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, November 13, 2008
7:30 a.m.
Board Room

A G E N D A

I.	Call to Order	Dr. Dietra Millard
II.	Approval of Minutes	Phil Prale
III.	Student Travel Presentation	Cindy Milojevic
IV.	Summer School Report	Dale Craft
V.	Textbook Review	Phil Prale
VI.	Additional Instructional Matters for Committee Information/Deliberation	Dr. Dietra D. Millard

Copies to: Instruction Committee Members, Dr. Dietra Millard, 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
October 15, 2008

An Instruction Committee meeting of the Whole Board was held on Wednesday, October 15, 2008 in the Board Room. Dr. Millard opened the meeting at 7:35 a.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, IV, Jacques A. Conway (departed at 9:11 a.m.), Valerie J. Fisher, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak Layman. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Jack Lanenga, Assistant Superintendent for Operations; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistance/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors included Kay Foran, OPRFHS Community Relations and Communications Coordinator; James Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Bill Grosser, OPRFHS Science Division Head; and Leigh Remack and Cathy McNary, OPRFHS faculty members.

Acceptance of Instruction Committee Minutes of September 18, 2008

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to accept the minutes of the September 18, 2008, Instruction Committee meeting, as presented.

Student Field Science Presentations

Mr. Grosser thanked the Instruction Committee members for allowing the Science Division to make a presentation. Mr. Grosser was impressed with the list of elected field studies that OPRFHS offered to the students:

Costa Rica Field Trip
Arctic Field Study Class
Field Geology Class in Washington State
Field Biology Class in Tennessee
Marine Biology Class in Florida

The sponsor of the Field Biology Trip to the Smoky Mountains, Ms. Remack, spoke about the experience. She reported that the students who participated began by meeting once per week during the spring semester to ready themselves for the two-week experience in August. The first week they traveled locally; the second week, they traveled to the Smoky Mountains.

A video, created with the help of the AV Studio class and to be used for marketing purposes, gave students an opportunity to share their experiences. They learned about

plants and animals, the environmental influences, research techniques, practical applications, meteor showers, catching snakes, hiking, and gained a greater appreciation of nature.

Mr. Prale stated that often student travel experiences are thought of as being international excursions, but this trip included a week of local study and a week in Tennessee. While this class is teacher-driven, it is also about the learning. Mr. Prale acknowledged that this was a huge amount of work for the teacher and he thanked both Mr. Grosser and Ms. Remack for their time and their work.

Discussion ensued.

Q: Are there problems recruiting students to participate?
A: Yes.

Q: What are the limitations?
A: 1) The amount of work students have to do to get ready for this trip, and 2) the advertising, although there is a good pool of students from which to draw and flyers were posted in other classrooms, etc. This year twelve students participated; other years the smallest group was 11 and the biggest group was 17.

Q: Is the cost of the trip prohibitive for some students?
A: Every year one student is recipient of the Alumni Association's support, which has been a very smooth process.

Q: Would 25 students be too many for this class?
A: No, but it would pose more challenges, require more buses, vans, chaperones, increase the cost of the trip, and would require more organization.

Course Proposals

Ms. Hill had provided a summary of the courses proposals, noting that the list as presented might not be the same one presented in December, as it has to be vetted by a number of stakeholders, e.g., Instructional Council, DLT, etc.

Dr. Weninger reported that last year given the number of proposals brought forward and the initiatives that were being implemented, a discussion had ensued about having a moratorium on course proposals. However, instead of that, Division Heads were informed that course proposals, in order to be brought forward, had to have one or more of the compelling reasons listed below.

1) part of logical sequence, e.g., Chinese 4, etc.;
2) a regular education course is not offered in Special Education, which should be offered to those special education students in self-contained areas; and
3) relative to student achievement.

World Languages

Add Chinese 3-4 to continue the development of the four language skills in Chinese.

Delete 411 French 1-2A because of lack of enrollment. Students would enroll in the French 1-2 course.

Delete 450 Italian 1-2A because of lack of enrollment. Student would enroll in the Italian 1-2 course.

Revise 499/2 World Languages & Cultures to make it a 2-semester course to ensure that both semesters of the course are open to students who need to satisfy the World Languages requirement.

Ms. Fisher was happy that the next course in the Chinese sequence would be offered but was sorry that the proposal for the deletion of the French and Italian honors level first year courses. Mr. Prale acknowledged that if a student were interested in taking French or Italian, he/she might be willing to work at the honors level. Students who had prior experience from the sender districts usually come in at Level 3 or 4. So, one is speaking to the pace of the course rather than the level of the student. It might be possible to offer students honors or an accelerated option within that course by differentiating the course content and then reflecting that on the transcript. It was noted that more students are enrolling at the regular level. Ms. Fisher wanted to encourage keeping the course line open so that these classes could be used as an escalator. Dr. Weninger suggested leaving them on the books to show what is being offered but with a disclaimer that if there were low enrollment, it would be combined with the regular level class. Marketing is important and if the school is going to encourage upper level languages, students need to see what is being offered. Mr. Prale stated that this could be brought back as a revision and not a deletion.

Business Education Department

Add Sport Management, a 1-semester course, which offers a comprehensive introduction to the sport management industry. The project-based curriculum provides students with hands-on opportunities within the OPRFHS Athletic Program. Along with Sport Marketing, this course would build a sports marketing/management continuum for our students.

Ms. Hill reported that although Division Heads had the guidelines for making proposals, some proposals did not rise to the level of compelling. This course proposal was presented to help build a sequence in the management marketing area that might assist the District in career education funding, providing students another opportunity in the area of business, etc. Questions did arise about whether this would better serve students if it were in a more generalized area. Although it was said that Sports Management is a

growing field and that students had expressed an interest in it, the case as to whether it was compelling was not made.

Add College Accounting A, a yearlong course designed for students who plan to operate their own business or major in business in college. This college-level course is designed to prepare our students for the CLEP Accounting test, which is accepted by most universities.

Dr. Millard observed that the difference between this and what was previously offered was that it was more accelerated and geared toward an accounting major vs. a general accounting class. Ms. Hill stated the attraction for this class was the ability to pass the CLEP Accounting test, which can draw college credit. However, the counselors reported that many of the top business schools prefer core academic classes, as rigorous as possible, on the transcripts, e.g., calculus, etc., as opposed to accounting.

Dr. Lee stated that some of the proposals are in the mix because of the dynamics of course proposals. If a teacher wants to offer a course, it is easier for Division Head to approve that request. Dr. Weninger stated that it was the District's expectation that Division Heads exercise leadership in that regard. They are not strictly to be the taker of a course proposal and then submit it. Division Heads have the responsibility to vet the proposal within the overall offerings in the divisions. Many courses were not brought forward by the Division Heads.

Ms. Patchak-Layman gave the Business Department gold stars for this year's and last year's proposals. She commended it for thinking out of the box, as it listened to the students' interests. She gave it credit for thinking about the students it has and trying to increase enrollment in its division in defense of thinking that honors courses are the only credible courses to take. Perhaps someone might decide to study accounting in college because of this course. Dr. Millard felt that students taking an accounting class and giving them additional, practical experience would help them work within the community. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that many students at the high school already have their own businesses.

<u>English</u>

Add Senior Composition, a 1-semester writing elective course for seniors to raise written communication skills. The course focuses on practical writing skills necessary in school and the workplace.

This course is for those students still needing assistance in writing, i.e., ACT, working on college essays, etc. Mr. Conway thought Fenwick High School also had a course for juniors/seniors designed to help the write their college essays. Mr. Conway reiterated that he wanted all students to have to apply to colleges. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that even good writers can get better and that this course should be made available to all students.

Fine and Performing Arts

Visual Arts. Revise the prerequisite for 668 Advanced Studio Art 1-2A and for 690 AP Studio Art 1-2 to Art Foundations, Drawing or Painting, or teacher recommendation and portfolio review.

Dr. Weninger was concerned about adding prerequisites to courses that students may want to try. If the intent is to open up these courses, then why have prerequisites, as that could discourage some students from enrolling in them.

Revise 661/2 Wheel Throwing by changing the course name to Beginning Wheel Throwing.

Revise the prerequisite for 666/2 Intermediate Wheel Throwing to Beginning Wheel Throwing or consent of instructor.

Music. Add Intermediate/Advanced Guitar to challenge students already proficient in guitar. Focus will be on improvisation, more advanced chords, and duet and ensemble techniques in many styles of music, including fold, rock, jazz, and classical.

Speech Arts. Delete Drama Explorations, a Summer School course, because of lack of enrollment.

Delete 107 Debate 1-2 because of lack of enrollment (freshman or sophomore level course)

Delete 108 Debate 3-4 because of lack of enrollment.

Delete 101/2 Introduction to Speech Communications because of lack of enrollment.

Revise 093/2 Acting Workshop to add the prerequisite of 091/2 Introduction to Theatre or consent of instructor. Adding the prerequisite improves continuity of the curriculum.

Revise 094/2 Directing Workshop to add the prerequisite of 091/2 Introduction to Theatre or consent of instructor. Adding the prerequisite improves continuity of the curriculum.

Q: Is speech communications being eliminated?

A: The courses have not run for years. The options for a yearlong elective course are restricted because of the student's class load. Previous discussion included the fact that the course was teacher-personality-driven and that has not been the case in recent years. A suggestion for a one-semester debate class was being considered. Mr. Allen suggested keeping Debate 1 and 2 and the four-year option, as students should have the opportunity to learn how to frame what needs to be said and to present their arguments. Mr. Prale said that OPRFHS does not currently have a speech requirement as a graduation requirement

Dr. Weninger asked if the English Division had ever discussed substituting one semester of freshman/sophomore year English for speech as a speech requirement as other schools have done. The expectations would be that as students move up sophomores, juniors and seniors, other classes would tap into it and it would become an instructional strategy.

Mr. Hunter stated that it was a Fine and Performing Arts decision to restructure years ago. OPRFHS ignores the talent the student population has; it is not addressed. The English Department has made a decision to support the writing aspect vs. the speaking aspect. It has gone nowhere from the perspective of taking time from the English coursework, as there is no time for it. The personality driven speech class was his. He once taught five sections of speech, but because of the turf battles between the Fine and Performing Arts Division and the English Division over jobs, OPRFHS had Fine & Performing Arts teachers teach this course. He repeatedly asks why speech is not made a graduation requirement.

Along the same lines, Dr. Lee noted that in a report on reading scores, between the classes of 2010 and 2011, the average White reading level is one-half to one-third of a year above the expected level. The average African-American reading level is one-half to three-quarters of a year below the expected level, yet there are no course proposals that have to do with reading. Mr. Hunter noted that English has responded by not taking a course approach to reading instruction but instead it looked at the students who need reading and targeted them. When the 9-period day was eliminated, it decreased the opportunity for courses and things of interest went to the side. The way to solve that would be to add more time in the day, which is unaffordable. With debate, there also are costs for transportation, registration fees, etc. When the debate program was eliminated at OPRFHS, his job was eliminated.

In debate travel, a ratio of four students to one teacher is needed. That is very high ratio and it is costly. In Chicago, debate is very good and so the students want to compete with other schools. Thus, students must travel and the teachers must travel with them or they will not be competitive. Debate was very expensive and was eliminated by the school. Dr. Weninger felt that it was a false argument to say that speech is not a part of writing and he wanted to engage in further discussion about speech as a graduation requirement or as a part of the English curriculum. Many more benefits are to be gained by students as they move through high school if they have a good foundations in speech, which entails writing, critical thinking, and confidence. Mr. Allen stated that speech is part of the concept of what literacy is.

Dr. Lee stated that while it has been stated that there is a renewed interest in reading, it does not show up in the course proposals. If that is the case, then how can it be made visible enough for members of the Board of Education to know that fact? Mr. Prale stated that it is embedded in the instruction. Every Division Head has been asked to 1) have a make reading improvement part of divisional goals, and 2) look for explicit reading strategies being used in the classrooms. In addition, the course formerly called Learning Support is now called Learning Support Reading, and is taught by English

teachers. The District has also changed its literacy-coaching model. Dr. Lee asked how the District would be determined whether this modified approach was working. Program assessment would include a review of grades and standardized test scores.

Family and Consumer Sciences

Revise 705 Clothing Construction and Design by adding, "Open to sophomores, juniors, and seniors," to encourage freshmen to enroll in 701/2 Exploring Family and Consumer Sciences.

Revise 717/2 Early Childhood/Preschool by removing the reference to experience in an "in-house preschool lab" and noted that student will learn lesson preparation and observation techniques.

No comment.

Math

Delete 2022 Survey of Algebra 1 because of lack of enrollment.

Delete 2062 Survey of Algebra 2 because of lack of enrollment.

No comments.

Special Education

Learning Development Program. Add Intermediate Algebra 1-2 Self-Contained to provide a second year of algebra to students in a self-contained academic setting.

Emotional Development Program. Add Computer Applications, a 1-semester course, to offer an introduction to computer technology to increase students' knowledge of computer use and applications. Successful completion of this course would fulfill the graduation requirement of computer proficiency.

Add Introduction to Marketing, a 1-semester course to provide a foundation to students interested in pursuing a career in advertising.

TEAM. Add Recreation and Leisure 1-2 to teach recreational and leisure skills to TEAM students, thus assisting them in developing social skills.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked why students were not being put in Business Ed classes with support. Ms. Hill replied that there was a concern that the students coming into that class were not having success, so it was felt that they would be more successful in a self-contained setting with support. If an IEP called for a one-on-one aide, of course it would be provided for the student in the work of the course.

Q: Was the instructor doing sufficient differentiation?

A: Yes.

Q: Would having an aide give more dollar flexibility rather than adding a new course?

A: No. Unless a one-to-one aide is identified by the IEP, hiring an aide is more expensive than adding a new course, as teachers teach multiple courses at the same time in this program. These teachers have to individualize and differentiate.

Q: This seems like an opportunity to give students an inclusion opportunity that is not in a core area. If that opportunity is removed, where are the other opportunities?

A: It is not removed. Some students do not succeed in that course. Those students need a place where they can take this course. Dr. Weninger saw the need in the ED Program for a parallel structure, but, perhaps, not so with that vision in the LD program for a cross-categorical program. Those students could benefit from the regular course with an aide placed across the curriculum and/or the day. He suggested looking at that option. Part of his long-range thinking was that the District could not afford to run an entire parallel curriculum in special education. While he could make a case for offering the special education courses as described, the costs could be prohibited. Yet, he acknowledged that there were learning needs to be satisfied.

Q: Are students with autism classified as learning developmentally or emotionally challenged?

A: It would depend on the learning programs affected. Many students are in the LD program are low incidence and are able to participate in most regular education classes. However, in some areas, the learning disability is more severe and these students are placed in the ED Program. The District always wants students to be placed in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Q: So, if students are not successful, are they are put into self-contained classes?

A: No, not everybody goes into self-contained classes, only those who need it. There are a number of instances where students are co-taught by both a Special Education and regular education teacher so they can have that mainstream experience.

Q: When a teacher teaches a number of classes, does he/she have endorsements for all of those courses?

A: Yes.

These courses will be presented again to the Board of Education after they have been presented to the parent groups, IC, students, and FSEC, etc.

Reading Report

Mr. Prale, Ms. McNary, and Dr. Spight compiled the following report on reading:

"The critical importance of reading as an essential skill in the success of students at the high school has been highlighted in the past year by many events including the Board of Education's resolution on reading from November 2007 and the participation of all District administrators in a reading across the content area workshop in August 2008 before the start of school. This report provides an update on several questions raised by Board members regarding results of efforts to improve reading scores at the high school. The Board of Education expressed interest in student growth in reading scores, and a summary of the reading assessments we use, beyond the standardized test scores derived from EXPLORE, PLAN and ACT tests.

"Regarding student progress as shown in reading scores, a review of 247 matched scores for current juniors, Class of 2010, most of whom are enrolled in regular college prep courses, show results similar to past years. Specifically:

- The average grade level reading score for these students at the end of freshman year is 10.36.
- The average subscore for these students on the reading test of the practice ACT test given to sophomores is 17.16.
- Data broken out by race show African American students scoring a full grade level below white students in reading and approximately 3 points below white students on the reading test subscore.
- Analysis of students likely to meet college readiness benchmarks predicts that the school will not make the 70% meets and exceeds mark for this year (these students are scheduled to take the PSAE this spring).
- A review of 178 matched scores for current sophomores, Class of 2011, most enrolled in regular college prep courses, shows a similar pattern.

"Regarding reading assessments used at the high school, the test used to measure reading level is the Gates-MacGinitie (GM). Benefits of using the GM include:

- The GM provides a nationally normed NCE score that can be used for comparison with other nationally normed tests as well as a percentile score, a grade-level-equivalency score, and a stanine score.
- The GM is divided into two subtests (vocabulary and comprehension), which may be given together or separately. Both are provided with nationally normed scores.
- Administering the GM is efficient and timely. The test can be given in a single class period, by a classroom teacher, and in a group setting. The test can be scored at the high school.
- The high school owns multiple grade levels and forms of the test, helping avoid test fatigue.
- The data provided by the GM is easy to manipulate, providing benchmark and growth measures.
- The GM is approved by the state and federal administrators of the Title I program.

"The main drawback of using the GM is that the GM is an achievement test and provides no instructional information. A student often achieves a less precise score on a group

achievement test than that student would on a diagnostic test that would yield individualized results.

"Reading teachers also conduct an Independent Reading Inventory (IRI) with selected students. This test is criterion-referenced and gives no normative information, but is designed to provide the classroom teacher with data about an individual student's reading skills so that the teacher may develop an efficient instructional plan. The IRI takes more time to administer and score, as much as two hours per student. The IRI also requires more training to administer and interpret. The school currently uses the Basic Reading Inventory by Jerry Johns.

"An alternative to the GM or the IRI is to use a nationally normed diagnostic test, such as the Woodcock Johnson (WJ) reading test. This test can be used to identify reading deficits in delayed readers. The WJ has four subtests, is given individually and takes approximately one hour to administer and between one and two hours to score. A reading specialist gives the test and while the test is costly in materials and time, it provides a detailed map of reading strengths and weaknesses.

"The above information has been shared in detail with other administrators and faculty.

"Regarding the reading scores of current students:

- Division Heads have been asked to follow up with the August workshop and incorporate a reading goal into the divisional goals for the school year and to work with teachers to use more reading strategies in daily classroom instruction.
- Additional licenses have been purchased for the Reading Plus and Lexia software to include regular education classes.
- Students whose reading scores indicate they will not meet state standards will be recruited for the CAP class and other test prep opportunities this spring.
- Test scores will be collected and reviewed regularly to assess progress and suggest changes.

"Regarding the reading test options:

- Continue with the Gates-MacGinitie and EXPLORE, PLAN, and I-ACT tests to track program effectiveness.
- Continue to use IRI materials with selected students to determine instructional needs.

"Faculty and administration will also consider how a pull out program for students with severe reading needs and the addition of a reading specialist could support and improve the teaching and learning of reading across classrooms."

October 15, 2008

Appendix of Summary Data

Table of Sample Students from Class of 2010 (current juniors) enrolled in regular courses

Race/Ethnicity	# of Students	Mean Reading Level End of 9th	# of Students	Mean Practice ACT Reading

		Grade, Spring 07		Subscore, Spring 08
White	124	10.86	129	18.27
African American	87	9.57	95	15.80
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	10.48	5	19.00
Hispanic	17	9.82	17	15.00
Multiracial	14	11.36	15	18.13
Total	247	10.36	261	17.16

Table of Sample Students from Class of 2011 (current sophomores) enrolled in regular courses

Race/Ethnicity	# of Students	Mean Reading Level End of 9th Grade, Spring 08	# of Students	Mean PLAN Reading Subscore, Spring 08
White	69	10.58	68	16.60
African American	68	9.21	76	13.88
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	9.17	7	16.14
Hispanic	11	10.90	12	16.83
Multiracial	15	11.07	15	15.47
Total	170	10.04	178	15.34

Mr. Prale introduced Ms. McNary as the teacher of the reading program, English courses, and a certified trainer of the CRISS Program. She has been instrumental in training approximately two-thirds of the teachers at OPRFHS. She and Mr. Prale also collaborated on the discussion of tracking the effectiveness of OPRFHS's program using reading scores. She has spearheaded, organized, and tallied data regarding student reading levels for all transition- and regular-level freshmen at the beginning and end of ninth grade and transition- and regular-level sophomores at the beginning and end of the tenth grade.

Discussion ensued.

Dr. Lee wanted more information regarding the kind of movement in reading levels that occurred between the beginning of ninth and the end of tenth grades. Mr. Prale said that had been a report given to the Board of Education and it could be revisited. Discussion ensued regarding the standardized assessment tests schedule and whether they provided this information.

Dr. Weninger acknowledged that the school does not have a consistent measurement of reading starting with the eighth or ninth grade. While logistical issues exist, he was concerned that if the GM were to show an increase in reading of two or three grade levels when the student was a junior, it would not be reflected by the PSAE. That is a huge

disconnect for the school, parents and the students. He wanted to determine a way to measure growth in reading and still satisfy the complexities.

Ms. McNary said that there were two issues. About 40 to 50 students read at the fifth grade level, 65 students are in College Prep and read at the same level of those in freshman transition classes, around the 5.5 grade level, and then another 35 to 50 students read a couple of years below the average reading level of the regular freshman. If one puts all the freshmen together at the end freshman year, OPRFHS's mean reading level is the same as the national reading level—9.7 percent. That is the 50th percentile. Projecting how these students will do on the ACT, she stated that they would stay at the 50th percentile. The way the "meets and exceeds" works is that everyone has to exceed beyond the 50th percentile. Mr. Prale stated that Ms. McNary had been able to determine that a group of students within the regular classes was reading below grade level and for them that instruction might not be effective or allow them to progress at the same rate as the other students in the program do. The issue is that every student needs to get that rate.

Discussion ensued about the frustration of not having a measurement to show why students exceed on the ISAT and not at the high school. Ms. McNary stated that there is not enough personnel to do the type of testing needed to substantiate those reasons. Dr. Lee asked why if the District could afford to have 30 or 40 AP teachers, it could not afford to have one FTE reading specialist. Mr. Prale stated that the District has two teachers with reading endorsements teaching in the English Division. The District has these reading teachers teaching reading. Mr. Rouse stated that at his former school, the decision was made to test all freshmen at the beginning and at the end of the year and to measure their academic growth. The problems relative to this extended testing were 1) the cost, 2) the time (shutting down the English department for that time), 3) someone to disaggregate data, and 4) then share the data with teachers in layman's terms. Students were then retested in April to see if there were any measurements of growth. Mr. Prale responded that some MSAN schools use the GM test. OPRFHS targets and tests regular- and transition-level students. Ms. McNary stated that the school is doing a good job of identifying students in terms of testing, but the focus must be on instruction rather than testing. The District needs to determine how to provide the instruction in an efficient manner. The District knows students are progressing, but it is similar to having parallel bars; all students are going up, yet the gap does not close. That is an issue of instruction, and not an identification issue. Mr. Prale referred to a report made a year ago on showing two linear regressions on reading scores and the EXPLORE and the ACT scores; it showed two parallel lines with a slight tilt at the upper end on the lower line. The gap started to close at the upper end. Those students with the skills sets of critical reading were able to improve themselves between their PLAN and PSAE scores. That taught teachers they must get better at instructional acuity in regular education classrooms, similar to what was happening in the honors courses. While all students progressed, the gap did not narrow. It is an instructional challenge. Dr. Millard asked if that could happen within the classroom with the teacher that is teaching or would it require putting students in a program that focused on reading. Ms. McNary was not a proponent of pulling students out of the classes, but was a proponent of teaching all teachers to be

teachers of reading with gusto, not phonetically, but critically and inferentially, which are the students' biggest deficits. All curriculum needs to reflect that reading is occurring.

Dr. Lee asked how practical it was to turn teachers from something that they were not into something that they should be. Mr. Prale stated that not only was practical, it was essential. When students are reading at a fifth grade level, but are not identified as special education, it is critical to have pullout programs, reading tutorials, etc. Engagement is also an issue. Often students with reading difficulties have had poor school experiences and it is difficult to engage them in the educational experience. The District needs to think about engagement, motivation, and the teaching of reading. No one has fixed this problem. Mr. Prale continued that even if the school increased the reading scores at a 50 percent rate, these students are still just "catching up." Because the District recognized that it needed to do more, it added Reading Plus training and more CRISS training for teachers.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if, in the process of helping students increase their reading ability, the students were given coping skills to bridge what was being asked for in the classes in ways of accessing that information while honing their reading skills. Mr. Prale replied that they give note-taking strategies, etc. In the Elements of Reading and in Essentials of Reading, there is a study skill component, which does teach these strategies. In regards to coping skills, Mr. Prale remembered a teacher who spoke about the background of students in Learning Support Reading; many emotional/social problems had to be dealt with before the teaching of reading could begin. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if auditory support was offered. If someone does not have the skills to read the chapter in the book, it does not mean he/she cannot understand it. Ms. McNary responded that the District uses everything it can to add to the experience, including audio books. Teachers of Learning Support Reading also help with the content of other instructional areas and they are invested in their students.

Mr. Hunter stated that teachers are engaged in CRISS training; numerous sections are offered every year. While the Board of Education's focus is welcome, it is expensive and he wanted everyone to know that the teachers are engaged in helping with this. Ms. McNary does a great job and the school does not get any credit for the gains being made. The Board of Education needed to change its focus to literacy. Ms. McNary agreed. OPRFHS is ahead of the game on learning strategies; the teachers are professionals and work diligently on this. Dr. Millard stated that more people and more money are necessary. There needs to be a discussion on the choices and the resources. Dr. Lee asked if there were more money, was the school prepared to say that this is the most effective way to spend that money. Mr. Prale stated that English 1 students also in Learning Support Reading were trying the more-minutes option; thus, having more time with their English 1 teachers. If there is an improvement, more dollars could be provided so that this experience could be extended into the sophomore year. However, evidence is necessary before asking for that funding. This evidence will include looking at the weighted GPA, tardy rate, discipline statistics, PLAN test and then compare that group of students to the students that were in the program last year. A report could be made in the February/March timeframe on this.

Ms. Patchak-Layman brought up the Sylvan methodology and its diagnostic activity. Ms. McNary stated that Sylvan creates its own diagnostic activity so that it can look successful. It is a marketing group. It uses short passages to train and students do better on short passages, but what they learn does not generalize and it costs lots of money. She did not recommend it.

Mr. Prale stated three reading assessment options:

1) the Gates MacGinitie;
2) Independent reading inventories, more one-to-one, individualized, and is administered with the 8 to 9 connections students; and
3) Woodcock Johnson, which is expensive but gives more specific diagnostics.

Ms. McNary responded to Ms. Patchak-Layman's question as to whether GM was used at the college level. The GM that OPRFHS uses goes to grade 13; however, the one used for adults would be considered the college level. The computer program that looks so promising, Reading Plus, does its own assessment and placement test. It is a good test; it is well engineered and focuses on vocabulary development, comprehension, and reading rate. Ms. McNary stated that OPRFHS has an effective testing progam. OPRFHS could do GM across the board, but the District is concerned about the population that is at risk, not the students who are doing well.

Going forward, the District will review the utilization of the Lexia and Reading Plus software, look at the Learning Support Reading Program and continue to review test score data to see if there is a narrowing between African-American students and white students with regard to their overall reading scores. Dr. Millard asked for proposals as to what would help and what the Board of Education could do to help. An update on reading will be presented at a future meeting.

Dr. Lee asked about data presented that had to do with math scores of 12 students. It was found that if the school addressed the needs of those 12 students, there would be little difference between the African-American students and other students. His point was that it was a small number of students who accounted for a large overall difference between the achievement levels of the African-American students and White students. Mr. Prale disagreed with that statement. Dr. Lee stated that no one had challenged that statement made a year ago by Dr. Spight on one particular math program. Ninety-five African-American students in the first group were tested. Is the difference between the average of 9.57 for the African-American students compared with the 10.86 for the White students due primarily to an even spread of the 95 students or is it more lopsided than that with a smaller number of highly deficient students. Mr. Prale said a scatter gram would have to be reviewed to determine that answer. Dr. Lee felt it was important for the Board of Education to know when it is talking about the overall movement in the achievement gap. One of the most important tools is where one can get the biggest bang for the buck in focusing time and attention to making the biggest change in the overall gap.

While Mr. Prale appreciated closing the gap on the small number of students who have the greatest deficiencies, he cautioned against focusing in on a number-driven orientation, as a number of students should have the same opportunities. Dr. Lee said that if the District is talking about, as a primary focus, just increasing the achievement level of all students then it should not be talking about closing gap; he was not ready to abandon the idea of closing the gap. The data was necessary. Ms. Patchak-Layman also wanted the scatter gram information. Mr. Prale will provide that information.

Defining Instructional Excellence

Ms. Hill informed the Instruction Committee members that since January 2008, the District has been working "to develop a set of outcomes, indices, timelines, and benchmarks for measuring student achievement as one component of a comprehensive definition of institutional excellence." Since May when the Instruction Committee received a draft of the document, it has been reviewed and revised with input from a variety of stakeholders, including students, faculty, community members, division heads, and district leadership. The Committee members received a copy of the revised document (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting).

Ms. Hill had informed the Committee that over the course of the current school year, the administration would continue to review and revise the specific components of this document with stakeholder input. The District will also determine how the values of achievement will be mapped or assigned across the curriculum, the co-curricular area, and the areas of Student Services and Student Health and Safety. Finally, it will determine responsibility for measuring and reporting student growth in each area and calendarize the reporting responsibilities.

Ms. Hill reiterated that this was not a final report. It would still receive input, including being shared with Citizens' Council members the next evening. The vetting process had been beneficial to the overall benefit of the document.

Dr. Weninger reminded the Board of Education that this was a critical document and it would be the basis on which the District will determine if it is achieving as a high school. As such, it will also be used to start the development of the quantitative mass measures of achievement goals. It is from this document that the District will determine the measures of achievement and this is the reason why so much time has been devoted to this document. He did hope that it would be complete by the spring of 2009, meaning taking the values of achievement under each of the categories, and then identifying the indices, the timeline, and the benchmark goals.

Discussion ensued.

Dr. Lee reflected that there were currently 55 to 60 sub-indicators in seven or eight categories. By completion, there could possibly be 60 to 70 sub-indicators. What happens past the list of 70 different indicators? How would that list be used? Dr. Weninger responded that the District would then develop a way of determining whether

the school was achieving based on the indices. He did not envision weighing the indices and then narrowing it down to a particular number. He continued that the beauty of the development is that there are nine categories of achievement. In each area, one would be able to see how students were doing academically in the future years, i.e., in three years, the District may be able to say that instead of closing the gap, achievement was substantiated by a variety of statements rather than by just one. The Board of Education will have to determine if one area of achievement would be more important than another one, if that were questioned.

Ms. Fisher noted that this was the most specific detail she has ever seen from OPRFHS and she looked forward to its development. Dr. Lee concurred and acknowledged the substantial development. Dr. Millard also acknowledged the work, the discussions, and the hours that went into it. While Dr. Millard found this document extremely student focused, she stated that students need their faculty, their families, and the community. She hoped to see the document broadened to incorporate the faculty and administrators, and then the expectation of parents and families. Ms. Fisher suggested that "later academic engagement" would embrace those items. Dr. Millard was still concerned about not listing expectations for the Board of Education, administrators, faculty, and family, etc. While Ms. Patchak-Layman concurred with adding the acknowledgement of the faculty, Ms. Fisher stated that the faculty is the fundamental vehicle, and that the report focuses on faculty inherently. Ms. Hill stated that when this project began, the idea was about defining institutional excellence in terms of student outcomes. The different perspectives are not mutually exclusive or contradictory. There is a measurement of the quality of faculty and administration in every area of the document. The faculty and administrative components are embedded; however, the term "institutional excellence" may be too broad. This document is a way to measure student achievement as a component of institutional excellence. Much of what has been said at this meeting has been discussed previously in various conversations. Ms. Hill reflected that a teacher once said, "Never put anything essential in the footnotes." Perhaps that is what she did. In the notes on the last page, there was a suggestion from the School Improvement Committee to add the community piece.

Dr. Weninger stated that the original purpose was to define institutional excellence for students in qualitative and quantitative form. However, works like this find a way of revealing where else excellence needs to be defined. What responsibility does the District have to define and then to work on the parental piece. It goes to the larger discussion of the four pillars: parents, community, school, and students. Definition of these domains may be a task to do, but it should be a separate document. Dr. Millard continued to want the document broadened to include the definition of excellence for the Board of Education, faculty, staff, parents, and community, as it takes a village and everyone needs to have an understanding of that.

Mr. Allen agreed, but stated that this Board of Education has a propensity for not acknowledging good behavior. The Committee jumped on the administration as soon as it received the document. This was the first comprehensive document he had seen that had the tools and measurements necessary to measure student achievement. He wanted

to commend the administration on a good job, as the document was helpful to him. In addition, he did agree that it would be good to see measurements for the administration, faculty, etc. Dr. Millard, Ms. Fisher, and Dr. Lee echoed Mr. Allen's comments, voicing their appreciation to all for the time the District had spent on preparing this document.

Dr. Lee argued in opposition to expanding the purpose and focus of the document. Its purpose was one—to define student outcomes. The additions proposed were things whose value can only be measured in terms of what is in this document. He did not believe that the administration should include what was wanted for the faculty as a part of this document. Nor was it more important to add to the document what was needed to improve the effectiveness of the Board of Education. If how the Board of Education functions does not have any effect on the measures of this document, then it does not matter. It would be superfluous to add things to this document for the faculty because it would not matter if they do not affect what is in this document. To throw everything else into this document diffuses the focus of the intent.

Ms. Patchak-Layman felt an input column was missing, e.g., if these are the indices, then the indices of what? The input is the teaching part of it. What is the school doing that will give the indices and what, perhaps, will be the benchmarks and goals? It becomes important for things such as key cognitive strategies. What is the input of that to know the indices and benchmarks? If it is just what students are doing now, e.g., four years of English, etc., then that is another part of what needs to be on the chart. She suggested including the number of students who have private tutoring for science classes. The indices here would suggest that the classes students are taking in science would give the school a direct measurement. However, some students take private tutoring, so it is not about what is happening only in those classes. Dr. Weninger asked her to clarify if she were asking to factor in cottage tutoring. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how something could be measured if the school was not teaching it. The District says to the community that it is going to measure the values of achievement in terms of study skills, but what is the District providing as an institution to increase that knowledge. What are the examples of study skills and where are they being taught in the school? If the District is not doing something proactive, there must be some other pertinent inputs. It is easy to see that math will be offered for three or four years for students in all of these classes, but when a statement says students will develop, have thinking skills, etc., there has to be input. Ms. Hill suggested this document was not the place for that because that request would entail including the curriculum of every course and how that curriculum would relate to each one of these. While important, it would be an injustice to the description of the work being done to get to these outcomes. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that if one does not talk about what the inputs are, where would the changes be made. Dr. Weninger stated that would be the next step. This is the implementation document and there will be action steps to support this document.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked again how the school tests for something not being taught. Mr. Rouse stated that the subject was being taught. Should a student decide on his/her own to go for tutoring to help them accomplish the goals, the school cannot control that. Ms. Patchak-Layman gave another example of "resolve conflicts constructively." What

is the school adding to the student's knowledge base that would help him/her to do this? Ms. Hill stated that the next approach would be to map these indices.

It was the consensus of the Committee members not to incorporate the input column as suggested by Ms. Patchak-Layman. Ms. Fisher stated that the Board of Education wanted to focus on the indices and that was the point of the Resolution. That is what is being responded to and this is an excellent beginning of mapping. She did not want it to become a greater product. If all external factors were added, the original purpose would be lost.

Mr. Allen suggested adding faculty and student evaluations. Dr. Weninger suggested that if there were one piece to add, it was the faculty. He suggested that DLT do this and bring it back as a separate companion document. He reminded the Committee that one of the reasons to start this was that there was frustration that everyone judged the high school based on a single score. Therefore, while some feel this document is cumbersome, he did not. The school can define itself in nine areas. He did not want to expand it nor condense it. To do that would be to fall into the trap of determining success by a single score. This does a wonderful job of getting to student achievement or excellence.

Mr. Rouse stated that one of the things he and Dr. Weninger had talked about was mirroring this document with the developmental assets document, which deals with the students' expectations and habits of achievement. He will bring together a representative group of students, faculty, community, administration, and staff, to determine what assets and habits of achievement are agreeable to everyone so that everyone can be held accountable.

Dr. Lee felt that they were about to lose sight of the need for having a multiplicity of documents each of which serves a specific purpose and is useful only in the context of what that document was intended to accomplish in the first place, e.g., the District's budget, etc. This document is as important as the budget and more things should not be added to it.

Dr. Weninger stated that this document was scheduled to be presented again to the Board of Education in the January timeframe.

Dr. Millard thanked the administration again for the work done on this document.

Ten years ago, Dr. Lee stated that the perception of the achievement gap was driven by the grade point average (GPA). Now the perception is that it is just by the PSAE. It is the school's job to educate people that there is more than one thing by which to measure academic achievement. People do not need to recognize 60 to 70 things as being important, but the school needs to work in terms of what is possible and what is possible within this lifetime. He would like to see the District develop the Institutional Excellence Document completely and then condense it to something that is understandable by the public and to the District. He hoped that there was resistance to building this into what

would amount to a monument stack of paper that becomes useless because of its size. He thought this was a danger.

PSAE/ACT Test Prep Results

Ms. Hill had prepared the following report:

"Each year in the spring we offer ACT test preparation opportunities to our junior students. During the second semester of 2007-2008, in addition to the privately-run ExcelEdge course we have facilitated for years, we ran a for-credit course called College Admissions Preparation (CAP), whose curriculum was primarily test preparation for the ACT and WorkKeys exams that comprise the PSAE. We identified students whose prior standardized test scores and junior year math courses suggested that they were within reach of meeting standards on the PSAE if they were given additional support. Forty students enrolled in the course, which met every day throughout the second semester. Students received preparation in all of the ACT subject areas only—English, math, reading, and science; however, this report focuses on their test results in reading and math.

"Test results for the CAP participants reveal a mixed picture with regard to the effectiveness of the program. Within the group of 40, matched test scores from the sophomore year IACT and junior year PSAE-ACT are available for 37 participants. Their results can be compared to a control group of 42 students who were invited to participate in the CAP course but declined or were unable to do so for scheduling reasons. CAP students were more likely than their control group peers to see score gains in reading beyond the predicted range of growth from the IACT to the PSAE-ACT (54% v. 33%). In math, CAP students were more likely to grow within or beyond the expected range of growth than were students in the control group (78% v. 62%), though the proportion with scores beyond the expected range of growth was only slightly higher than among the control group.

"On absolute measures, the CAP students also demonstrated higher performance than their non-prepped peers. The average reading score for CAP was 18.2, compared to 17.2 for the control group; the average math score for CAP was 18.1, compared to 17.2 for the control group. However, the CAP averages were well below the junior class average (23.4 in reading and 23.2 in math) and the average for students enrolled in the ExcelEdge test prep program (25.6 in reading and 26.9 in math).

"CAP participants were only slightly more likely than students in the control group to meet or exceed standards in reading on the PSAE (27.5% v. 26.2%), and they were far less likely to meet or exceed compared to students in the junior class, as a whole (67%), and to students in the ExcelEdge course (82%). In math, nearly twice the proportion of CAP students met standards compared to the control group (40% v. 21%); compared to the overall group (69% Meets/Exceeds) and to the ExcelEdge group (84% Meets/Exceeds), CAP students met and exceeded standards at a much lower rate.

"The analysis indicates that participation in the CAP course had an overall positive impact on students' test performance, though the effectiveness in helping students meet standards was less than we had hoped.

"We should offer two CAP sections again this spring, working with last year's results to hone the program and perhaps tailor instruction more specifically to individual students' needs. It is worth noting that in both reading and math, seven CAP participants missed the cut score for meeting standards by five or fewer points (on a 200-point scale). A more explicitly data-driven instructional approach would help teachers more effectively identify students' areas of strength and weakness and monitor their progress toward meeting standards."

Additional Instructional Matters for Deliberation

Baldridge Program

Dr. Weninger referred to a prior conversation regarding the District's exploration of implementing the Baldridge Program at the high school. Dr. Weninger reviewed much information about that program and he was in the process of inviting someone from the Lincoln Foundation to talk with the Board of Education about this approach within the next couple of months.

Indicators

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that the Board of Education has not yet had a discussion of the indicators that are a part of the District's goals. There has been no discussion as to whether the Board of Education wants the ones proposed and how they would be translated into the evaluation of the superintendent. Dr. Millard will speak with other committee chairs in consultation with Dr. Weninger and Mr. Conway about where to have this discussion.

Adjournment

The Instruction Committee adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Oak Park and River Forest High School
District 200

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Dale Craft

DATE: 11/12/2008

RE: Summer School Report — Information

BACKGROUND

The District's summer school program was run from June 11 through July 18. 1,186 students took at least one course during this time. Courses ranged from remedial courses in math to field studies in Costa Rica.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

See attached.

RECOMMENDATIONS (OR FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

For information only.

2008 SUMMER SCHOOL REPORT

The Oak Park and River Forest High School's summer program served 1,186 students with combined paid registrations totaling 1,786 opportunities for enrichment or remedial credit. There were fifteen sections of Health, six of Art Foundations and Consumer Education, and four of Keyboarding. The English Division presented ten offerings to help students improve their academic performance. The History Division offered two general classes and four classes for remedial credit. The Mathematics Division ran thirteen sections of courses allowing students to fulfill a credit due to a failure or to advance their mathematics course work. Driver Education continues to be a popular offering and again was filled to capacity. We continued to offer enrichment courses in pottery, photography, computer animation and musical theater. The Science Division offered three stimulating field study opportunities in Tennessee, Florida and Costa Rica.

The summer school budget ended with a surplus of $50,670.00. We worked diligently to hold down expenses and cancelled classes when enrollment did not justify another section. The summer musical of Cinderella ended with a $6,732.00 surplus. This is the first time in three years the musical has finished in the black. Thanks to Doug Wiley in the Business Office, we worked to develop new budget lines to better reflect current revenues and expenses. This will help us to better track expenses to help us manage our resources in the coming years. After last summer's successful pilot of the online registration with RevTrak, we expanded online registration for all classes. We continue to experience positive feedback from the community on the convenience of the system.

The Oak Park Youth Township Service provided $2,400.00 in funding for students in need through the Work/Study Volunteer Program. Twenty-four students participated in the program to subsidize the cost of either academic classes or sports camps. Altogether, these students performed 480 hours of volunteer service for the benefit of the Oak Park and River Forest communities.

I believe we experienced a successful summer school. Few problems arose regarding discipline, and overall, a positive atmosphere for teaching and learning was sustained, thanks to the combined efforts of the teachers and support staff. We presented students with 1786 opportunities for academic credit and over 98% were successful. Many thanks go to Summer School Secretary, Linda Hayes, for taking care of the many details, especially those concerning the course registration process.

Submitted by Dale Craft, Summer School Director

Oak Park and River Forest High School
District 200

201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Instruction Committee Members
FROM: Director of Assessment and Research
DATE: November 13, 2008
RE: Textbook Recommendation

BACKGROUND
The English Division recommends use of The Crying of Lot 49 by Thomas Pynchon for the course 145: AP College English.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
The Director of Assessment and Research has reviewed the textbook and recommends its adoption by the Board of Education. Attached is the Textbook Adoption Form for the proposed textbook.

RECOMMENDATIONS
It is recommended that the Instruction Committee recommend that the Board of Education approve the adoption of the above-named textbook for the above-named coursesat its regular Board of Education meeting.

OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL

TEXTBOOK ADOPTION FORM

Division: English

Course Name(s): AP College English

Course Code(s): 1451 – 9 and 11

Grade Level of Course: Seniors

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX ☑ Core Text ☐ Supplementary Text

(A copy of the proposed text must accompany this form.)

Title: The Crying of Lot 49

Author(s): Thomas Pynchon

Publisher: Harper

Copyright Year: 1966 Edition: 4th ISBN #: 0-06-091307-X

Type of Cover: Soft OPRFHS Bookstore Cost to Student: $ 12.00

Please complete the appropriate portion below. See attached

Text replaces the following book:	Text is in addition to the following book(s) also used in this course:	
Title:	Title:	Title:
Publisher:	Publisher:	Publisher:
Year of Adoption:	Year of Adoption:	Year of Adoption:
OPRFHS Bookstore Cost: $	OPRFHS Bookstore Cost: $	OPRFHS Bookstore Cost: $

QUALITIES OF PROPOSED TEXT

(Completion of this entire section is mandatory. Attach additional sheets if needed.)

Readability Score: 6.4 (See reverse for instructions.)

Please Attach Reading Level Documentation.

Positive Qualities of the Proposed Text: It's one of the great-st novels of the second half of the 20th Century.

Evidence of Title IX and Cultural Pluralism: The characters are culturally diverse.

ENDORSEMENTS

(Signatures are required prior to submission to the Director of Assessment & Research.)

Division Curriculum/Textbook Selection Committee: _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Division Head: S. Garvin Date: 11/3/08

Director of Assessment & Research: Thyra Briggs Date: 11/4/08

Date of Approval by Board of Education: _____

Bancroft, Milanne

From: McGinnis, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2008 8:48 AM
To: Bancroft, Milanne
Subject: FW: Book costs

Here are the prices.

From: Charette-bassirirad, Jacqui
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2008 8:46 AM
To: McGinnis, Nancy
Subject: RE: Book costs

(Price including 10% tax)

The Stranger = **$8.85** ($9.74)
Heart of Darkness &The Secret Sharer (in one book) = **$4.00** ($4.40)
Beloved = **$11.30** ($12.43)
King Lear (Folger)= **$4.85** ($5.34)
Light in August = **$11.30** ($12.43)
Essential Literary Terms = **$21.25** ($23.38)

Jacqui Charette-BassiriRad
Bookstore Manager
Oak Park & River Forest High School
201 North Scoville Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60302-2296
708.434.3140 - Tel
708.358.8540 - Fax

From: McGinnis, Nancy
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2008 3:13 PM
To: Charette-bassirirad, Jacqui; Jones, Sharon
Subject: Book costs

Jacqui or Sharon – Would you please let me know the cost of each of the following books for the AP College English classes:

The Stranger
The Secret Sharer
Heart of Darkness
Beloved
King Lear (folger)
Light in August
Essential Literary Terms

Thank you so much.

Nancy