assessing and reviewing the plan, implementation, and the evaluation and monitoring of the plan; all by April 8, 2011. Attached is Phase 2 of the plan. Phase 1 was provided to the BOE in November.

Should you like to view the information through ISBE, the Login Information is as follows:

To open the login page, go to www.centerii.org and click the – Login- button at the bottom left side of the web page. Login: **guestSIL4760** Password: **guestSIL4760**

Next Steps

Our next steps are to complete Phase 2 of the plan and submit to ISBE by December 17, 2010. We would like to vet Phase 2 through our DLT, IC, and Citizen’s Council prior to submitting. I will also share with APPLE parent membership next week.