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I. Call to Order Dr. Dietra D. Millard

II. Approval of Minutes Phil Prale

III. PSAE Plans Amy Hill
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VI. SIP Update Nathaniel Rouse

VII. Textbook Approval Nathaniel Rouse

VIII. Additional Instructional Matters for Committee Amy Hill
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An Instruction Committee of the Whole Board
January 15, 2009

An Instruction Committee meeting of the Whole Board was held on Thursday, January 15, 2009 in the Board Room. Dr. Millard opened the meeting at 9:14 a.m. Committee members present were Jacques A. Conway, Valerie J. Fisher, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak Layman (arrived at 7:59 a.m.). Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment; Cheryl Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors included Kay Foran, OPRFHS Community Relations and Communications Coordinator; James Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair, Dale Craft, PE Division Head, and Amy McCormack, parent.

Acceptance of Instruction Committee Minutes of December 11, 2008
It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to accept the minutes of the December 11, 2008, Instruction Committee meeting. Dr. Millard applauded Ms. Kalmerton for her thorough reporting of the meetings.

Summer School Session
Mr. Craft reported that the 2009 Summer Session would consist of twenty-seven (27) instructional days beginning Wednesday, June 17, 2009 and ending Friday, July 24, 2009. Three sessions will be offered each day with the last session devoted to the summer musical. No school will be held on Friday, July 3, 2009. He provided budgets from recent years and projects for the coming year. No significant changes were projected for this year’s course offerings and the District continues to offer a wide selection of regular, elective, and remedial classes.

He recommended no increase in the tuition cost for each section, as the current tuition fee per class was $180. He did recommend an increase of $5 for the class supply fee for classes like Art Foundations. He also recommended a $50 increase for teacher compensation per section, representing a 2.2 per cent increase for a total compensation of $2,400 per section taught. When asked if the compensation was a detriment to having OPRFHS teachers teach the classes, Mr. Craft replied there had not been any complaints, as generally OPRFHS teachers teach classes that are for students who have failed or who are trying to catch up on their coursework. Approximately 10 to 15 percent of the summer school teachers are out-of-district teachers and teach such courses as keyboarding, art foundations, etc.
Mr. Prale complimented Mr. Craft on his leadership and demonstrating more fiscal accountability in order to attempt to have a balanced budget. He has made tough decisions to cut some programs when there were not enough registrations.

In response to Dr. Millard’s question, Mr. Prale stated that District 97 and OPRFHS Title I Funds pay for the tuition of students for the 8 to 9 Connection Program. Two teachers from District 97 and two teachers from District 200 participate in this program. There were distinctions between this program and that of summer school. Mr. Craft monitors the 8 to 9 Program and Kris Johnson, the Director of the 8 to 9 Connection Program, is available for other summer school students.

**Requested Information**
Ms. Patchak-Layman at a previous Finance Committee requested information as to how instruction related to the phase-in dollars of 2005. From the information in the packet, Dr. Weninger highlighted the fact that 16 FTE positions had been funded with phase-in money to address Special Education mandates, additional graduation requirements mandated by the Governor, etc. These positions totaled 82.7 percent of the total of the $1.5 million or $1.3 million. Mr. Prale explained that in 2005, the Board of Education and the administration had made a commitment as to what the phase-in dollars would support. A structure was created to keep internal accountability and the chart presented showed that the District kept its word in how it used those dollars.

When Dr. Lee asked if the Board of Education had an obligation to use these funds for these programs in the future, he was told that no timeline had been placed on them by the then sitting Board of Education. Dr. Lee felt it was inevitable that someone could in the future say that these dollars belong to these specific programs and that the dollars would not be allowed to be removed from the programs. Dr. Weninger stated that the programs are reviewed internally and strategic decisions are made from year to year. He spoke of the example when money had been set aside for something specific and yet the funds were not used last year for that purpose. As a result, the funds were used to fund a resource manager this year.

Dr. Millard commented on the tremendous debate by the Board of Education in taking the phase-in money and there had been opposition to it. As the programs that would benefit students were debated, there was a consensus in the discussion that there was a specific purpose for taking this money, which was to focus on programs for students with specific needs that, perhaps, had not been addressed appropriately. The Board of Education asked the administrators to remain vigilant about how the money was spent so that the Board of Education would feel comfortable asking the community for more of the phase-in dollars. She left with the feeling that the funds would be designated for these programs, and that she could not place it into any program that she wanted.

Dr. Lee was concerned about how the District would react if it were hit with a financial disaster, e.g., the explosion of the field house, etc. When dollars are attached to specific programs in this way, these programs can be thought of as the programs that were funded with this “extra” money. Now that the school is in a financial pinch, it would be logical
that these things might be removed from the budget because they were funded with extra money, signifying that they were less important than the rest of the school’s program; he considered that invalid thinking. Mr. Prall concurred, noting that not everything on the page held the same weight. Some areas were reflected as requirements, e.g., state mandates to have additional math, English and science, etc. Other items such as the summer school transition programs might have more flexibility. Originally, the summer programs were projected to be larger and more money had been proposed for them. Since then, efficiencies were found and it lowered the budget. The idea for the behavior interventionist position came from the buy-in for PBIS activities in that program, so the priority shifted within another area. Thus, there was discussion about possibilities within the established budget. Dr. Lee still saw this as a danger. While at least two categories were listed, he did not see listed additional sections of Advanced Placement Physics or an additional assistant football coach as having flexibility, as they were thought of as ongoing costs with no flexibility. When identified in this way, these programs are most likely to be eliminated, unless someone continues to raise the point he is raising. He reminded the Board of Education that the ability to list can easily be taken as an assignment of lower priority, when that is not the case. He wanted the administration and the Board of Education to keep these factors in mind and not to think of them as lower priorities because they had been increased with these funds. He simply wanted the Board of Education and the administrators to be aware of this fact.

Ms. Fisher noted that because there is no legal requirement to make these lists, it would be up to the Board of Education at the time of an emergency to make decisions about what needed elimination. The fact that these programs were highlighted on a list would not make them any more or less available to the Board of Education for preserving or dismantling over any others. The other side of that is, at the time the Board of Education was determining the phase in and the amount of the phase in, which was considerable, some Board of Education members were not comfortable with taking huge amounts of tax dollars without giving a reason. The Board of Education charged the administration with developing programs that were prioritized for student needs, specifically with respect to the academic achievement gap. It has given the Board of Education members who supported the phase-in comfort in knowing how those dollars were to be used and it provided accountability. The District lived up to its commitment to use the dollars as it said at that time. This does not bind any future Board of Education in terms of making hard or necessary economic decisions. It should be not be a concern. One can decide that they are programs of priority at the time when something needs cutting. Dr. Lee continued that the logic that was used in justifying additional expenditures was not valid in the first place. He did not believe it was logical to say that the additional money is going to these programs. He believed that the additional money was going to the totality of all programs of the District and these were new priorities. An increase in taxation is always for the entire program, including the latest priorities, and not just for those things that are the newest.

Dr. Millard stated that anyone listening to the discussions at the time when the Board of Education was debating the taking of those dollars knew it was a tough debate for those Board of Education members as to how the money would be used. It was not to have an
improved building and it was not to stretch out the dollars so that the District did not have to go for a referendum. It was used for a top priority. She would not have voted for the phase-in dollars if she thought the money would not have been used for very specific needs for specific students. Dr. Lee asked if those dollars had not been available, would the Board of Education have cut something else out in order to fund these programs. Mr. Pralle stated that the administration might have done that and Dr. Millard concurred. Dr. Millard reiterated that OPRFHS is a comprehensive high school. It has to meet the needs of all students. She wanted to maintain as many programs as possible and the intention of this money was to expand and focus on the programs that needed more attention. Dr. Lee stated that when programs are identified as not getting enough attention, one does not have to have new tax dollars for that. Priorities might be rearranged. That is a part of the later discussion of future financial planning. Dr. Lee felt it is a matter of shifting priorities.

Ms. Fisher noted both ways are true; they are not mutually exclusive. One can set priorities as monies are needed to operate, but at the time of the debate on the phase in, the Board of Education had a legal right to take those dollars and had to make a decision whether to take any money, to take no additional money or an amount in between. It was a one-time decision to phase-in those dollars. That does not mean that future boards of education could not prioritize; however, at that time, the sitting Board of Education had the ability to obtain additional dollars. The money could have been taken for untagged dollars.

Dr. Lee clarified that he was not trying to change the mind of the Board of Education in the past circumstances, but he was trying to influence the frame of mind of the present Board of Education in future circumstances.

Ms. Patchak-Layman learned that the total amount of the phase-in was $5 million and the District uses $1.5 for these programs.

Dr. Weninger addressed the administrative dollars. He stated that the District gives itself the maximum flexibility to respond to challenges and the administration has done that for this year. The amount of money earmarked for six of these programs for the 2008-09 was reduced and three new items were added which specifically responded to the current priorities. He felt the administration has responded to the needs internally. Dr. Lee reiterated that he was not criticizing what had been done, as his focus was on the future, not the past.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the mandated programs had to be implemented whether there were phase-in dollars or not. She liked Dr. Lee's look as this as a different categorization of the dollars being spent, because of the way it was phased in. These were new initiatives to her; when new ones are implemented, one looks at them. She interpreted that while these programs would be last in and first out, mandates cannot be removed and they would affect the regular budget. Other models can be used to classify the amount of the dollars spent, rather than the line item budgets. As one looks at the dollars in the instruction program and activities and does the next step of figuring out the
per capita per students, one knows how many dollars are being allocated to the program and they can be matched or compared to statewide dollars. This would be another measure.

Ms. Witham reported that in the budget document, these were categorized and reflected by objectives, salaries, etc. This is a communication to direct the administration. The Board of Education just needs to direct the administration as to what would be most beneficial communication.

Dr. Millard reported that it was the responsibility of the Board of Education to oversee this. Ms. Patchak-Layman continued that this could be part of the discussion of the restructuring plan based on the AYP. The subgroups in need attention had been identified and the Board of Education could look at putting dollars into those educational services. She stated that some of the evaluation is having the data that supports the program. Are students having better success when these programs are in place? If not, there needs to be a reorganization and evaluation of where the dollars are being successful. It was that the Behavior Interventionist was an addition as a direct correlation to the data. The District looked at the special needs of certain students and it has tracked the dollars allotted to them. Special Education is an area where money was allocated to help students read better and as a result, they are meeting AYP in reading. However, Committee members were reminded that AYP is only a one-day snapshot; the high school is working on the broader indicators of student success and there have been some successes. Dr. Lee stated that changing priorities within the school is very difficult.

Dr. Weninger stated that there was some legitimacy to see if these initiatives/programs were having an impact on student achievement; however, some programs were not intended to be a direct strategy to raise student achievement, e.g., the incorporation of resource managers has to do with the social/emotional behavior and climate in the building for this year where the work was done last year, etc. In many instances in the discipline system, an impact has been made with the funds that were attributed to informational consulting services, hardware, software, etc. Care must be taken to make the correlation with student achievement and some programs did not. Programs must be looked at individually, rather than with a broad-brush stroke.

**Board Financial Resolution**

Dr. Lee submitted Draft 4 of the Financial Resolution to the Instruction Committee members, per the discussion at the Finance Committee meeting. He asked for further comment.

Dr. Millard felt the resolution was too long and suggested making it more reasonable for the citizens, e.g., the last WHEREAS was something that would come up in a discussion, etc. She did not know whether the voters in 2018 would agree to the fourth WHEREAS. She wanted to be as judicious as possible in understanding the revenues and expenses and to keeping those as equal as possible, so that the District does not have to ask for more money. She also suggested combining Items 3 and 5, but she was concerned about over extending the new administration and the work in which it is engaged. Dr. Lee stated that
until now, the Board of Education had not been visibly keeping up with the status of Senate Bill revisions to H.B. 750. It surprised him that a new Senate Bill had become a greater focus than H.B. 750 on the revision of educational funding in the State. The Board of Education has not kept abreast of where different things were occurring or how it may have been of help to move that Bill somewhere else. It also has not taken a position as to whether the Board of Education agreed with H.B. 750, or its revision. If the Board of Education can keep up with the Illinois legislature, it can focus its own actions based on what is going on in Springfield. While Dr. Lee felt the No. 3 might not be worth the trouble, he wanted it considered. He felt the Board of Education or the administration should be more involved in legislative issues in order to try to influence the outcome. He felt this Board of Education was capable of doing that. Ms. Patchak-Layman added that it was common for boards of education to have legislative committees. She felt the Board of Education should take the active role, rather than the administration, because it might spread itself too thin. Dr. Weninger informed the Committee that a group of fifteen superintendents meets four times per year with the legislators, state senators and the general assembly legislators. He felt this might provide some motivation with the legislators to lead that charge. For example, one superintendent pushed for looking at special education funding and, as a result, a statewide task force was formed on this issue. The superintendents could get into the specifics. Dr. Millard had asked Mr. Conway to reassign the Board of Education’s liaison to ED-RED, as she can no longer participate because of her professional obligations. ED-RED is an organization to which the District is a member and it does keep up with legislative issues. While Dr. Millard did not object to Dr. Weninger pursuing this endeavor, she did not want him to lose the focus of what needs to be accomplished at the District. However, having split the role of superintendent/principal, the Board of Education could charge the superintendent to be more involved.

Responding to Dr. Millard’s concerns, Dr. Lee stated that the term “foreseeable future” meant that the Board of Education could not see everything. He took the position that some things cannot be anticipated and some things can be seen reasonably clear. Presently, the District can see that without any actions, it is headed for a brick wall in 2018. By that time, the District will have spent all of its reserves and its costs will have continued to escalate. The Board of Education will have to ask for another tax increase in 2018. While that is not a guarantee, it is a best estimate of what will happen if the District does nothing else different. Dr. Millard challenged him by saying that the school would start to deficit spend in 2014. There is a projected budget model that suggests that it is likely that the District will have to go for a referendum in 2018, but not necessarily. Dr. Lee agreed but asked if it mattered when the District asked for a tax increase.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that the key was in No. 2 where the District will look at the educational priorities in terms of spending priorities rather than getting tax revenue. Dr. Millard noted that it was critical to look at both No. 2 and No. 4. If the District has to make priorities, and it has to sacrifice the quality of education of some students to the value of the others, she asked if that were fair. Ms. Patchak-Layman did not believe that would happen. Dr. Millard countered that it was an unknown. Dr. Millard wants to
protect that the high school maintains the highest quality for everyone as priorities are reviewed. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that was part of the school’s mission.

Dr. Weninger reflected that there were three parts to the resolution 1) cost containment, 2) establishing educational priorities; and 3) capping the amount of money taxpayers must pay. Dr. Lee suggested that it was difficult to separate them from each other because they were so interconnected. As he saw it now, this resolution was a descriptor of the whole package. To remove any part, regardless of how it was reworded, would do substantial damage to the whole thing.

Ms. Witham noted that the reality of the brick wall was that in 2018 the school would deficit spend $8 million and in 2019, $10 million. The Board of Education and the administration needs to do cost containment. The sooner that is done, the softer the landing will be. It would be dangerous to think that the school can continue as it is and that it would find $8 to 10 million in the budget. In 2018, the budget will be $70 million and it should have six months reserves in the bank. She stated that a referendum would need to pass before the money was actually needed. If it would not pass, then the District would be looking at $10 million in cuts or 15 percent of its budget and those savings would have to be found every year. Ms. Witham continued that the District will begin to deficit spend in 2014. In the State of Illinois, there is a structural imbalance for school districts.

Dr. Millard stated that the biggest threat to OPRFHS is the new proposed funding solution. Ms. Witham concurred noting that any time income tax is swapped for property tax, more will be paid in income taxes, and the State will turn back less to this community. It will have higher taxes and less money. She suggested that the Committee members compute their own personal income and property tax as she had done; they will determine for themselves that they will pay more taxes. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that it was would be an even swap for those in the community. In terms of what comes to the school, the amount of money the school would not change. It is revenue neutral for the school. Ms. Witham disagreed and stated that while that was the intent, the per pupil allotment that would come back to the District would not be the same. Dr. Weninger concurred. Dr. Lee stated that the District has ten years to straighten things out and that is a wonderful position in which to be. OPRFHS is in one of the best financial shape in the state and he did not want to squander that position. Dr. Millard concurred but she wanted this stated as clearly as possible. Dr. Lee felt that there would be those that will still misunderstand. Mr. Allen supported the general meaning, but he did not like the fourth WHEREAS. Dr. Millard, Ms. Patchak-Layman, and Ms. Fisher concurred. Ms. Fisher concurred, as she did not think that taxpayers would not vote because they would not have the money.

Dr. Millard suggested combining No. 3 and No. 5, as she believed this District had made an effort to be financially responsible in the years she served on the Board of Education and she felt efforts were being made. When phase-in dollars were discussed at the public meetings, the intention was to do something for the students. As this resolution goes
forward, that point needs to be made. She did not want the citizenry thinking that the Board of Education had been financially irresponsible. Dr. Lee stated that to become more responsible is not an accusation of past irresponsibility. It is not a message that one has spent his/her life foolishly. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested eliminating the fourth WHEREAS.

Discussion ensued regarding the word “the” versus “a” long-range plan in No. 1, as there was no model to be referred to at this point.

A lengthy discussion about the fourth WHEREAS and the revised statement is at the end of this section. Dr. Millard noted the majority of the Board of Education members had general support for this resolution, but she suggested that this could have been brought to the Finance Committee and the Board of Education could have gone through the budget line by line and determined what would happen if certain things were cut from it. She did not feel passing a resolution was necessary. Independent of a resolution, the Board of Education could have made a public statement that it would be a responsible entity whether the resolution passed or not. Ms. Patchak-Layman did not feel it was a matter of eliminating programs in the future. She felt another type of program could be engaged in that would cover the same activities. If OPRFHS were a dual language school, and a teacher could teach math in Spanish, would there be a need for a special Spanish teacher or a special class. One could affect change by having a re-organization. One would be achieving math and a language at the same time. Dr. Millard was concerned how a Spanish teacher could teach math. Ms. Patchak-Layman responded that often people could do double duty. If everyone were technology literate and could fix machines, there would be no need for someone to fix machines. Dr. Millard remarked that the Board of Education will have to do the hard part after the resolution is passed, i.e., look at the numbers, what is provided to the students, and listen to the taxpayers. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the State of Illinois is telling the schools that this goes hand in hand and OPRFHS is involved in a restructuring plan. Mr. Prale added that DLT is involved in these kinds of discussions annually and on a global basis. Both Dr. Weninger and Ms. Witham, as the Chief Financial Officer, demand that of everyone in the building.

It was explained that the Urban Consumer Price Index (CPIU) was for the school as a whole and, the Department of Congress had established an additional parameter for the consumer price index for the urban area—CPI-U. It is a fraction of a difference higher than the CPI for the entire United States.

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Financial Resolution at the regular January Board of Education meeting with the following amendments:

4th WHEREAS, line 2: Replace the words “that the anticipated referendum in 2018 to support the required expenditure rate may result in a taxing level that would not be sustainable by the taxpayers residing in the District at that time” with “that future referendum for a higher taxing level would not be supported by our taxpayers”

No. 1, line 1: Replace the word “this” with “a”
No. 3: Replace it entirely with “The District taking an active role in seeking to change the public school funding mechanism and structure in the State of Illinois; and”

No. 4, line 4: Delete “; and”

Textbook
It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the textbook, Geometry, for the Mathematics Division, at the regular January Board of Education meeting.

Ms. Hill informed the Committee members that the last geometry text was adopted in 1993. Because most math textbooks are part of the state-loan program, this might also be included in that category. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if this book were on CD. She continued that using books on CD should be a high priority so that the students can use them instead of carting around their books. It was noted that this book was available online. Could students have online access only and the teacher keep a set of books in the classroom so that the students would not have to buy this book? Ms. Hill was unsure of the publisher’s requirements. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if other categories fit in the top priority with the state. Mr. Prale stated such classes as algebra, consumer education, biology, have been in the past. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the school influences the state by making requests of it. Mr. Prale affirmed that the school works with the state to use state loan dollars most efficiently. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked whether the state questioned what the books cost.

Additional information
Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for more information on the required restructuring plan. Mr. Prale stated that the state requires a restructuring plan to be submitted in February; it is a matter of gathering existing information and deciding on the best procedure. The information will be presented SIP, IC, the faculty, BLT, DLT, and various groups already in place. He hoped a draft the plan would be available in the next few weeks on the information available. This document will also be presented to the Board of Education. When in final form, it will also be posted on the website. The restructuring plan is different from the School Improvement Plan, as it does not focus on AYP, but on a different set of guidelines determined by the state. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that the act of putting everything into one package was not restructuring; it was not something new. Mr. Prale stated that the ISBE gives the word “restructuring” and what it is looking for is a plan that will comply with the law that asks schools to identify corrective actions for a change in the governance, staffing, contracting with an outside organization to run the school, etc. The way in which one thinks about the definition of the term restructuring may not be one of State’s options. The District is looking at administrative governance changes that have been made, i.e., the creation of assistant principal positions, the set of achievement initiatives, the SIP Plan, changes to the PSS Team models, etc. These show a change in governance, staffing, and curriculum. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked whether these changes were intended to improve score results and not move OPRFHS into the sixth year with the same status. Mr. Prale answered that the goal is for student achievement, teacher performance, and the overall performance of the
school district and that the law says the District will file a plan annually; there is no remedy or follow-up. The current requirement of the law is only the filing of the plan.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked whether the school would be notified that it would have to implement school restructuring after year five. Something suggests that whatever the school is doing, there should be results that will show that the District will not get to year six or year seven. Mr. Prale noted that a number of districts are a year or two ahead of OPRFHS and the ISBE has not been following the remedies available to it. OPRFHS is hoping not to be in year six or year seven. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked a question regarding SIP, but Mr. Prale was unsure to what she was referring. He suggested that this be brought forward at another time. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that if there were an addendum to the SIP, she would like a copy of it. She had two conversations with residents who are following what happens at the high school, who have looked at the school improvement plan, the ISBE monitoring, and who know the District has to put a restructuring plan together. She asked if the necessary changes would come to the Board of Education for consideration and review before implementation and when the general community would have the opportunity to give their input. Mr. Prale noted that any interested citizens were invited to participate in the committee. Previously Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for permission to listen to the discussion of the SIP Committee. Mr. Prale noted that he would pass the information on to the Principal.

Dr. Weninger stated that while the spirit of NCLB is honorable, the letter of the law is onerous, unpractical, and will never come to fruition. The quality of a school’s achievement cannot be based on snapshot scores unrelated in time. While OPRFHS tries to adhere to the compliance issues, the work at OPRFHS and the work in which Board of Education has been involved, is the defining of institutional excellence.

Dr. Millard asked that if any Committee members had agenda items for March or April meetings, in anticipation on the Board of Education elections of which the Board of Education wants to make the community aware, to send them to either Mr. Prale or she. 

Dr. Millard reported that Tim Wise, the author of White Like Me, would present at the downtown campus of Northwestern at Thorn Auditorium.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked when there would be an update on the Baldrige proposal. Mr. Allen informed her that Mr. Bloom’s consulting firm focuses on schools, an element of the Baldrige Process. The proposal was created by Mr. Bloom, Dr. Weninger, and Mr. Allen attempted to cover all of the details, including a steering committee structure with six criterion workshops. Each working group, composed of a Board of Education member, a faculty member, a staff member, parents, and students, will focus on certain elements. Baldrige is not a specific way of doing things; it is the development of a school improvement plan to work with what the school is doing based on its criterion. Once an assessment is completed, a three or four month project, a process will be determined.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked why this proposal was not going out for an RFQ and the pros and cons of the other models considered. Mr. Allen offered to show her the process of
development and the other institutions contacted about this endeavor. Mr. Bloom had come with great credentials and he was committed to maintaining the Baldrige process. Dr. Weninger noted that the process itself does not change from group to group. Mr. Allen reported that The Lincoln Foundation was the resource that the State of Illinois used in the child-support enforcement area and it turned that area around. The state assigned a full-time staff person to this endeavor. The Lincoln Foundation stressed using its evaluative testing programs, a revenue-generating system for it. He wanted the evaluation done before the tool was in place, so he felt that process was backwards system for this school. In addition, someone was needed to initiate a system within the school and it was not feasible for OPRFHS to hire a fulltime staff person for this purpose as the State of Illinois had done.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that there were electronic surveys offered as a beginning step that were not part of this proposal. She asked why the school was not including this part in the process to secure more feedback and develop a baseline in the school community. Mr. Allen explained that the Baldrige method typically would only cover DLT and BLT; the OPRFHS proposal included a broad representation of stakeholders from the school that Baldrige does not. Mr. Bloom’s presentation to the Board of Education next month will include some of these points.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the District would use the same vetting process to check references, etc., that it uses when it goes out to bid. Ms. Patchak-Layman’s concerns were about the amount of experience Mr. Bloom has had in working specifically boards of education and procedures and the number of times he has done the Baldrige plan. While he has lots of technology background and human relations experience, she was unsure of his experience in working with school boards of education and board protocols. Mr. Allen, in reviewing the proposal, noted that Mr. Bloom has worked with twelve schools and with a variety of school leadership teams and that Dr. Weninger had contacted six of them. She asked that references be checked.

Adjourment
The Instruction Committee adjourned at 10:03 a.m.
TO: Board of Education
FROM: Amy Hill
DATE: March 19, 2009
RE: Plans for April Testing

BACKGROUND
On April 22-23, 2009, we will conduct standardized testing of our freshman, sophomore, and junior students.

SUMMARY OF TESTING ARRANGEMENTS

Test Registration
- On Wednesday, April 8, all juniors will register for the PSAE-ACT.
- That same day, all freshmen, sophomores, and seniors will complete the High School Survey of Student Engagement (HSSSE).

April 22-23 Testing
On Wednesday, April 22 and Thursday, April 23, we will conduct standardized testing of our freshmen, sophomores, and juniors.
- No classes will meet on these two days.
- Seniors will not attend on these two days.
- Testing will take place in classrooms.
- Faculty and staff will be assigned to proctor tests and/or to serve in supporting roles.

Wednesday, April 22
- Freshmen will take the pre-ACT PLAN test.
- Sophomores will take an instructional ACT.
- Juniors will take Day 1 of the PSAE (ACT Plus Writing).
- Student dismissal times will vary by class and according to the length of the test.
- Full-faculty staff development activities will occur from 1:00-3:04.

Thursday, April 23
- Freshmen will engage in career and course orientation activities with their counselors and with faculty from Fine and Applied Arts and Business Education.
- Sophomores will take practice WorkKeys Reading and Math tests.
- Juniors will take Day 2 of the PSAE (WorkKeys Reading and Math tests and ISBE science test).
- Tentative student dismissal time is 11:00.
- Divisional staff development activities will occur from 11:00-3:04.

Other Logistics
- Each grade level will test on a different floor and/or a different area of the building to minimize potential disruptions from variations in testing schedules.
- Students will be assigned to classrooms in groups of 25-30.
- Students testing with accommodations will test in locations least likely to be disrupted by the end of standard-time testing.
- Special Education faculty and staff will proctor students testing with accommodations.
- Off-campus juniors will test at OPRF with appropriate accommodations and supervision.
TO: Board of Education
FROM: Amy Hill and Phil Prale
DATE: March 19, 2009
RE: MSAN RPC and Mini-Conference Update

BACKGROUND
Last month, members of the MSAN Research Practitioner Council (RPC) held their winter meetings here in Chicago.

Earlier this month a two-day mini-conference focusing on carrying forward conversations about race and achievement was held here at the high school. Forty teachers and administrators from six districts attended the conference.

SUMMARY
RPC members discussed the recent Read 180 mini-conference held in Cleveland, Ohio and reported on the developing plans for the national conference in June. The theme for this year’s national conference is “Accelerating Growth – Aligning Beliefs and Actions.” Keynote speakers will include Dr. John Diamond from Harvard’s Graduate School of Education and Dr. Bonnie Davis. Also, a discussion was held regarding a revised sub-committee structure that would align more closely with the direction of the governing board. Mark Janda from Columbia, Missouri school district the RPC in an activity designed to highlight issues of race and privilege in the lives of teachers and administrators attending the meeting.

The mini-conference included ideas regarding critical race theory and the role of critical race theory in educational contexts. Dr. David Stovall and Dr. Marvin Lynn from the University of Illinois spoke to the group as did a panel of teachers connected to the important work of carrying forward conversations about race and achievement in schools and districts.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Continue to monitor and support MSAN activities including a mini-conference on Special Education issues scheduled for May 2009 in Green Bay, Wisconsin and the national conference and RPC meetings scheduled for June 24 and 25, 2009 in Dearborn, Michigan.

Continue to support professional development efforts involving all members of the faculty and staff in courageous conversations about race.
TO: Board of Education
FROM: Nathaniel L. Rouse
DATE: March 17, 2008
RE: SIP Approval

BACKGROUND

This winter a committee composed of teachers, parents, administrators, staff, and community members met to review and revise the School Improvement Plan. Since the plan was revised with input from several stakeholders, one additional meeting was scheduled in early February to allow for final review. The SIP team will be asked to reconvene in the next school year to continue its work.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The School Improvement Plan has been revised with input from the committee. The latest draft is submitted to the Board of Education for approval. A major shift in the SIP focuses on the implementation of Response to Intervention (RtI). The professional development and technical assistance under Illinois ASPIRE focuses on designing and implementing a multi-tiered early intervening services model including RtI. ISBE initiatives such as the former Flexible Service Delivery Project (problem solving and RtI) Standards-Aligned Classrooms and Illinois Reading First helped provide the foundation for the content of the training and technical assistance provided by each Illinois ASPIRE region.

In addition to the initiatives listed above, in June 2008 Illinois was selected as one of four states participating in the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs’ national technical assistance grant to “promote student academic achievement and behavioral health by supporting implementation and scaling-up of evidence-based practices in education settings.” The State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center “will work with the selected states to increase their capacity to carry out implementation, organizational change, and systems transformation strategies to maximize achievement outcomes of all students in each state.” Illinois ASPIRE will be an integral component of Illinois’ SISEP activities, and the primary focus of SISEP will be on:

1. Full integration of all ISBE-supported general and special education training and technical assistance projects to ensure a cohesive approach to implementing effective practices,
2. Establishing a statewide coaching network that will support the implementation of evidence-based practices in schools across the state and
3. Data-based decision making founded on outcomes measurements.

Illinois ASPIRE is also an integral part of ISBE’s efforts to ramp up implementation of RtI across the state. While RtI is connected to the state special education regulations that went into effect in June 2007, as conceived by ISBE, RtI is more than part of the process to determine eligibility for specific learning disabilities. RtI is an overall school improvement process. This school improvement process is designed to provide scientifically based, appropriate instruction to all students in a multi-tiered early intervening services model. Dr. Nikki Paplaczyk, our OPRF Program Director for Support Services, has been identified as our ASPIRE North Coach to help implement RtI.

**RECOMMENDATION**

MOTION: To approve the School Improvement Plan as presented and direct administration to submit the plan to the Illinois State Board of Education.
BACKGROUND
Over the past several weeks the School Improvement Plan (SIP) committee has met to review the SIP. Suggestions and changes have been made based on input from members of the SIP committee. We are also in the process of soliciting feedback from West 40 consultants, and a peer review team. The SIP Executive Summary draft attached to this memo covers the 08-09 and 09-10 school years and the data is taken directly from the 2008 e-plan template. In an effort to make the SIP a document that stakeholders can understand more clearly, I have developed this Executive Summary to clearly outline and identify where we did not meet NCLB benchmarks, what objectives we have to address those specific areas of weakness, as well as a timeline for implementation and fund sources.

As was indicated in last year’s SIP report to the Board of Education, OPRFHS was required to submit a two-year SIP plan, using the 2008 e-plan template. This was a result of our current AYP status.

New RtI Requirements: The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) believes that increased student learning requires the consistent practice of providing high quality instruction matched to student needs. Response to Intervention (RtI) is a general education initiative which requires collaborative efforts from all district staff, general educators, special educators and bilingual/ELL staff. In a quality educational environment student academic and behavioral needs must be identified and monitored continuously with documented student performance data used to make instructional decisions.

The process of such identification and continuous monitoring are the foundational pieces of a successful system of early interventions. The success of all students toward the Illinois Learning Standards is improved when instructional and behavioral goals are frequently monitored. Data derived from such monitoring should then inform instructional strategies gauged to enhance success. It is important to note that it is through the continuous use of progress monitoring and analysis of student academic and behavioral growth that proper instructional and curricular responses may be made.
As districts develop their SIP Plans by January 2009, their plans shall support a fluid model of response to interventions of varying intensity to meet the needs of all students.

What is RtI?
Response to Intervention (RtI) is “the practice of providing 1) high-quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and 2) using learning rate over time and level of performance to 3) make important educational decisions” (Batsche, et al., 2005). This means using differentiated instructional strategies for all learners, providing all learners with scientific, research-based interventions, continuously measuring student performance using scientifically research-based progress monitoring instruments for all learners and making educational decisions based on a student’s response to interventions.
RtI has three essential components: 1) using a three tier model of school supports, 2) utilizing a problem-solving method for decision-making, and 3) having an integrated data system that informs instruction.

By the 2010-2011 school year, documentation of the RtI process shall be a part of the evaluation process for students when a specific learning disability (SLD) is suspected. After implementing an RtI process, a district may use a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement as part of the evaluation process for determining whether a child has a specific learning disability.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The proceeding SIP Executive Summary draft covers a limited, specific number of areas determined by the Illinois State Board of Education and presented in the template. The draft is guided largely by the template and the data from the high school’s report card and is presented for review by the Board of Education. The draft also has amendments for RtI as required by the ISBE.

RECOMMENDATION

- No specific action is required of the Board of Education at this time.
- In March, the entire SIP document will be brought to the Board of Education for action. However, comments and feedback on this draft from the Board of Education are always welcome.
Oak Park and River Forest High School 2008-09
School Improvement Plan (SIP) Executive Summary

Section I-A Data & Analysis - Report Card Data

**Data – What do the School Report Card data tell you about student performance in your school? What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? What areas of strength are indicated?**

**Amendment for RtI:**
PSAE data indicate that over the past five years, the proportion of our students who have met or exceeded state standards in all subject areas has been well above the corresponding proportion of students statewide. On average, the high school program succeeds for most students in the district. Upon disaggregating the data, however, performance gaps are evident among our subgroups in both PSAE reading and math. Specifically, OPRFHS students who are African American, who have disabilities, or who are economically disadvantaged meet and exceed state standards at lower rates in both reading and math than do our white, non-disabled, and non-economically disadvantaged students.

In general, students’ performance on state assessments in the areas of reading and math are roughly the same. However, in 2008, student scores in reading and math improved marginally. An area in which the school has shown strength is in the reading scores for students with disabilities. Program improvements in that area have succeeded in continuing student performance gains and meeting adequate yearly progress in that area.

Staff continues to monitor the progress of all ethnic groups attending the high school whether or not the group forms a subgroup as defined by state and federal guidelines.

**Factors - What factors are likely to have contributed to these results? Consider both external and internal factors to the school.**

**Amendment for RtI:**
Students in each of our underperforming subgroups continue to enroll in our most rigorous courses at lower rates than students in groups that are making AYP. These students’ academic preparation in high school may not include sufficient teaching and learning in the content tested by the PSAE. We have made uneven efforts to uniformly document, identify, and assess state standards as they appear in our curricula. Placement and standardized test data indicate that students who enroll as freshmen at our high school arrive with vastly different skill sets in core academic areas such as math and reading. EXPLORE scores used as one source of placement data display a range from 8 through 25. Discrepancies in entry-level academic preparedness [existing skills, habits, and knowledge] influence the academic placement of students and therefore their exposure to rigorous curricula.

An existing system of academic tracks at the high school creates a difference in the rigor of a student’s academic program that varies widely from the basic/transition level to the regular/college preparatory level to the honors/AP level. A student’s access to the higher academic levels also varies among content areas, with some core academic divisions applying more rigid criteria than others. The tracking system produces a gate-keeping effect that, along with student academic preparedness, limits many students’ access to rigorous courses and content.

Prior educational opportunities vary widely among students who enroll at OPRFHS. The majority of students new to our high school arrive as freshmen and have attended one of three public middle schools in the two communities served. Smaller numbers of incoming freshmen attend local private schools for their elementary
years. Roughly 10% of our students in any given school year matriculate from districts outside our two communities. Uneven articulation efforts to align high school curricula with K-8 curricula from sending elementary districts contribute to students’ disparate levels of academic preparedness upon entry to the high school.

Reaching and engaging parents to involve them appropriately and in a way that contributes to success for all students, in particular underachieving students, is a challenge for the school. Ongoing efforts to successfully engage these parents have been uneven.

Research into student achievement gaps indicates that factors such as family income, parents’ level of education, parents’ involvement in a student’s education, available health care, nutrition, access to educational resources in and outside of the home, teacher expectations, teacher practices, and peer pressure, among other factors, may contribute to students’ levels of achievement. It is likely that some of these factors have influenced our students’ PSAE performance.

*What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).*

**Amendment for RtI:**
The school needs to offer effective academic support for students who enroll in our high school lacking critical reading skills, and other essential knowledge, and/or habits necessary for academic success. Effective support programs need to focus on improving the skills critical for success in core academic areas and establishing a school climate/learning environment that fosters a commitment to education, success and achievement by continuing to expand access to rigorous courses and content, and implement counseling and teaching strategies that improve student success rates.

There has been ongoing discussion with division leadership surrounding aligning core curricula with state standards, as well as continuing efforts to build a professional teaching and learning community through the use of teacher collaboration teams. In addition, asking teachers to examine relevant student performance data, such as Mastery Manager, to inform instructional practice and response to intervention measures may also lead to improved instruction and achievement.

As of this January, we are in the process of hiring a community outreach coordinator to organize, implement, and evaluate efforts to support all parents, in particular the parents of underachieving students, and consider ways to expand that support with afternoon and evening parent education programs.

We need to continue efforts to align high school curricula and expectations with K-8 curricula in an effort to aide our district in accomplishing the goal of more students transitioning into high school with the requisite skills, knowledge, organization, and habits for successful learning. We had our first articulation with our feeder elementary and middle schools this January.

There is a continuing need for us to research and provide professional development on race and its impact on student achievement to address the needs of our African American students; in particular, those who are not meeting or exceeding standards.

The professional development and technical assistance under Illinois ASPIRE focuses on designing and implementing a multi-tiered early intervening services model including RtI. ISBE initiatives such as the former Flexible Service Delivery Project (problem solving and RtI) Standards-Aligned Classrooms and Illinois Reading First helped provide the foundation for the content of the training and technical assistance provided by each Illinois ASPIRE region.
In addition to the initiatives listed above, in June 2008 Illinois was selected as one of four states participating in the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs’ national technical assistance grant to “promote student academic achievement and behavioral health by supporting implementation and scaling-up of evidence-based practices in education settings.” The State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center “will work with the selected states to increase their capacity to carry out implementation, organizational change, and systems transformation strategies to maximize achievement outcomes of all students in each state.” Illinois ASPIRE will be an integral component of Illinois’ SISEP activities, and the primary focus of SISEP will be on:

1. Full integration of all ISBE-supported general and special education training and technical assistance projects to ensure a cohesive approach to implementing effective practices,
2. Establishing a statewide coaching network that will support the implementation of evidence-based practices in schools across the state and
3. Data-based decision making founded on outcomes measurements.

Illinois ASPIRE is also an integral part of ISBE’s efforts to ramp up implementation of RtI across the state. While RtI is connected to the state special education regulations that went into effect in June 2007, as conceived by ISBE, RtI is more than part of the process to determine eligibility for specific learning disabilities. RtI is an overall school improvement process. This school improvement process is designed to provide scientifically based, appropriate instruction to all students in a multi-tiered early intervening services model. Dr. Nikki Paplaczyk, our OPRFHS Program Director for Support Services, has been identified as our ASPIRE North Coach that will help facilitate the implementation of RtI.

**Section I-B Data & Analysis - Local Assessment Data (Optional)**

*Data - Briefly describe the relevant local assessment data used in this plan. What does this data tell you? What areas of weakness are indicated by this data? What areas of strength are apparent?*

**Amendment for RtI:**

A universal screening system is in place and used by the district to assess the strengths and challenges of all students in academic achievement and behavior. All students take EXPLORE, PLAN, and practice ACT tests to track how well students perform in relation to college readiness benchmarks. Also, ninth grade students enrolled in the regular and basic levels of the curriculum are given a nationally normed reading test to identify areas of the curriculum that need improvement. Incoming ninth grade students also take locally produced math and science placement tests. Data from these tests strongly predict student success in the math and science programs at the high school.

Pupil Support Services Teams (PSST) analyze classroom data in structured, collaborative, discussions designed to inform instructional and student placement decisions. Data from continuous progress monitoring drives instructional decisions through the three-tier process. Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) approaches are used in specific areas of the building and SWIS data is provided to suggest program improvement areas. Academic and behavioral progress is monitored with increasing frequency as students receive additional tiered interventions. A data collection and management system, via Skyward and Mastery Manager, is in place for the purposes of regular screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring for academics and behaviors.
Overall averages of scores on ACT tests show an upward trend in recent years. However, significant gaps appear when the assessment scores are analyzed by subgroup. These assessments show that approximately half of the students enrolled in the regular level instructional program do not score at acceptable levels to meet and exceed state standards in their junior year of high school. Students who take honors classes tend to meet or exceed state standards.

While these assessments show that African American, special education, and economically disadvantaged students score higher than state averages for those student subgroups, they are more likely to not meet state AYP guidelines.

**Factors - What factors are likely to have contributed to these results? Consider both external and internal factors to the school.**

**Amendment for RTI:**
Some students come from middle school with skills that place them at a disadvantage in the high school. Enough students with reading and math deficits do not accelerate their learning sufficiently for all subgroups to reach state standards or college readiness by the time the students take college entrance exams.

Students respond positively to a rigorous and academically constructive classroom environment. At the honors level classrooms are highly engaging and rigorous. Expectations for success are high. Some of the classrooms at the regular level are rigorous and academically constructive. However, some classrooms are not fully engaging or successful as learning environments. Those classrooms do not provide success streams for students to meet standards.

Teacher quality plays a critical role in student success. Effective teachers are at work in many classrooms, however, with the range and disparity of abilities that appear in regular level classrooms; in some situations teachers do not have the time, resources, or preparation to incorporate the instructional differentiation needed to address the learning needs of those classrooms.

In the perceptions of some students, a school environment and the overall pupil support services area of a school may feel restrictive and make attending school uncomfortable. There is a continuing need for us to research and provide professional development on race and its impact on student achievement to address the needs of our African American students, in particular, those who are not meeting or exceeding standards.

**Conclusions - What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).**

We need to improve articulation efforts with all feeder schools and districts in an effort to increase academically prepared students who are achieving at the 9th grade level or above. This includes monthly contacts between teachers in the content areas.

Regarding creating a rigorous curriculum across all levels of the school, we should provide professional development and collaborative opportunities for the administration and faculty leadership to help foster aligned curriculum to provide rigor, engagement, and excellence at every level of the program.

Regarding improving teacher quality and all teachers’ ability to address instructional differentiation, more professional development is needed so teachers may meet the learning needs of all students.
Regarding school environment and overall pupil support services, consistent support services that encourage student success and keep students out of the discipline system are needed to provide students with the opportunity for success. The school climate for students and for parents should be positive and welcoming, and the counseling and guidance models for students and parents should build toward student success.

**Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)**

**Item I - Attributes and Challenges**

**Data** - Briefly describe attributes and challenges of the school and community that have affected student performance. What do these data and/or information tell you?

**Amendment for RtI:**

OPRFHS is a large suburban comprehensive high school with a student population of approximately 3,100. The school’s rich academic program includes over 200 course offerings and has a long history of overall success in preparing students for college. OPRFHS serves and is supported by two communities whose residents place a high value on education, and we are fortunate to have a solid financial foundation with which to pursue the common educational goals of the school and the communities. Beginning in 2005-2006, we have made significant increases in spending for initiatives designed to provide additional academic support for struggling students.

The ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic diversity of the community facilitates the development of mutual respect as well as social and personal responsibility among Oak Park and River Forest High School students. The student body is roughly 62% White, 25% African American, 5% Hispanic, 3% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 5% Multiracial/Ethnic, with a tenth of one percent identifying themselves as Native American.

While the majority of our students experience relative affluence, with the median community income at $88,713, 12.5% of our students come from low-income families. In addition, Special Education students comprise roughly 16% of the student body. These factors influence the skills and academic preparedness of OPRFHS students. The accompanying challenge for the high school is to meet struggling students at their point of readiness and balance a tailored approach to academic support with appropriate acceleration toward grade level performance.

Years before NCLB required schools to disaggregate student assessment data, OPRFHS recognized in its own data several patterns indicating achievement gaps predictable by race. Closing such gaps has been among the school’s primary goals for over ten years, though our efforts have not always been data-driven or systematic. In 1999, we joined with fourteen other diverse suburban districts to form the Minority Student Achievement Network, a consortium of districts dedicated to research-based efforts to close achievement gaps predictable by race or ethnicity. We continue to work as active members of the network to identify and implement evidence-based initiatives to improve student achievement.

In core subject areas, curriculum guides may need to be rewritten and assessed for the degree of alignment and compliance with state standards. Using a research based model, such as backward design or the use of formative assessments to shape curriculum standards, each content area needs to reassess and redraft course goals and assessments. Mastery Manager, now in its second year of implementation could be used to help measure curricular and instructional effectiveness of classroom experiences. By the end of next school year, our goal should target the use of Mastery Manager a minimum of once per semester in all core academic classes. PBIS standards and approaches could be incorporated in select classrooms to address improvement areas for teacher and student behavior.

**Factors - In what ways, if any, have these attributes and challenges contributed to student performance results?**
Amendment for Rti:
The strong educational orientation of the communities contributes to many indicators of student achievement. For example, 473 students took 1503 AP exams in May of 2008, with 84% earning scores of 3, 4, or 5. Our ACT composite for the graduating class of 2008 was 23.5, inclusive of students testing with accommodations, while the average combined SAT score for OPRFHS students in 2008 was 1843. In each case, the performance of OPRFHS students outpaces that of their peers in Illinois and in the nation. The economic diversity of the communities we serve contributes to differences in the number and quality of resources in the home as well as to students’ opportunities for stimulation and enrichment outside of formal schooling. These factors influence the range of academic performance among OPRFHS students. The achievement initiatives undergo annual or bi-annual evaluation to determine their impact. The record is mixed, with some programs showing more promise than others. We have seen success with two cohort programs that support incoming freshman students who enroll in a higher academic level than their prior educational record would indicate. Initial results show that a program to support freshmen in Algebra I has also helped more students achieve mastery than in previous years. Computer assisted reading instruction has shown positive results for many students in English classes and reading programs.

Conclusions - What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).

Amendment for Rti:
We should continue to use early indicators of performance (e.g., 8th grade EXPLORE test, 8th grade final GPA, Gates-McGinitie reading tests) to identify students who may struggle. We should continue to refine and improve the range of academic supports available to help students succeed. These supports include the summer 8 to 9 Connection Program, Learning Support Reading, Academic Strategies, co-taught classes, the collaborative teaching model, and basic/transitions and regular/college preparatory level curricula in all academic divisions.

Section 1-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)
Item 2 - Educator Qualifications, Staff Capacity, and Professional Development

Data - Briefly describe data on educator qualifications and data and/or information about staff capacity and professional development opportunities related to areas of weakness and strength. What do these data tell you?

At Oak Park and River Forest High School 84% of the faculty of 247 have earned an M.A. degree, while 50% have earned 30 or more hours beyond the MA. The typical teacher has been at Oak Park and River Forest High School for 7 years and has been in the profession for 11 years. Every teacher in the high school is highly qualified for his or her classroom teaching assignment. For purposes of professional development, teachers have been organized into small divisionally-based collaboration teams as part of an effort to create a professional learning environment. Twenty-nine late-arrival schedules have been incorporated into the school calendar to allow teachers to work on specific projects, program development, and/or action research in support of school improvement.

Factors - In what ways, if any, have educator qualifications, staff capacity, and professional development contributed to student performance results?

Amendment for Rti:
Currently, staffing and teacher qualifications are not essential growth areas for the district. Therefore, we have turned to the area of professional development as a critical way to improve school performance. Teacher quality strongly influences student achievement. Teachers who engage in regular, self-directed, relevant professional development activities can address and improve their classroom practice and help students reach their academic
potential. Teachers participate in a Professional Development Committee that plans and coordinates programs and activities. Teacher led collaboration teams are focused on divisional efforts to improve school performance and student achievement.

Teachers have begun developing data management skills at the classroom level using Mastery Manager, a testing and assessment program that allows for item analysis and easier alignment of tests to content standards.

Conclusions - What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).

Each year the Office of Human Resources monitors the qualification of faculty in order to maintain compliance with NCLBA standards. At the close of every school year, each faculty learning team issues a report, a summary of which is presented to the Board of Education and the school community. Those reports should inform the decisions, priorities, and plans for the next school year. The faculty could benefit from a program that helps teachers develop expertise and effectiveness in working with students from a variety of backgrounds. This could include preparation in understanding socio-cultural adolescent development as it relates to achievement. The structure and implementation of a program will be considered for the coming year. To address this need, this school year we plan to host a mini-conference on fostering school based conversations about race and achievement in order to address this need.

The Office of Human Resources has developed a program for recruiting a more diverse faculty balancing the needs of maintaining and improving the academic performance of the school and building a diverse, multi-talented faculty.

Section I-C Data & Analysis - Other Data (Optional)

Item 3 - Parent Involvement

Data - Briefly describe data on parent involvement. What do these data tell you?

Amendment for RTI:

Parent involvement has always been a critical element of the school improvement process. Twice each year the school hosts a parent visitation day, once in the fall and once in the spring. Approximately 160 parents take advantage of this opportunity to visit the school, observe in classrooms, meet counselors and administrators, and become oriented and comfortable in the school. Five board approved parent organizations operate and meet in the school. The five parent groups are - African American Parents for Purposeful Leadership in Education (APPLE), the Boosters, Citizen's Council, the Concert Tour Association, and the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). Each parent group recruits membership on an annual basis. The PTO sponsors a liaison program which assigns a parent liaison to each division in the school to enhance collaboration and communication. Ten evening meetings occur each year for the purpose of assisting families who may have a difficult transition to the high school. These meetings begin in the summer before the ninth grade for students identified as having greater needs in the process of beginning their high school careers. The middle schools in Districts 97 and 90 identify the students for this program. Six parent meetings are held in the summer and four follow up meetings are held during the school year. Attendance at these meetings runs between 10 and 20 families at each meeting.

The data suggest that the school must take deliberate proactive measures to engage parents in ways that support student achievement. Parents are an asset and the school needs additional effort to improve parent participation. Collaboration with parents is essential to school improvement and student success.

Factors - In what ways, if any, has parent involvement contributed to student performance results?

Amendment for RTI:

In the last three years the student information system has allowed for parents to view the electronic data associated with their students. This includes attendance and classroom achievement information. The response to this access has been strongly supportive. Parents frequently access their students' information and use e-mail to
reach out to teachers for additional information. Counselors sponsor a series of evening programs on college readiness that are well attended and evaluated.
Four years ago available slots for parent teacher conferences were expanded to meet a growing demand by parents. The total number of conferences has doubled and the number of families attending conferences has increased by 66% since the addition of conference opportunities. Additionally, parent organizations support classroom equipment and technology efforts through fund raising efforts.

Conclusions - What do these factors imply for next steps in improvement planning? These conclusions will be carried forward to Part D (Key Factors).

Amendment for RtI:
Positive parent involvement in actively supporting student engagement and achievement in school is desired by parents and school faculty and staff. More opportunities for parents should be developed to address school improvement goals. To aid us in this process, we have earmarked resources to recruit and hire a parent and community outreach coordinator to enhance and build upon the existing connections to the parent networks of our African-American and Special Education parent networks and the SIP team in order to develop and strengthen family-school connections, engage parents in their children's learning, and improve student and academic social learning.

Section I-D Data & Analysis - Key Factors
Section I-D - Key Factors – From the preceding screens (I-A, I-B, I-C, I, 2, 3) identify key factors that are within the school’s capacity to change or control and which have contributed to low achievement. What conclusions about next steps have you reached from reviewing available data and information and about all the factors affecting student achievement?

Amendment for RtI:
Develop a focused program of staff development
Using data to review and improve programs and make decisions
Use individual student data to monitor progress for all students, but especially for those students not meeting or exceeding state standards
Better dissemination of staff development across divisions and district wide
Align staff development with District Goals
Better training for all staff in Plan, and for new hires with respect to CRIS, RtI, and mentoring program
Teacher expertise
Student academic preparedness
Access to rigorous courses and content
Academic support for students lacking skills, knowledge, and/or habits necessary for success
Alignment of curricula with state standards
Articulation of K-12 (and particularly 6-12) curricula
Parent outreach and support
Implement Mastery Manager in core areas to assist teachers in assessing student progress towards achievement benchmarks
Provide for reading and math teaching and learning in foundational skill areas identified in educational research
Apply PBIS principles and systems to establish expectations and positive reinforcements for improved student behavior

2008 Section IIA-Action Plan Objectives, Descriptions and Deficiencies

8
Deficiencies
The following deficiencies [not objectives] have been identified from the most recent AYP Report for our school.

1) African American students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2) African American students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
3) Students with special needs are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
4) Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Objectives To Address Deficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiency #</th>
<th>Objective to Address Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 4.</td>
<td>Improve reading scores for African American and economically disadvantaged students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3.</td>
<td>Improving math scores for African American and students with special needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 1 Title:
Improving reading scores for African American and economically disadvantaged students.

Objective 1 Description:
African American and economically disadvantaged students will meet and exceed state standards at the levels of at least 70% in 2009 or attain Safe Harbor levels.

Objective 1 addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1) African American students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds
2) Economically Disadvantaged students are deficient in Reading Meets and Exceeds

Objective 2 Title:
Improving mathematics scores for African American and students with special needs

Objective 2 Description:
While our current achievement in mathematics for Black students is 34.1% and 34.3% for students with disabilities respectively, these subgroups will meet and exceed state standards at the level of 70% in 2009 or attain Safe Harbor levels. For the 2009 PSAE, Safe Harbor levels are 38.8 % for Black students, and 43.9 % for students with disabilities.

Objective 2 addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1) African American students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
2) Students with special needs are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds

Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities Timeline (Reading)

Objective 1 Title:
Improving reading scores for African American and economically disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities #1:
Low achieving students in the area of reading will be assigned to a class that will have access to a reading lab and have access to web-based software that addresses the differentiated needs of these students. These differentiated needs include fluency, vocabulary acquisition, phonemic awareness, and reading comprehension. Software packages include Reading Plus and Lexia. Student growth will exceed more than one grade level per year.

Start Date: 9/2/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund Source: Local Funds; Amount: $50,000.
Strategies and Activities #2:

Identified ninth grade students will receive an additional period of instruction from their English teachers as part of their school day. Students will earn above average grades in their English classes.

Start Date: 8/26/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund Source: Local Funds; Allocation: $120,000.

Strategies and Activities #3:

Identified ninth grade students will be assigned to additional study and tutorial instruction from classroom teachers. Students who attend the program will improve their attendance and grade point average (gpa) by the end of each semester.

Start Date: 1/27/2009; End Date: 6/4/2010; When: After School; Fund Source: Title I; Allocation: $ 65,000.

Section II-C Action Plan - Professional Development Strategies and Activities Timeline (Reading)

Objective 1 Title:
Improving reading scores for African American and economically disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities #1

In each school year, forty teachers who work with low achieving readers will receive CRISS (CREating Independence through Student owned Strategies), a nationally-recognized research based approach to improving content area literacy training in each school year. To date, nearly 55% of our full-time faculty has been CRISS trained.

Start Date: 8/27/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund Source: Title I; Allocation: $4,000.

Strategies and Activities #2

Teachers participate in collaboration teams that meet weekly to address teaching and learning areas of growth.

Start Date: 8/27/2008; End Date: 6/4/2010; When: During School; Fund Source: Local Funds; Allocation: N/A.

Strategies and Activities #3

Teachers will receive direct information about RtI approaches and structures during professional development in cross-divisional and full faculty sessions.

Start Date: 8/27/2008; End Date: 6/4/2010; When: During School; Fund Source: Local Funds; Allocation: $ 1,000.

Section II-D Action Plan - Parent Involvement Strategies and Activities Timeline (Reading)

Objective 1 Title: Improving reading scores for African American and economically disadvantaged students.

Strategies and Activities #1

Parents will receive mail and phone contact invitations to attend Title 1 meetings during the school year. These meetings have a curriculum designed to address the major questions that arise at different points in each academic year as well provide helpful tips for academic success. Parents will be surveyed to determine the effectiveness of each meeting.

Start Date: 8/27/2008; End Date: 6/4/2010; When: After School; Fund Source: Title I; Allocation: $1,000.
Strategies and Activities #2
During the summer before ninth grade parents will receive phone calls inviting them to attend six parent/student evening programs/socials. These events are for all of the students enrolled on our 8 to 9 summer bridge program. Six of these meetings are scheduled for each summer and follow a prescribed curriculum that addresses the parents and students needs and concerns over the course of the summer leading up to their first semester in the building. Parents will be surveyed to determine the effectiveness of each meeting.

Start Date: 8/27/2008; End Date: 6/4/2010; When: Summer School; Fund Source: Title 1; Allocation: $1,000.

Strategies and Activities #3
A parent outreach coordinator will be hired and whose duties will include the creation of a parent education and involvement program. The effort will include an evening program for school staff and representatives from up to five parent organizations in the community to collaborate on topics including Skyward family access, homework support, academic programs, college selection, and school support options. Parent education programs will address parent issues across grade levels.

Start: 1/28/2009; End Date: 6/4/2010; When: During School; Fund Source: Local Funds; Allocation: $ 50,000

Section II-E Action Plan – Monitoring (Reading)

Objective 1 Title:
Improving reading scores for African American and economically disadvantaged students.

Monitoring - Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)

In June of each year, we will examine the standardized test scores for students enrolled in English 1-2 and English Literature 1-2 to determine student achievement patterns. EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT Reading subscores will also be used to track program effectiveness and student achievement.

Monitoring Persons - List the individuals and designate the role of each person (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

Name Title
Nathaniel L. Rouse Principal
Phil Praise Assistant Superintendent for C&I
Amy V. Hill Director of Assessment and Research

Section II-A Action Plan – Objectives, Descriptions, and Deficiencies (Math)

Objective: 2 Title:
Improving mathematics scores for African American and students with special needs.

Objective 2 Description:
While our current achievement in mathematics for African American students is 34.1% and 34.3% for students with disabilities respectively, these subgroups will meet and exceed state standards at the level of 70% in 2009 or attain Safe Harbor levels. For the 2009 PSAE, Safe Harbor levels are 38.8 % for Black students, and 43.9 % for students with disabilities.

Objective 2 addresses the following areas of AYP deficiency:

1) African American students are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
2) Students with special needs are deficient in Mathematics Meets and Exceeds
Section II-B Action Plan - Student Strategies and Activities Timeline (Math)

Objective 2 Title:
Improving mathematics scores for African American and students with special needs.

Strategies and Activities #1:
Freshman students scoring between the 40th and 60th percentile on local and standardized assessments will enroll in an Algebra Block course in which instructional time is increased by 50%.

Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $50,000.

Strategies and Activities #2:
Students will use Agile Mind (a web-based program) in Algebra Block and Algebra 1-2 to increase student engagement and performance. Agile Mind is an interactive, visually oriented program that helps students solve algebra problems and monitor their own progress. It teaches students to think conceptually and look at algebra problems using the rule of four: verbally, numerically, graphically and algebraically.

Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $14,000.

Strategies and Activities #3:
Students will engage a more positive classroom culture within the Algebra 1-2 program and thereby positively influence student achievement in Algebra. Students will participate in the Academic Youth Development (AYD) program to enlist incoming freshman Algebra and Algebra Block students as “allies” of their teachers. Attention will be paid to navigating the multicultural environments of these classrooms. Teachers will engage in activities to build cultural competencies in order to improve instruction for all students.

Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $5,000.

Strategies and Activities #4:
Full time members of the mathematics department will be available as tutors to every student in the building every period of the day. For freshmen students they are actually located in their respective study halls for easy access.

Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $30,000.

Strategies and Activities #5:
Special Education teachers will develop and implement specialized PSAE mathematics review materials as part of the Academic Strategies curriculum.

Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation N/A.

Section II-C Action Plan - Professional Development Strategies and Activities Timeline (Math)

Objective 2 Title:
Improving mathematics scores for African American and students with special needs.

Strategies and Activities #1:
Teachers of the Algebra Block classes will spend up to five days during the school year learning to maximize the instructional value of Agile Mind and the additional instructional minutes allotted for their course.

Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $3,000.

Strategies and Activities #2:
Teacher learning teams comprised of algebra teachers will meet during eight late arrival days during the school year to examine their course content, instructional practices, and student performance results. Teams will focus on increasing the rigor and scope of their math courses to provide that students enrolled in all junior year math courses are exposed to and become proficient in necessary advanced algebra and geometry skills.

**Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation N/A.**

**Strategies and Activities #3:**
Math teachers will be trained in the use of Mastery Manager, a web-based tool for analyzing student assessment performance, all Algebra teachers will use Mastery Manager to score and analyze the results of common semester exams. Results will determine changes to course assessments and content.

**Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $500.**

**Strategies and Activities #4:**
Math teachers from the high school will meet and work with teachers from the sender schools and districts to ensure that more students should take an algebra course before they enroll in the high school. This work includes improved curriculum alignment and teaching summer step up math courses.

**Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $5,000.**

**Strategies and Activities #5:**
Teachers of Special Education math courses will revise curricula to include more outcomes that provide students with advanced algebra and geometry skills.

**Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $2,000.**

**Section II-D Action Plan - Parent Involvement Strategies, Activities, and Timeline (Math)**

**Objective 2 Title**
Improving mathematics scores for African American and students with special needs.

**Strategies and Activities #1:**
Parents will attend the Math Division’s annual “Math Night” which provides detailed information about homework and success opportunities in math classes.

**Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation: N/A.**

**Strategies and Activities #2:**
Parents will receive mail and phone contact invitations to attend each of four Title 1 meetings during the school year. These meetings have a curriculum designed to address the major questions that arise at different points in each academic year as well provide helpful tips for academic success. Parents will be surveyed to determine the effectiveness of each meeting.

**Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Title 1; Allocation $1,000.**

**Strategies and Activities #3:**
During the summer before ninth grade parents will receive phone calls inviting them to attend six parent/student evening programs/socials. These events are for all of the students enrolled in our 8 to 9 summer bridge program. Six of these meetings are scheduled for each summer and focus on a proscribed curriculum that addresses the parents and students needs and concerns over the course of the summer leading up to their first semester in the building. Parents will be surveyed to determine the effectiveness of each meeting.
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Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $2,000.

**Strategies and Activities #4:**
Parents will be invited to attend parent education programs created by collaboration between school staff and representatives from up to five parent organizations in the community. Parent education areas will include Skyward family access, homework support, academic programs, college selection, and school support options. Parent education programs will address parent issues across grade levels.

Start Date: 8/22/2008; End Date: 6/11/2010; When: During School; Fund source: Local; Allocation $5,000.

**Section II-E Action Plan – Monitoring (Math)**

**Objective 2 Title**
Improving mathematics scores for African American and students with special needs.

**Monitoring** - *Describe the process and measures of success for the identified objective. (How will district personnel monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and activities?)*

In June of each year, we will examine the grades assigned to all students in Algebra 1-2 courses to determine the proportion of each class that earned a grade of C or better. EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT Math subscores will also be used to track program effectiveness and student achievement.

**Monitoring Persons** - List the individuals and designate the role of each person (e.g., Karen Smith, assistant principal) overseeing the strategies and activities in the action plan to achieve each objective.

**Name Title**
Phil Prale, Assistant Superintendent of C & I
Amy V. Hill, Director of Assessment and Research

**Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation**

**Part A. Parent Notification** *

This section describes how the plan has been developed and reviewed and identifies the support in place to ensure implementation.

**Parent Notification** - Describe how the school has provided written notice about the school’s academic status identification to parents of each student in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand. (*Requirement for Title I Schools only.*)

In November 2008 a letter was sent to the parent of every student in the district. The letter specified the status of the school with relation to NCLBA and detailed the reasons for the school status. The letter also provided preliminary information about the school improvement planning process and included contact information for interested persons. The appropriate ISBE administrator approved the letter before it was sent to every parent in the district.

**Part B. Stakeholder Involvement**

**Stakeholder Involvement** - Describe specifically how stakeholders (including parents, school staff, and outside experts) have been consulted in the development of the plan. The names and titles of the school improvement team or plan developers must be identified here.
The SIP planning team was first assembled six years ago. A member of each division was included on the team along with a non-certified staff member, a representative from each board approved parent group, members of the administrations, student representatives, and two community members who do not have children at the high school. Since then some of the membership has changed, but the representation has retained a similar organization.

The members of the current school improvement plan team are:

George Bailey - Community  
Colleen Biggins - Special Ed  
Bill Boulware - Fine & Applied Arts Divisional  
Linda Cada - Special Education Divisional  
Dale Craft - PE Divisional  
John Costopoulos - Science  
Terri Dixon - PTO  
Steve Gevinston - English Divisional  
Bill Gresser - Science Divisional  
Fred Galluzzo - Guidance  
Amy Hill - Dir. Assessment and Research  
Anita North-Hamilton - History  
Burcy Hines - Community  
Ron Lawless - Community  
Cary McLean - Citizen's Council  
Richard Mertz - History Divisional  
Debbie Neuman - Math Divisional  
Phil Prale - Asst. Supt. C&I  
Nathaniel Rouse - Principal  
Don Vogel - Bus Ed/Library/Tech Divisional  
Kathy Haney - Citizens' Council  
Nikki Paplaczyk - Special Education  
Claudia Sahagun - World Language Divisional  
Wiley Samuels - Community  
Abby Schmelling - Community  
John Stelzer - Athletic Director  
Sandy Williams - Concert Tour Assoc.

Names and titles of school improvement team or plan developers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nathaniel Rouse Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phil Prale Asst. Supt. C&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amy V Hill Director of Assessment and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>John Costopoulos Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation

Part C. Peer Review Process

Peer Review - Describe the district's peer review and approval process. Peer review teams should include teachers and administrators from schools and districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. As appropriate, peer reviewers may be teachers from other schools, personnel from other districts, Regional Office of Education staff, Intermediate Service Center staff, RESPRO staff, university faculty, consultants, et al., or combinations thereof. RESPRO staff serving on a School Support Team should not serve on a peer review team in the same district. Peer review and subsequent local board approval must be completed within 45 days of receiving the school improvement plan.

Describe the peer review process including participants and date(s) of peer review.

In February of 2009, two individuals will review the SIP and provide comment and feedback. Dr. Jack Denny, Assistant Superintendent of C & I of Leyden District 212, and Dr. Scott Eggerding, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction for Lyons Township school district. We will then submit our SIP to Hillyn Sennholtz, Consultant - West 40 Intermediate Service Center.
Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part D. Teacher Mentoring Process

Teacher Mentoring Process - Describe the teacher mentoring program. Mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced professionals who serve as role models and provide practical support and encouragement. Schools have complete discretion in deciding what else the teacher mentoring program should provide.

In collaboration with the teacher association, a faculty mentoring program was created three years ago. Each teacher new to the school is assigned a mentor teacher from his or her division. The program calls for the mentor teacher to meet weekly with the teacher new to the school and accomplish a series of tasks to orient the teacher to the school. The new teachers also attend a short orientation to the school before the start of the school year and are invited to a series of sessions orienting them to the school. Mentors are also asked to visit and observe the new teacher twice during the teacher’s first year in the school. Mentors are assigned to new teachers for a period of two years.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part E. District Responsibilities

District Responsibilities - Specify the services and resources that the district has provided to revise the plan and other services that the district will provide toward implementation of strategies and activities. District technical assistance should include data analysis, identification of the school’s challenges in implementing professional development requirements, the resulting need-related technical assistance and professional development to effect changes in instruction, and analysis and revision of the school’s budget (NCLB, Section 1116). If applicable, identify corrective actions or restructuring options taken by the district.

The District has created and maintains a School Improvement team for several years. This team meets to review and recommend changes to the SIP. The SIP addresses key areas of improvement, specifically reading and math instruction and student performance. The SIP team has reviewed school performance data and provided input in the current plan.

In December 2005, the Board of Education approved additional local funding to support efforts to improve student achievement and teacher performance. Achievement and professional development initiatives are reviewed and reported to the school community on a regular basis. Their have been two areas where corrective action has been taken by the school district in recent years. First, the school has been restructured significantly with the addition of the position of Principal. Prior to the 2007-2008 school year District 200 had a combined Superintendent/Principal position. The separation for this school year has allowed a building level administrator to concentrate on building operations and improving school and classroom climate and achievement. Three Assistant Principal positions were created to support the day-to-day operational needs of the high school. The role of Director of Assessment and Research continues to support the ongoing and growing data needs of the school.

The second corrective action taken by the school district has been to institute and implement a new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional development for all relevant staff. In the area of mathematics, the Algebra program is being revised to incorporate Agile Mind a web based program that allows for student practice and program assessment. Agile Mind has a research basis from the Dana Center at the University of Texas and offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students and enabling the school to make AYP in the area of mathematics.

In the area of reading, the ninth grade program for struggling readers will incorporate the following software packages – Lexia, Soliloquy, and Reading First in order to assist the development of key reading skills by the students who can benefit the most form these programs. We have continued to offer CRISS training to all staff to improve literacy instruction across the entire school.
Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part F. State Responsibilities

State Responsibilities: Specify the services and resources that ISBE, RESPROS, and other service providers have provided the school during the development and review of this plan and other services that will be provided during the implementation of the plan. ISBE shall provide technical assistance to the school if district fails to do so.

West 40, the RESPRO consultant and support for Oak Park and River Forest High School, has provided money for CRISS training. By the end of the 2008-2009 school year, approximately 60% of all faculty at the high school will have CRISS Level I training. West 40 has encouraged and supported PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions Systems) training for teachers and administrators. Administrator Academies in the areas of focused walks, improving professional development, PBIS, reading across content areas, and administrative leadership in diverse schools have been approved and funded by West 40. OPRFHS attends system of support meetings at West 40 on a regular basis. State support of RESPRO and IIRC data uploads also support school improvement efforts.

Section III - Plan Development, Review and Implementation
Part G. School Support Team

State Responsibilities – List the names and identify the roles (e.g., distinguished educator, district curriculum coordinator, university partner, or RESPRO consultant) of the School Support Team. If applicable, School Support Teams are assigned to schools in corrective action to provide sustained and intensive support for those schools to make adequate yearly progress. Note: School Support Teams are not the same as school improvement teams or the school planning team. Schools in academic watch, restructuring, or restructuring implementation status should have School Support Teams. Some schools in Choice, SES, or academic early warning status also have School Support Teams.

Name Title
1. Hillyn Sennholtz, Lead RESPRO Consultant
TO: Instruction Committee Members
FROM: Director of Assessment and Research
DATE: March 19, 2009
RE: Textbook Recommendation

BACKGROUND

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
The Director of Assessment and Research has reviewed the textbook and recommends its adoption by the Board of Education. The text focuses on the key topics that provide a strong foundation in algebra. Lesson concepts are presented in a clear, straightforward manner, supported by frequent worked-out examples. Checkpoint questions and exercises for each lesson provide opportunities to check for understanding and for practice to maintain skills. Students learn to apply algebraic concepts to real-world problems. Colorful illustrations pique student interest.

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 course at its regular Board of Education meeting.
**OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL**  
**TEXTBOOK ADOPTION FORM**  

**Division:**  MATHEMATICS  
**Course Name(s):** INTERMEDIATE 1–2  
**Course Code(s):** 229  
**Grade Level of Course:** JUNIOR & SENIOR  

**CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX**  
- [ ] Core Text  
- [ ] Supplementary Text  

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

**Title:** ALGEBRA 2 CONCEPTS AND SKILLS  
**Author(s):** LARSON, BOSWELL, KANOLD, STIFF  
**Publisher:** MCDOUGAL LITTEL  
**Copyright Year:** 2008  
**Edition:** 1st  
**ISBN #:** 978-0-618-55210-8  

**Electronic Format Available?**  
- [ ] No  
- [x] Yes; describe: Through use of online activation code  

**Type of Cover:** HARD  
**OPRFHS Bookstore Cost to Student:** $ STATE LOAN  

Please complete the appropriate portion below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text replaces the following book:</th>
<th>Text is in addition to the following book(s) also used in this course:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Algebra 2, An Integrated Approach</td>
<td><strong>Title:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publisher:</strong> Southwestern</td>
<td><strong>Publisher:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Adoption:</strong> 2000</td>
<td><strong>Year of Adoption:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPRFHS Bookstore Cost:</strong> $63.00</td>
<td><strong>OPRFHS Bookstore Cost:</strong> $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUALITIES OF PROPOSED TEXT**  
Completion of this entire section is mandatory. Attach additional sheets if needed.  

Readability Score: 7.3  
(See reverse for instructions.)  
Please Attach Reading Level Documentation.  

Positive Qualities of the Proposed Text:  
More examples than previous textbook. More ancillaries, very readable, and online access  

Evidence of Title IX and Cultural Pluralism:  
Several pictures included in text  

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

**Division Curriculum/Textbook Selection Committee:**  

**Division Head:**  
**Director of Assessment & Research:**  

Date: 2/23/09  
Date: 2/26/09  

Date of Approval by Board of Education:  

Revised 01/20/09
Oak Park and River Forest High School
District 200
201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Janel Bishop
      Assistant Principal for Student Health and Safety

DATE: March 19, 2009

RE: 2008-2009 FIRST SEMESTER DISCIPLINE REPORT

BACKGROUND
The Board of Education annually receives a summary of first semester student discipline data. Below and attached please find that information.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
Attached, please find ten separate reports about OPRFHS student discipline for the First Semester of the 2008-2009 school year. Each report contains a title page, cover memo with analysis, and data table. The data and analysis are per Board direction in summer and fall 2008. Below, please find a general, summary analysis for all reports.

An increase can be seen in each of the five areas of consequences in comparison to data reported for Semester 1 of the 2007-2008 school year. Numbers of Detentions (1 and 2 hours), After School Detention (ASDs - 3-hours), In-School Suspensions (ISS), Out-of-School Suspensions (OSS), and Expulsions have all increased. The following information summarizes additional findings:

- African-American males continue to receive a disproportionate number of discipline consequences in comparison to males of other races and to females.
- Specific data for fights, battery and mob action for first semester of 2007-2008 is unavailable for comparison. More students than we are comfortable with have been involved in violent offenses this year, however. This signals a need for more intervention/prevention programs and support for students.
- With the implementation of new tardy procedures, there is a significant number of students with attendance-related offenses. This is to be expected with greater accountability and record keeping of student tardies.
- Approximately 32% of all consequences given to students have been given to Special Education students. Housed Special Education students comprise 15.6% of the total student population.

Data Information
With the new tardy procedures in place and after gathering the first semester data, it was discovered that 2 infractions for tardies are being used: 1. “excessive tardiness”, and 2. “tardies.” One is not more severe than the other. Beginning next school year, this will be corrected and only one infraction will be used. For purposes of consistent reporting, the data in this report and the upcoming end of year report will include both infractions.

Detention consequences are categorized on the data tables by either “ASD” or “Detention.” An ASD is a 3-hour detention. “Detentions” are one- or two-hour consequences served before or after school and may be served over more than one day. It should be noted that students who are assigned ASDs are also given opportunities to serve consequences over multiple days. If students choose to do this, Skyward does not allow this to be recorded as
ASDs. They must be recorded as Detentions served in one- or two-hour increments. Therefore, the totals for ASD do not reflect the true number of times ASDs were issued as consequences.

Periodically, students who are involved in discipline incidents might incur more than one infraction. However, our database, Skyward, does not allow for more than one infraction to be assigned for a single incident. Therefore, our practice has been to enter into the database the most serious infraction incurred by the student, or to use the Gross Misconduct infraction. It should be noted that, due to this limitation, totals do not reflect true numbers of infractions.

The Gross Misconduct infraction is used as described above and also when situations are so unique that they do not fit into one specific category. This also leads to totals not reflecting true numbers or infractions.

It was also discovered that two infractions are being used when students fail to serve a detention. They are Failure to Serve DET/ASD and Failure to Serve DN-Detention. These two offenses are essentially the same. One is not any more severe than the other.

Violation of Operation Bag-It and Violation of Cell Phone Policy are two others that are being used interchangeably.

RECOMMENDATION

1. In gathering data for this report we have found that there are many instances in which multiple infractions are listed where there should only be one and they have been used interchangeably. We realize that this causes inaccurate reporting and will correct it for the coming year.

2. The development of this report is still evolving. Previous semester reports were not as extensive. We ask for the patience of the Board as we work to develop a report that includes enough data to truly get a view of our students and their needs. Our desire is for future reports to cleanly reflect students involved in the discipline system and what direct PSS interventions were used to help these students. We have currently found that PSS and the discipline center do not share a common database in order to cross-reference this information. We are working to solve that problem.

3. We will also work to include more reports that disaggregate the data by transfer students, feeder school, by interventions (before and after), total amount of missed class time due to suspensions, etc.

4. We continue to have students tutored if they are suspended 5 or more days out of school. Counselors assist with getting assignments collected for students suspended out of school four days or less. We are also working on devising a plan for students who are in In-School Suspension to more quickly receive their work from teachers. Any day missed from class is detrimental to a student's academic success. We acknowledge that we currently must improve in this area so that we are doing all we can for the student while he/she misses class.

5. The Instructional Council (IC) has also begun examining our school's policy on how to treat days of suspension. We recently discovered that our Student Handbook states that OSS days are considered unexcused and that teachers can use their discretion regarding whether or not to allow suspended students to make up work. Please note that this was not truly being practiced school-wide because we have tutored students suspended 5 days or more for several years. It does, however, bring to light an issue that needs to be clarified. We ask the Board to reconsider this current procedure as it is written in the Student Handbook. If it were to be practiced as it is currently written, this would mean a true “academic death sentence” for many of our already struggling students. We anticipate more information and possibly a recommendation will be brought to the Board after the IC has fully discussed this and made a recommendation to the District Leadership Team (DLT).
6. While we certainly have many students who are suspended from school, we are also working on more alternatives to suspension that can be implemented for the fall. We have begun this with our partnership with Concordia University’s Community Counseling Center (explained in more detail within this report). Our plan is to expand the opportunities for alternatives to suspension by forming other partnerships with community agencies. Discussion has already begun about students volunteering time at the Volunteer Center of Oak Park in lieu of suspension days. This is still in the developmental stages.

7. We are also working towards global opportunities to educate all students in areas they do not always receive information about in traditional classroom settings. We hope this will be accomplished with the Counseling Curriculum that is being developed (discussed in more detail within this report).

8. The Deans also plan to continue to use other alternatives to detentions and suspensions. We have currently begun assigning students to Lunchroom Duty and Restricted Lunch in lieu of detentions/suspensions. We currently do not have an actual location for Restricted Lunch which limits how much we can use this alternative, but we are working to secure one so that we expand the use of this alternative consequence.

9. The Deans are also working on the creation of a curriculum to address tardiness with our students. Our goal is to have what is called “Tardy School.” Students would be sent here instead of detentions/suspensions. A curriculum is being developed that would teach students the importance of being on time. This is still in the developmental stages.

10. It is also the plan to present these statistics to the Deans, Counselors, and to IC in hopes that all will be more aware take ownership to improve student achievement through improved student behavior. While the Deans issue the consequences, the referrals are generated primarily by faculty with the exception of events that take place outside the classroom. It may be necessary to review classroom management and how it plays a role in the number of discipline referrals that are written.

Finally, it is also important to note that we have 3 new Deans this year and a new Assistant Principal. This lends itself to errors that will be corrected as we progress and become more knowledgeable in our jobs. We appreciate the Board’s patience as we grow.
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1. Student Discipline Summary by Gender and Race
2008-2009
Semester 1
TO: Board of Education
FROM: Janel Bishop
Assistant Principal for Student Health and Safety
DATE: March 19, 2009
RE: Student Discipline Summary by Gender and Race
Analysis of Data

BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following table.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
1. 1894 infractions were committed by males of all races.
2. 1151 infractions were committed by females of all races.
3. 1165 or 38% of 3046 total infractions were committed by African-American Males. This is in comparison to 492 or 16% committed by White Males.
4. Approximately 68% of all infractions are for attendance-related offenses (Truancy, Excessive Tardiness, Tardies).
5. There were 31 offenses of Gross Misconduct. These offenses were incurred by 24 students in 15 incidents.
6. There were 23 offenses of fighting. This number reflects the number of students involved in fights, not the number of fights.
7. There were 18 offenses of Mob Action. 18 students committed this infraction in 4 incidents.
8. 16 students were found to be Under the Influence of an Illegal or Controlled Substance.

RECOMMENDATION
African-American males continue to be over-represented in the discipline system. This remains unacceptable and indicates that we as a district must continue our efforts to increase success for our African-American males.

With the implementation of new tardy procedures this school year, all faculty/staff have taken an aggressive approach to addressing attendance concerns, which accounts for the high number of attendance-related offenses. This approach will hopefully help to decrease the overall number of attendance-related offenses over time.

The Deans have also attempted to focus a great deal of effort on students who are truant to class in hopes of changing this trend over time.

The number of students involved in violence-related offenses is greater than what we would be comfortable with. This indicates a need to think globally about how we as a District can teach students problem-solving and conflict-resolution skills proactively. We hope that some of these needs will be addressed with the implementation of the Counseling Curriculum that is currently being developed in our Student Services Division, as well as the recently
re-newed Peer Mediation Program. Possible areas of instruction for the Counseling Curriculum include problem solving and conflict resolution skills, sexual harassment, relationships, responsible behavior, etc. Counselors (with input and assistance from Deans) will provide instruction in a classroom setting. The Board will receive a report on this curriculum in the summer of 2009.

While the number of students involved in violence-related offenses is certainly higher than we would like, it should be noted that there was no recidivism in the categories of Fighting, Mob Action, or Battery during this first semester.

There was also no recidivism for any Class IV infraction.
### STUDENT DISCIPLINE SUMMARY BY GENDER AND RACE

#### 2008-2009 Semester 1

In Descending Order within Class of Infraction

1 = WHITE, NON-HISPANIC  
2 = BLACK, NON-HISPANIC  
3 = AMER INDIAN / ALASKAN NATIVE  
4 = ASIAN / PACIFIC ISLANDER  
5 = HISPANIC  
6 = MULTIRacial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FEMALES BY RACE</th>
<th>MALES BY RACE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RACE 1 2 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>Tot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION OF CELL PHONE POLICY</td>
<td>3 7 9</td>
<td>6 19</td>
<td>1 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION OF OPERATION BAG IT</td>
<td>2 6 1</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>12 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUANCY</td>
<td>84 171 48 34</td>
<td>176 347 84 298</td>
<td>590 948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCESSIVE TARDINESS</td>
<td>44 131 36 6</td>
<td>90 179 84 272</td>
<td>320 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARDIES</td>
<td>44 131 36 6</td>
<td>84 186 21 105</td>
<td>310 549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISREPECT</td>
<td>4 37 6 2</td>
<td>21 108 20 120</td>
<td>141 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISRUPTIVE</td>
<td>3 40 1 2</td>
<td>29 83 18 102</td>
<td>130 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAILURE TO SERVE D/N-DETENTION</td>
<td>4 27 1 1</td>
<td>33 51 12 81</td>
<td>114 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAILURE TO SERVE DET/ASD</td>
<td>7 28 4 2</td>
<td>41 36 7 58</td>
<td>99 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBAL ABUSE</td>
<td>16 6</td>
<td>6 21 1 17</td>
<td>33 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGRESSIVE PHYSICAL BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>7 23 1</td>
<td>31 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAUTHORIZED AREA OF BUILDING</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6 19 1 1</td>
<td>27 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUGITIVE</td>
<td>4 6 2 2</td>
<td>14 6 1 1</td>
<td>14 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOKING/TOBACCO USE OR POSSESS</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>4 3 1 1</td>
<td>13 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION OF ACADEMIC HONESTY</td>
<td>3 1 4</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
<td>5 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAILURE TO SERVE TCH-DETENTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION BEHAVIORAL AGREEMNT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS III</td>
<td>6 27 4 1 38 17 62 1</td>
<td>5 87 124</td>
<td>27 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS MISCONDUCT</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>6 2 23 1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGHTING</td>
<td>2 9 2</td>
<td>13 2 8</td>
<td>10 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREATS/INTI TO STU/FAC/STAFF</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>5 1 8 1</td>
<td>15 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS. STOLEN PROPERTY/THIEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 7 1 12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDANGERING SAFETY OF SELF AND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 3 2 6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ILLE SU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLYING</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>3 1 1</td>
<td>3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER INFLUENCE OF CTR. SUBST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY POLICY MISCONDUCT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMBLING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS. OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSESSION OF DRUG PARAPHERNAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 4 8</td>
<td>1 13 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB ACTION</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 5 2 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATTERY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSESSION OF WEAPON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 3 1 4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSON/BOMB Threat/False Alarm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSESSION OF ILLEGAL SUBSTANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (Does not include expulsions) | 212 779 13 106 41 1151 492 1165 1 10 102 124 1894 3046 |
2. Student Discipline Summary by Special Education and Race
2008-2009
Semester 1
BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following table.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
1. 2058 of 3046 total infractions were committed by non-special education students.
2. 987 infractions were committed by special education students.

RECOMMENDATION
The number of special education students involved in the discipline system could be much higher if it were not for the employment of the Behavior Interventionist in the Special Education Division. This person provides interventions to struggling students before they are referred to the discipline center. The number of involved special education students is still high, however, and this is an indication of the need for more collaboration between the PSS Teams and Special Education Case Managers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NON-SPECIAL ED BY RACE</th>
<th>SPECIAL ED BY RACE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 4 5 6 Tot</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 Tot</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION OF CELL PHONE POLICY</td>
<td>7 22 1 32 2 4 7 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION OF OPERATION BAG IT</td>
<td>6 13 1 20 1 1 6 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS II</td>
<td>428 1201 19 123 129 1900 233 589 1 3 78 28 930 2832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUANCY</td>
<td>160 340 5 26 31 562 100 241 1 36 8 386 948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCESSIVE TARDINESS</td>
<td>91 260 5 34 27 417 43 90 1 10 7 151 568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARDIES</td>
<td>90 238 6 39 28 401 42 86 1 14 5 148 549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFANCE</td>
<td>15 103 1 7 7 133 9 42 6 1 57 191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISRUPTIVE</td>
<td>21 85 7 9 122 11 39 2 3 54 177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAILURE TO SERVE DN-DETENTION</td>
<td>13 55 1 10 79 6 23 1 3 2 35 114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAILURE TO SERVE DET/ASD</td>
<td>14 46 1 3 8 72 7 18 1 1 27 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBAL ABUSE</td>
<td>5 24 2 31 1 13 4 1 19 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAUTHORIZED AREA OF BUILDING</td>
<td>3 13 1 17 3 17 1 21 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGRESSIVE PHYSICAL BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>6 19 1 26 3 9 12 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORGERY</td>
<td>6 11 3 3 23 4 1 5 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOKING/TOBACCO USE OR POSSESS</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 5 2 5 1 8 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION OF ACADEMIC HONESTY</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 5 1 3 4 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAILURE TO SERVE TCH-DETENTION</td>
<td>2 2 4 1 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAILURE TO IDENTIFY SELF</td>
<td>2 1 3 1 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION BEHAVIOR AGREEMNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS III</td>
<td>17 64 1 3 3 88 6 25 1 3 37 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS MISCONDUCT</td>
<td>3 15 1 8 0 13 15 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGHTING</td>
<td>2 15 2 19 2 2 4 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREATS/INTO STU/FAC/STAFF</td>
<td>2 9 1 1 13 2 4 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS. STOLEN PROPERTY/THEFT</td>
<td>2 6 1 9 2 2 1 5 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDANGERING SAFETY OF SELF AND</td>
<td>8 1 9 1 1 2 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ILLE SU</td>
<td>2 3 5 4 1 5 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER INFLUENCE OF CTRL. SUBST</td>
<td>3 2 5 1 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLYING</td>
<td>1 2 1 4 1 1 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY POLICY MISCONDUCT</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMBLING</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSESSION OF DRUG PARAPHERNAL</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS. OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS IV</td>
<td>1 18 19 3 9 1 13 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB ACTION</td>
<td>12 12 1 5 6 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSESSION OF WEAPON</td>
<td>1 1 2 2 1 1 4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATTERY</td>
<td>4 4 2 2 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSON/BOMB THREAT/FALSE ALARM</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSESSION OF ILLEGAL SUBSTANCE</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Does not include expulsions)</td>
<td>459 1317 20 129 133 2058 245 627 1 3 79 32 987 3046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Student Discipline Summary by Consequence, Grade Level, and Race

2008-2009

Semester 1
BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following table.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
The following indicates the number of consequences given by year in school:

- Seniors: 763
- Juniors: 773
- Sophomores: 769
- Freshmen: 748

This data shows that consequences are evenly distributed across grade level.

Four students were expelled held in abeyance by the Board of Education. These four students were involved in a total of two incidents. This compares with 3 students expelled in the first semester of the 2007-2008 school year.

As previously mentioned, the number of detentions issued (2270) includes ASDs that were given as consequences divided into three 1-hour detentions, or a 1-hour and a 2-hour detention. This is due to data entry limitations in Skyward. Had that limitation not existed, the number of ASDs would be higher and the number of detentions would be lower.

RECOMMENDATION
We will continue to work with Skyward to learn better ways of reporting the data so that it more accurately reflects the totals.
### STUDENT DISCIPLINE SUMMARY BY CONSEQUENCE, GRADE LEVEL, and RACE
#### 2008-2009 Semester 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action by Race</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD (3 hr Det)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETENTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPULSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. In-School Suspensions by Gender and Race

2008-2009

Semester 1
Oak Park and River Forest High School
District 200
201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Board of Education
FROM: Janel Bishop
       Assistant Principal for Student Health and Safety
DATE: March 19, 2009
RE: In-School Suspensions by Gender and Race
       Analysis of Data

BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following table.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
The totals given in this table represent the number of times ISS was given as a consequence. Though it would seem odd for a student to receive ISS’s for our two lowest classes of infractions (Class I and Class II), it should be noted that the majority of students who received ISS for either of these classes either had multiple infractions at the same time or had reached their third offense or higher for a certain infraction.

There is one student reported who received an ISS for Battery. This happened due to the need to have the student in school while the Deans investigated the incident. The student was kept in ISS that day. Once it was determined that the student was involved in a Battery (which normally results in a 5-day OSS for first offense) the student completed the suspension at home. We allowed the day of ISS to count toward the full consequence rather than have the student miss an additional day of school.

Our locker rooms were the prime location for many of the thefts that occurred in the building. While the number of students who committed the infraction of possession of stolen property/theft is higher than we would like, we are confident that the number would have been much higher were it not for new locker room procedures that were implemented midway through the year. These procedures removed the chance for students to leave their belongings unattended which lead to “crimes of opportunity” for the thieves in the building. The number of locker room thefts decreased to zero after the implementation of the new procedures. This, coupled with regular communication to faculty/staff about reminding students to not leave belongings unattended, has resulted in a decrease in frequency of this offense.

RECOMMENDATION
We will continue to teach students the importance of not leaving their items unattended in order to decrease the opportunities for theft. We are implementing new procedures in our weight room and are exploring solutions for issues that occur during athletic practices after school that will decrease the opportunities. Because there is no locker room supervision after school, as we have during the day, this is an area we need to examine in order to find the best way to protect students’ belongings while they are participating in their sport.
### IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS - By GENDER and RACE
#### 2008-2009 Semester 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Classes of Infractions</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Class I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Total</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Unauthorized Area Blding**: 1 5 6
  - 1
  - 2 1 4 5
- **Verbal Abuse**: 9 9 18
  - 1
  - 2 9 6 15
  - 5 1 1
  - 6 1 1
- **Viol Academic Honesty**: 1 1
  - 2

#### Class II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infraction</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Agressive Physical Behavior**: 2 9 11
  - 1
  - 2 2 7 9
  - 5
- **Defiance**: 5 26 31
  - 1
  - 2 4 18 22
  - 5 1 2 3
  - 6
- **Disruptive**: 4 14 18
  - 1
  - 2 2
  - 2 4 12 16
- **Excessive Tardiness**: 7 13 20
  - 1 1 4 5
  - 2 4 6 10
  - 5 2 2 4
  - 6
- **Failure to Serve Det/Asd**: 5 5 10
  - 1 2 1 3
  - 2 2 4 6
  - 5
- **Failure to Serve Dn-Detention**: 1 9 10
  - 1
  - 2 1 7 8
  - 6
- **Forgery**: 2 2
  - 1
  - 2
- **Smoking/Tobacco Use/Possess**: 1 3 4
  - 1
  - 2 1 2
- **Truancy**: 14 51 65
  - 1 7 16 23
  - 2 4 32 36
  - 5 3 3 6

#### Class III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Bullying**: 3 3
  - 1
  - 2 1 1
  - 6
- **Endanger Safety/Self Others**: 2 2
  - 6
- **Fighting**: 6 10 16
  - 1
  - 2 4 8 12
  - 5
- **Gambling**: 1 1
  - 2
- **Gross Misconduct**: 3 11 14
  - 1
  - 2 2 9 11
- **Poss. Stolen Property/Theft**: 1 4 5
  - 2 1 3 4
  - 6
- **Possession Drug Paraph**: 1 1
  - 2
- **Technolg商铺 Misconduct**: 1 1
  - 2
- **Threats/Inti Stu/Fac/Staff**: 2 5 7
  - 2 1 5 6
  - 5
- **Under Influ Contr. Subst**: 2 3 5
  - 1
  - 2 2 4
  - 2
- **Under Influ Illegal Subst**: 2 8 10
  - 1
  - 2 1 6 7
  - 5

#### Class IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Battery**: 1 1
  - 2
5. Out-of-School Suspensions by Gender and Race

2008-2009

Semester 1
Oak Park and River Forest High School
District 200
201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Board of Education
FROM: Janel Bishop
Assistant Principal for Student Health and Safety
DATE: March 19, 2009
RE: Out-of-School Suspensions by Gender and Race
Analysis of Data

BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following table.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
As mentioned previously, the 18 students involved in Mob Actions were involved in 4 incidents and there were no recidivists for Class IV infractions. There were also no recidivists for Fighting; however, 7 African-American females were suspended for fighting and of the 18 involved in Mob Action, 12 of them were African-American females.

RECOMMENDATION
Though there were no recidivists of violent infractions, we must continue to address the needs of our students pertaining to problem solving and conflict-resolution. Specifically, the needs of the African-American females who are involved in violent offenses must be met. The FREE program has been changed both structurally and organizationally to better meet the needs of many of these girls. There will be a full report of females involved in FREE in the end-of-the-year report. The MUREE program has also been changed to better meet the needs of our males who are having difficulties and will be reported on at the end of the school year, as well.
### OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS - By GENDER and RACE
#### 2008-2009 Semester 1

#### ALL CLASSES OF INFRINGEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER TOTALS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASS II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infracktion</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agressive Physical Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Tardiness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Area of Blding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Behavior Contr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASS III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infracktion</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endanger Safety Self &amp; Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Misconduct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss. Controlled Substance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss. Stolen PPRRTY/Theft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats/Inti To STU/FAC/Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Influence of Ctr. Subst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASS IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infracktion</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson/Bomb Thrt/False Alarm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mob Action</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Weapon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Illegal Substance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. All Suspensions by Class of Infraction, Year of Graduation, and Race

2008-2009

Semester 1
TO: Board of Education

FROM: Janel Bishop
Assistant Principal for Student Health and Safety

DATE: March 19, 2009

RE: All Suspensions by Class of Infraction, Year of Graduation, and Race
Analysis of Data

BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following tables.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
1. Freshman students received the highest number of ISS and also tied with Seniors for the highest number of OSS.
2. Juniors received the lowest number of ISS and OSS of all four grade levels.

15 different students included in the data tables received a combination of ISS and OSS for a single infraction. This happens when a situation occurs that presents an immediate safety issue, such as a fight, and students are asked to stay home for safety reasons the day after the event. They may then return to school to complete their consequence in ISS. Other times, situations occur where students are kept in ISS while an investigation is conducted and are later found to be serious enough for the student to complete the rest of the consequence as an OSS.

RECOMMENDATION
The high number of freshman suspended in and out of school is alarming. This suggests a need for more school-wide programs that address the needs of freshman as they transition in to high school. This high number during freshman year could be an indicator of future behavior concerns as this freshman class progresses. It also suggests a need for PSS Teams and Special Education Teams to identify struggling freshman earlier and begin to provide supports sooner.
### In-School Suspensions*

**By Class of Infraction, Year of Graduation, and Race**

**2008-2009 Semester 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class / Race</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Out-of-School Suspensions*

**By Class of Infraction, Year of Graduation, and Race**

**2008-2009 Semester 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class / Race</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 15 different students included in the above data received a combination of ISS and OSS for a single infraction.
7. Recidivism

2008-2009

Semester 1
BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following tables.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
Approximately 26% (791 students) of the total population of students attending school here at OPRFHS have had at least 1 discipline referral. While 791 students is more than we would prefer, it should be noted that of the 791 students, 510 have had three or fewer referrals. This means 64% of all students did not continually repeat the behaviors that caused them to receive consequences from the discipline center. 64% of all students can be described as having minimal interaction with the discipline system.

The second table shows what actions have been taken to provide support for those students who are our major recidivists. This table shows the use of referrals to our Resource Managers, PSS Teams, the Substance Abuse Counselor, Special Education Screening, Collaboration between PSS Teams and Case Managers, FREE/MUREE, Harbor, Ombudsman, Outside Agencies and other interventions put in place to help these students have more success.

RECOMMENDATION
What is disappointing about the information provided here is that of the 21 students shown with a high rate of recidivism, 16 are African-American males. This is unacceptable and indicates we must continue to do more to serve the needs of this group.
# Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Offenses</th>
<th># of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>791</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*approximately 26% of the total students attending OPRFHS

## Students with High Rate of Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Infractions</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Yr of Grad</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Comments / PSST Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MUREE &amp; RES MANAGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HOMELESS - ALL CLASS II – PARENT/TCHR CONF – FATHER DIED – GRIEF GROUP WITH RES MANAGER – JOINED WRESTLING TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>REFERRED TO PSST - PARENT CONTACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALL CLASS II - RES MANAGER - PARENTS CONSIDERING ADHD TESTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SE - HAS BEEN PLACED INTO PRIVATE DAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SE - ALL CLASS II - PSST &amp; SE CASE MANAGER WORKING TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HOMELESS - REFERRED FOR SE EVAL BUT MOM REFUSED – REFERRED TO ALL OUTSIDE AGENCIES BUT MOM NOT PARTICIPATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SE - ALL CLASS II - MOSTLY TRUANT - PSST &amp; SE CASE MANAGER WORKING TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE - ALL CLASS II - PSST &amp; SE CASE MANAGER WORKING TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SE – 2 TRUANCY – 17 TARDIES – PSST &amp; SE CASE MANAGER WORKING TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>5TH YR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5TH YEAR SENIOR - ALL CLASS II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>REFERRED FOR SP ED CASE STUDY AND FOUND ELIGIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALL CLASS II - FREE - RES MANAGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SP ED – PSST AND SP ED CASE MANAGER WORKING TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRESH - CLASS II – SUBST ABUSE COUNSELOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL REHAB – SUBST ABUSE COUNSELOR – SCHOOL SUPPORT GROUP - OUTSIDE THERAPIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOW ATTENDING HARBOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>APPROVED FOR SP ED SCREENING - MOM HAS NOT SIGNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALL CLASS II – PARENT CONF – RES MANAGER – MOM FORMER MILITARY IN IRAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>REFERRED FOR SP ED CASE STUDY AND FOUND ELIGIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOW ATTENDING HARBOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Each Row Represents a Student with 16 or More Offenses)*
8. GPA Tables

2008-2009

Semester 1
TO: Board of Education
FROM: Janel Bishop
Assistant Principal for Student Health and Safety
DATE: March 19, 2009
RE: GPA Tables
Analysis of Data

BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following tables.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
The data presented in these tables gives the range of weighted GPAs for students receiving at least one ISS, at least one OSS, and all students who had at least one discipline referral.

1. The highest number of students who received an ISS had a GPA that ranged from 1.0 and 1.99.
2. The highest number of students who received an OSS also had a GPA that ranged from 1.0 and 1.99.

RECOMMENDATION
Weighted GPAs in the range of 1.0 and 1.99 are considered low and below the expectation of achievement for all OPRFHS students. This data simply points to the direct correlation between achievement and involvement in the discipline center. This, again, is an indicator that we are not where we would like to be in tackling the achievement gap and the disproportionate representation of African-American students in the discipline system.
### WEIGHTED GPA RANGES OF STUDENTS RECEIVING AT LEAST ONE IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION

#### 2008-2009 Semester 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHTED GPA RANGES</th>
<th># OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - .999</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 1.99</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 – 2.99</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 – 3.99</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEIGHTED GPA RANGES OF STUDENTS RECEIVING AT LEAST ONE OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSION

#### 2008-2009 Semester 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHTED GPA RANGES</th>
<th># OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - .999</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 1.99</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 – 2.99</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 – 3.99</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEIGHTED GPA RANGES OF STUDENTS RECEIVING AT LEAST REFERRAL TO THE DEAN

#### 2008-2009 Semester 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHTED GPA RANGES</th>
<th># OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - .999</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 1.99</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 – 2.99</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 – 3.99</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Alternative Actions & Interventions

2008-2009

Semester 1
BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following table.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
While we are not satisfied with our current numbers for discipline consequences, we feel that our numbers would be significantly higher were it not for the Deans’ use of alternative actions and other interventions.

This year the Deans have used Restricted Lunch and Lunchroom Duty as alternatives to detentions and possible suspensions.

The Deans have worked very hard this year to create a school environment where students come to their Deans for support and assistance with conflicts before they escalate. While we are not where we would like to be, we are well on our way to creating that kind of culture. The Deans have conducted 79 conferences with students, teachers, parents/guardians, counselors, other school personnel and community agency personnel. Over 40 mediations were also conducted by the Deans. This is another area where we found that multiple terms are being used interchangeably. Among the 79 conferences, many of those were mediations of student conflict but were not classified as such. We will clean this up for next year’s reports. We firmly believe that spending this kind of time with students helps them realize that the adults in the building are here to help them succeed. Though we have had several students involved in fights, we feel the numbers could be much worse. These conferences and mediations have averted many more violent acts that could have occurred.

In lieu of detention hours when students have been involved in smoking/tobacco violations, the Deans have assigned students to a Smoking Cessation Class conducted here in the building after school by the Oak Park Department of Public Health.

42 students have been referred to participate in the FREE/MUREE programs. The end-of-the-year report will include more information on these participants.

In an effort to deter students from future involvement with the discipline center, for most students involved in a Class III or Class IV infraction, a Behavior Expectation Meeting was held. The Deans held 61 of these meetings with students, their parents/guardians, sometimes their Counselor or Resource Manager. We no longer use the Behavior Contracts used in the past. Now, Behavior Expectations on the part of the student, parent/guardian,
Dean, and Counselor are discussed and documented. Other supports such as referrals to the Substance Abuse Counselor are included in this documentation. This is kept on file and regularly revisited by Deans to be sure all are maintaining the expectations.

One intervention the Deans are quite proud of is our partnership with the Concordia University Community Counseling Center. We have begun allowing students to receive counseling at this Center in lieu of days of suspension, or in order to regain certain school privileges. Our students receive basic-level counseling from graduate students pursuing their school counseling degrees/certifications. This partnership allows our students to receive counseling and allows Concordia’s students to earn the practicum hours they need. We have used this with 14 students, 12 of which are African-American females involved in two mob action incidents. Although these two incidents were severe, the Deans sought to create alternatives that would allow students to learn and grow from this negative experience. At the time of the writing of this report, all 12 girls are more than halfway through their counseling sessions.

Also, the students who could not make it to Concordia were given the opportunity to receive counseling through Family Services. The Deans have made a total of 26 referrals for other Community Support Services in addition to the referrals made to Concordia.

10 home visits were made by the Deans and 22 referrals were made to our own Resource Managers.

RECOMMENDATION
These kinds of interventions tend to go unnoticed when examining discipline statistics. We want to make sure that does not happen. As previously mentioned, we also want to increase the number of proactive opportunities we have with students. We want to make every interaction they have with the Discipline Center such that they learn from their mistakes, grow from them and not repeat them. We hope to achieve this by continuing to promote a culture where our students will know who to get help from. We’d like to provide more instruction to students as previously mentioned with the Counseling Curriculum and provide more alternatives to our current consequences in an effort to reduce the amount of missed class wherever possible. For those students where suspensions are necessary, we would like for that time to be meaningfully spent.

We will again work to clean up our method of reporting to receive more accurate data. We know that many more interventions were done (such as referrals to the Substance Abuse Counselor) than what is shown in the report but they have not been accurately recorded.
# Alternative Actions and Interventions

## 2008-2009 Semester 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Females by Race</th>
<th>Males by Race</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females Subtotal</td>
<td>Males Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Lunch</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunchroom Duty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Conference</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Expectation Meeting</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE/MUREE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Referral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Manager Referral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking Cessation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Counseling Referral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data is not included in any previous reports.
10. Year-to-Year Comparisons

Semester 1
TO: Board of Education

FROM: Janel Bishop
Assistant Principal for Student Health and Safety

DATE: March 19, 2009

RE: Year-to-Year Comparison of Consequences
Analysis of Data

BACKGROUND
The information below provides specific summary and analysis of data shown on the following table.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
The information provided in the Semester One Report from previous years did not have the detentions separated by 1-, 2-hour detentions and ASDs. Total number of detentions was combined in that data. The current number of detentions for this year is still significantly higher than previous years. This can partly be attributed to the fact that Deans have decreased the number of hours of detention given to students for the truancy offense. In previous years, an ASD was given for truancy. This year we felt that was too harsh and chose to decrease the detention from 3 hours to 1 hour. This, coupled with the previously mentioned fact that the data entry for ASDs that are served in increments cannot be applied to the totals for ASD and are applied to the totals for Detentions, provides an explanation for the significant increase in Detentions.

The data for ISS and OSS for this year is significantly higher than what was reported at this time last year. In comparison to what was reported for previous years, however, there is a slight increase over the years in ISS and a decrease in OSS (except in 2005-2006 where the numbers were equal).

The number of expelled students at this point in the year has increased by 1 since this time last year. Both years, however, have seen a significant reduction from 2006-2007 (19 expulsions). We would like to attribute this reduction to more support being provided to students and the use of the PSS model in providing interventions and addressing students’ overall needs.

RECOMMENDATION
It continues to be our goal to decrease the overall numbers of students receiving discipline consequences. Many plans of how to achieve this have been described throughout this report.
YEAR-TO-YEAR COMPARISON OF CONSEQUENCES
2004-05 through 2008-09
Semester 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DET</th>
<th>ASD</th>
<th>ISS</th>
<th>OSS</th>
<th>EXPULSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>2270 (1,2 hr)</td>
<td>420 (3 hr)</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>1854 (1,2,3 hr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>No Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>No Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>