

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

**BOARD OF EDUCATION  
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING  
Wednesday, August 19, 2009  
8:15 a.m.  
Board Room**

**A G E N D A**

- |      |   |                            |
|------|---|----------------------------|
| I.   | Call to Order   | Dr. Ralph H. Lee           |
| II.  | Approval of Minutes   | Phil Prale                 |
| III. | Discussion and Agreement on Preliminary Rules of Procedure              | Dr. Ralph H. Lee           |
| IV.  | Report on MSAN National Conference                                      | Dr. Weninger<br>Phil Prale |
| V.   | Preliminary AYP Results   | Amy Hill                   |
| VI.  | Additional Instructional Matters for Committee Information/Deliberation | Dr. Ralph H. Lee           |

Docket

1. Summer School Report
2. Standardized Test Report

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

**Oak Park and River Forest High School  
201 N. Scoville  
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**An Instruction Committee  
June 18, 2009**

An Instruction Committee meeting was held on Thursday, June 18, 2009 in the Board Room. Dr. Millard opened the meeting at 7:35 a.m. Committee members present were Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors included Linda Cada, Director of Special Education and Cindy Milojevic, and Assistant Principal for Student Activities.

**Approval of May Instruction Committee Minutes**

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to accept the May 19, 2009 minutes of the meeting by acclimation, as presented.

**Review of ARRA Funding Plans**

Per the Board of Education's request, Mr. Prale reported on the following:

Plans for ARRA IDEA, Part B funds

- Purchase hardware and software to support Special Education students and classrooms, as well as to improve tracking of student information.
- Fund service-providers to provide physical/occupational therapy, auditory services, social work, and psychologist services.
- Contract for group counseling services for Special Education students.
- Fund parent seminar on transitional planning for students with significant cognitive disabilities.
- Provide professional development for all faculty on tiered instruction.
- Provide release time for an external coach to develop delivery systems for multi-tiered interventions.
- Fund construction in the Adaptive PE facility and provide a lift for access for special needs students to the fourth floor center hallway.

Plans for ARRA Title I funds

- Expand reading pull-out program piloted this school year. ARRA Title I funding will cover two periods of reading pull-out targeting ninth grade student reading below grade level.
- Continue to support supplemental educational services and professional development activities according to federal guidelines.

The detailed breakdown was included in the packet.

These funds will purchase a Skyward information system module which will allow general education teachers to access information about special education students. Mr. Prale encouraged technology purchases versus adding ongoing salary expenses, as technology is an expense that does not necessarily reoccur. The purchase of math software is part of one teacher collaboration team's research on how to increase AYP scores. A math teacher collaboration team in Special Education spent significant time researching technology applications; in the coming year the team will focus on learning the software and teaching others. Substitute pay was not built into the budget, as Mr. Prale did not believe there would be the need for any additional days. Other projected costs include a speaker who will address the needs of TEAM and LD families in the evening, and another speaker scheduled during the teacher collaboration time, or possible for a professional development activity scheduled for a Saturday.

### **Report on Professional Development Activities**

Mr. Prale stated that the professional development activities for the 2008-09 school year were as follows:

- Teacher Collaboration Teams
- Professional Development Committee (PDC) Work (a joint committee of faculty and administration which planned activities to address goals established by the Board of Education and Superintendent)

Mr. Prale outlined the fall faculty activities which included the opening and closing of school activities and the January 26, 2009 Institute Day, a bi-district effort with Districts 97 and 200, to bring in Dr. John Diamond to update faculty and staff on achievement research, to improve communication, and to address pressing school issues.

The teacher collaboration teams set goals, met Monday mornings during the modified schedule, and issued reports summarizing their work. These teams are also called learning teams or professional learning communities and their purpose is to provide teachers with time to improve teaching skills, develop curriculum, instruction and assessment materials, and assess the impact of their work on student performance. Division Heads are responsible for monitoring the teams and ensuring their work aligned with the goals of the District.

Division Heads have reviewed the bulleted items. Dr. Lee asked how satisfied Mr. Prale was with the results of the late arrival plan. Mr. Prale responded that his satisfaction was 50 percent. While some divisions did very exciting work, other divisions did not. Dr. Lee commented that in some divisions, the work appeared productive and not in others. That is a dilemma. Just as every hour spent on testing is an hour of lost teaching the same is true of this program as well. He asked if the budgeting of time had been considered. Mr. Prale said it was a cost benefit analysis. The District is not increasing Learning Team time out of instructional minutes as they are meeting after school. He had debated with the English teachers who wanted a half day off to do reliability; he offered to pay them for the hours between 3 and 6 p.m. and for dinner, but they disagreed.

### **Update on Restructuring Plan**

Mr. Prale presented an edited version of the draft of the Restructuring Plan. The purpose of the Restructuring Plan is to encourage the District to take intensive and far-reaching interventions to revamp the operation and government of the school.

Administrators, teachers, the West 40 RESPO consultant, and community members who are familiar with the school and school improvement efforts have reviewed this plan and had offered suggestions.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked that this plan be more than AYP as a measure of attainment of AYP.

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Restructuring Plan at its regular June Board of Education meeting.

### **Stipend Review Committee Annual Report**

Ms. Milojevic distributed the Senior Supplement, an addition to the Tabula, which included a listing of where seniors planned to go for post secondary education. Ms. Milojevic provided the Committee members with an update on current clubs and activities, a review and analysis of them for next year, and where the District is in terms of the reporting of data as it relates to co-curricular. The Stipend Review Committee work consisted of the following:

#### Two New Stipends

- Athletics/Adaptive Gym/Cardio Room Supervisor. Currently, OPRFHS offers Health and Wellness classes to faculty two days per week, and therefore have supervision coverage in the Adaptive Gym on Mondays and Thursdays. This proposed stipend position would provide supervision on Tuesday and Wednesday, and would allow faculty, staff and students to utilize the facility after school in a supervised manner. In addition, it would provide another supervised area for students to complete P.E. make sessions.
  - Level 5, ½ stipend in the 5-8 year index = \$3, 838
- Activities/a new club – Service Learning and Leadership. Students in the club will be active participants in the community through volunteer involvement with local agencies such as PADS, Hephzibah, The Oak Park Food Pantry, etc. The students will have a hands-on role with this new Service Club.
  - Level 6, 5-8 year index = \$2,866

#### New Club Requests

- Nine new club proposals were submitted for consideration for next year. Funding allowed for only one new club *The Service Learning and Leadership Club*. The eight other proposals were: Animal Care League Support Club (will suggest to be included in New Service Club), Athletic Managers Club, Horror Movie Club

(absorbed into Film Club), Fashion Club, Fishing Club, Fencing Club, Paintball Club, and Guitar Club.

#### Stipend Level Changes

- Three requests were made and approved by DLT to increase stipends from Level 5 to Level 4 due to growing student participation numbers as well as expanded offerings. They are Spoken Word, Gospel Choir and Biology/Environmental Club.

#### At-Risk Clubs

- Ten clubs had participation levels that are a bit lower than what the faculty contract requires, and are considered “at risk.” Personal conversations were held with each sponsor, with the goal of expanding membership next year.

#### Discontinuation of Clubs

- Dissolution of two clubs due to low participation levels:
  - French Club
  - Freedom Readers (will continue the mission, under the umbrella of ACTSO)

#### Student Participation Rates

- Student participation data for 2008 was entered into Skyward this fall. The numbers reflect that 1,800 students participated in activity related co-curricular offerings last year (excluding athletics). Based upon a student enrollment in 2008 of 3,079, that is a 58% participation rate. (Note: the national average is 60 percent.)
- The entry of roster data for each club/activity for 2009 is being completed. Early in the summer, a final report will be submitted that compares participation rates from last year to this year.
- That report will include the percent of student participants and key demographic information.
- This report will be shared with the Board of Education once complete.

Everything that Ms. Milojevic does is directed by the Faculty Senate Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), which spells out the stipends based on the number of years of experience, number of students involved, etc. In March, the District began to evaluate the current clubs and activities for the following year, e.g., when they meet, their performance, and who participates in the club, etc. Stipend levels relate to the clubs. As the membership of the group increases, a sponsor takes on more responsibility and thus will be rewarded with more.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how the stipend level changes fit into the budget. Ms. Milojevic responded that there is an allocation of money for stipends. Sponsors are invited to return if their evaluations show that they are doing their jobs. Should the sponsor be invited back, his/her years of service puts him/her on a particular salary lane. As that salary lane changes, it may constitute the sponsor receiving a larger stipend. If the club has a certain number of students and meets a certain number of times, the

District needs to reimburse the sponsor appropriately. The CBA has the names of the clubs listed in it. It also says that the club should have fifteen (15) members with three-quarters of them being active members. Ms. Milojevic stated that a lot of clean up has occurred since she started, and it was ongoing. The sponsors now understand the process and know they have to report data.

A question arose regarding the club Freedom Readers and it was explained that the club consists of girls working with ACT-SO to nurture reading and the love of reading.

Ms. Milojevic reported that last time there was a report on student participation was in 1996. At the time, students were asked in their homerooms what activities they were involved. Ms. Milojevic's mission was to find out how many students were involved. While discovery of this information has been challenging, each year it has gotten better. This year 85 percent of the sponsors responded. Ms. McCormack suggested holding their stipend back until they did respond.

Ms. Milojevic stated that the data was part of the Skyward system. Athletes cannot compete unless there is an IHSA roster, which is included in Skyward. Ms. Milojevic is most interested in finding out those students who are not involved in anything and then give that information to the counselors. Generally, fifty-eight percent of students are involved in cocurricular activities, not athletics; more females are involved than males; and the ethnicity of students involved in cocurricular activities is similar to the school's demographics.

When Dr. Lee asked what the percentage of African-Americans engaged in extracurricular activities were compared to the percentage of White students, Ms. Milojevic said that this data is not available for last year, but it will be in the future.

Mr. Rouse and Ms. Milojevic will work on a format and bring a detailed report in August; it will include class year, gender, race and percentage of students involved, either overall or club-by-club detail. Ms. Patchak-Layman also asked for thumbnail sketches for each club and then a composite report. It was noted that while participation is high with freshman students, it drops in the sophomore and junior years.

Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted to know how stipends could be increased because of the District's fixed cocurricular budget. Dr. Weninger noted this was a concern. If the goal is to increase the level of participation, then the level of funding will also have to increase in order to accommodate new programs. Discussions are occurring with Ms. Witham about adjusting the budget accordingly. Dr. Lee asked to what extent was money limiting student participation. Is it too limiting? Dr. Weninger responded that at this point, it is not too limiting but the District has to be careful not to make it too limiting. The school budget allocated for stipends is \$287,000.

Ms. Patchak-Layman learned that OPRFHS funds IHSA competitions, just as it does for athletics and other pre-designated groups.

### **Draft Plan to Implement Student Achievement Domains and Components**

Ms. Hill provided a two-year implementation process plan which identified the administrative responsibility for each domain. The draft assumes a continuous

improvement process. Ms. Hill stated that the guiding statement that provides an overall purpose for the Student Achievement Domains and Components is as follows:

Oak Park and River Forest High School will develop, assess, and revise programs through which all students achieve their maximum potential in each of the following domains.

She also stated that the term “programs” refers to the regular programs of teaching, learning, and assessment across all curricular areas; targeted interventions to support students with demonstrated needs; and co-curricular offerings.

The Curriculum and Instruction Office would primarily oversee efforts in the following Domains:

- Domain I, Academic Knowledge
- Domain II, Key Cognitive Strategies
- Domain III, Academic Engagement
- Domain V, Information Literacy and Technology Literacy

The Principal would primarily oversee efforts in the following Domains:

- Domain IV, Habits/Modes of Work
- Domain VI, Social-Emotional Wellbeing
- Domain VII, Post-Secondary Planning and Readiness
- Domain VIII, Citizenship and Civic Responsibility
- Domain IX, Valuing Diversity

Ms. Hill provided a proposed sequence of activities and calendar in the report and noted that by 2011-12 the Student Achievement Domains and Components for Measuring Institutional Excellence would be fully implemented.

She also stated that the reports would include a single summary cover sheet, followed by separate reports for each measure. The reports would follow the standard format for all reports to the Board of Education and would contain the following elements:

Background: The overview should state the intent, goal, or purpose of the program or information collected. A theory of action may also be included and any supporting information.

Summary of Findings: The information may include but would not be limited to course selections, grades in specific courses, standardized test scores, survey responses, attendance and discipline records, and student demographic information. Data should be disaggregated by race, gender, and other factors as appropriate (e.g. grade level, special education); a summary statement evaluating the school’s progress toward achieving the benchmark (to include longitudinal comparisons beginning in 2011)

Note: data tables may be appended but would not be included in the summary section.

Recommendations (or Future Directions): Proposals for maintaining, adjusting, or eliminating existing programs, or recommendations for new courses of action, based upon the analysis of the data.

Ms. Hill asked for the Instruction Committee members' input, noting that there was a convergence of the Board of Education working on its goals and this plan. Dr. Millard felt that what was most important point to consider was what was feasible. Ms. Hill explained that she had attempted to start from the end and move backwards to determine how long it would take to get the data. Because of the timeframe for developing the document, she had not had a chance to vet this internally. Division Heads have not seen the latest document but would later in the day and they will have an in-depth discussion about this in August.

Reports have to be created in order to be able to mine the data; it is a matter of collecting the bundled data. It will be the Division Head's responsibility to identify the course outcomes in terms of key cognitive strategies and to work backwards for a design process, to make sure that the outcomes are in place, to collect data on student achievements ~~of~~ related to those outcomes, and to make instructional changes based on that analysis.

Dr. Lee asked 1) how it would be known when certain things were done over a one-year period; 2) what could be accomplished in 2009-10; and 3) when would the Board of Education get status reports. He also asked when the Board of Education could expect to receive last year's GPA reports disaggregated by race and gender. He was told that it would be included in the academic indicator report to be presented in September, as stated on page 2.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how the school would measure the academic progress or institutional excellence of those students receiving private tutoring. How can their progress be measured against those who do not receive private tutoring? In the case of a student receiving private tutoring, one must ask, where does the actual learning occur? If half of the class receives private tutoring or has a public library card and does well, then she surmised that learning was occurring outside of class. Ms. Hill stated that it was discovered that it was difficult to compare the students who were bumped up in math or who overrode the recommended course because often they had outside tutoring. Other family contributions having an impact on student achievement would be more difficult to document and to only pick out one type of intervention and track it down would then overlook the other factors. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt this was more than measuring institutional excellence. As one does Mastery Manager and as one has the specifics of what one is looking at, one would see whether the whole sequence had produced results. Ms. McCormack agreed with Ms. Hill that there were many variables, e.g., student study groups, etc.; the school cannot cover the gamut, so this is the best it can do. Mr. Prale stated that the system is not built for causal proof. Correlations can be



found between patterns of students, but when talking about excellence, the school is talking about the four pillars: faculty, students, parents, and community. The District looks for patterns that cause institutional excellence. The school is looking for correlations vs. causations.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the District wants all who take AP chemistry to score a certain amount and to be able to say that the students who took that class scored a 3, 4 or 5 or that the pass rate in the class was 100 percent. Mr. Prale stated that the District will make the assumption that what was happening in the class was producing these results. If these students had significant tutoring in order to achieve A's and B's across all subgroups in the chemistry program, the school would feel satisfied, but it would ask why. When looking at Agile Mind students, the District found that while African-American students used computers more, they had similar outcomes as whites. Ms. Hill responded that the model assumes that there is continuous improvement and that teachers in chemistry are using Mastery Manager to look at classroom data and, therefore, are making instructional changes to help students.

Dr. Millard concurred with Ms. McCormack that the school cannot factor in all of the variables. While the District has to make families aware of the opportunities available to them, she did not know how the District would quantify them.

Ms. Patchak-Layman remarked that this was not a document that measured institutional excellence because if all of the things happened as listed, OPRFHS would be an excellent institution. Dr. Weninger stated that this document has evolved from the initial goal of telling the District how it will know institutional excellence and develop into the forays described. The document codifies 1) those values on which the District will agree that students should have; 2) the tools of measurement; 3) the benchmarks for attainment; and the direction when a student does not achieve the previous three. This document would focus the District's effort on coordinating much of what it is attempting to do. Dr. Millard added that it was not just what happened during the day that determines what a student does. Ms. Patchak-Layman remarked that institutional excellence is supposed to define what happens here at OPRFHS. Ms. Hill stated that the SIP Team had asked about the other pillars, e.g. family, teacher, parents, community, etc. The most important measure of the District's success is the students' outcomes; it is a piece of the excellence of the institution. If the District is achieving these things by drilling the information into the students and narrowing the focus by test preparation, it is not excellent. If the District does this in the context of a rich curriculum and it maintains the other elements of its work, then it is striving toward excellence. Ms. Hill was unsure if there would be an effort to define other domains.

Dr. Weninger was unsure if a parent would want to be asked if he/she provided tutoring for his/her students. Tutoring is a cottage industry. Parents do things that contribute to a student's success. The school can only control what it can control. Dr. Lee felt a parent would feel the question about tutoring would be an invasion of privacy. Ms. Patchak-Layman has heard that tutoring has to be provided because learning does not occur in the classroom. Ms. Hill, as a parent of a child who struggles, responded that she has

provided much tutoring to her child. She sees this from both sides of the coin. In looking at RtI, there is the sense that when instruction is most effective, 85 percent will get it and 15 percent will need extra interventions. There will still be an estimated 5 percent of the students, even with that second level of intervention, who will not achieve the outcomes and will need additional intervention. She does not hold her child's teacher responsible for her child's difficulties, as it is a function of how the child's brain functions. She accepts the responsibility of having to provide additional supports. She understands that the school's resources are limited and that her child needs many hours of additional support. Ms. McCormack noted that some parents put their students in higher level classes than they should be in and, thus, they need the extra help to move beyond their capability. Mr. Rouse added that parents in these situations will say that they will provide additional tutoring so that their children are placed in higher level classes. The school also offers tutoring before, after, and during school. Some parents may elect for their students to go for outside tutoring because they feel it is incumbent upon them to do so. Students go to the math tutoring center every hour of the day. Students need additional help based on their level and challenge and the tutoring does not reflect the teaching in the classroom.

Dr. Lee asked what the "Growth Mindset" concept meant. Ms. Hill explained that the growth mindset is characterized by a belief that intelligence can be grown through effort. Through one's own efforts, one can be better at anything by doing specific and purposeful action that can push him/her beyond his/her current performance. Students who have the growth mindset are more interested in taking on challenges to stretch and grow than those who have the fixed mindset. Research supports that nurturing the growth mindset produces significant changes in outcomes. Dr. Lee asked for more information on the author of this concept, Carol Dweck.

Ms. Hill stated that while there are some pieces available for longitudinal data, they are not available in every area. Dr. Lee wanted the longitudinal data on reading scores, i.e., reading across the curriculum program going back several years. It would be useful to know how successful the District has been in its efforts. He believed that some things that have been taken for granted are useful, but supporting information is not available in order to evaluate. He was more concerned about going back in time with longitudinal studies in the areas possible, i.e., taking what is available on a limited framework and going forward. He asked for detailed expansion of what was being presented, e.g., reports, data analysis. Dr. Weninger stated that the District has data that goes back five years, e.g., reading, GPA, etc. Dr. Lee would like to see the plan expanded not only with the data that will be collected but the past data as well.

Dr. Lee added that he was very impressed and happy with the work that has gone into this project. Dr. Millard concurred.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked what benchmarks and indices would be used for Domain 2. Ms. Hill responded that Ms. Neuman focused on No. 8, Problem Solving, and No. 5, Reasoning Argumentation and Proof. The index for reasoning, argumentation, and proof is the student's ability to accurately do geometric proofs, and this will be measured in all

geometry courses by semester and by other assessments throughout the school year. One could take the interpretation or analysis and in the core history courses, in American History and World History, there would be an index of the student's ability to write a response to a document based question (DBQ), and that would involve the student looking at historical evidence and developing a coherent argument in answer to a specific prompt that asks the student to provide the analysis that goes into answering the questions. That would be done in all World History and all American History courses. Dr. Millard stated that the value of achievements was listed, but it would vary subject to subject and division to division. That work is still in progress for each division to develop.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if other divisions besides math had a benchmark for problem solving. Ms. Hill responded that problem solving occurs in every curriculum, but there are core components to problem solving. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the process was documented. Dr. Millard suggested that Ms. Patchak-Layman meet with Ms. Hill on this specifically. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that a value of achievement is one of improvisation. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that some things had nothing concrete in place. In the examples given, there is a teaching component. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if there were an interdisciplinary aspect of those components so that the District can say problem solving was accomplished because everyone takes geometry. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that there are core components/skills that go into problem solving. Is that process documented somewhere in terms of the process for any of the analysis? Are there processes that go into problem solving? What has been described in the document is the outcome. Dr. Millard suggested that if any of the Board of Education members had other indicators of achievement to submit to bringing them directly to Ms. Hill.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked where in the document student knowledge of learning styles, aptitudes, and interests was. The response was Domain 3, under self monitoring. It too has an instructional component.

Dr. Lee stated that this document was at least an outgrowth of the goal set last year to define student achievement and the racial achievement gap. How far is the school from having an initial, imperfect statement to describe the racial achievement gap, as it is not addressed in the document? He was concerned about making visible progress toward defining the racial achievement gap. This document is an outgrowth of 2007 when it was said that institutional excellence needed to be defined. Dr. Weninger stated that he would provide Dr. Lee with an imperfect definition by the end of the summer. Dr. Lee felt this was just as important as the broader goal and he wanted concrete steps.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if passing grade was still a D. The response was yes. One could have an unweighted GPA of 2.0 and still have a D. Ms. Patchak-Layman expressed concern that some domains had nothing in place that was concrete.

### **Adjournment**

The Instruction Committee adjourned at 9:53 a.m. on Thursday, June 18, 2009.

# **Recommended Procedures for the Conduct of The Business of the Board Instruction Committee**

(rlee – 8/15/09)

## **I. Goals of This Document**

- A. To have a generally acceptable and publicly stated set of rules and understandings on how the Instruction Committee of the Board of Education of OPRFHS District 200 will conduct its business.
- B. To establish procedures that enable the committee to handle all of its business (as determined by the meeting agenda) within the allotted time (usually 1 ½ hours; up to two hours with advance planning).
- C. To help assure that the matters addressed, the information shared, and the time spent in committee meetings generally meet with the approval of a large majority of board members.
- D. To help assure that all board members have the opportunity to make their views known on the agenda issues, even if those views constitute a minority opinion.
- E. To establish procedures that help to enable board members to have their questions answered about presentations, even if this cannot be done in public session.

## **II. Operating Procedures**

- A. **Adoption of rules of procedure** – These rules will be recommended by the Instruction Committee for formal adoption by the Board of Education.
- B. **Setting of the agenda** – The agenda will be set by the chair after consulting with the appropriate senior administrators. The chair will take into consideration the advice of the President, fellow board members, the Superintendent, and other community stakeholders. The chair will attempt to schedule only as much work as the committee might reasonably expect to accomplish in the 1 ½ - 2 hours allotted. Each agenda item should have an estimated time limit that will serve as a basis for the chair's exercise of judgment in conducting the meeting.
- C. **Participation of community stakeholders** – Interested community members are always welcome to observe committee meetings, and will be allowed to participate in discussions within limits set by the chair. Generally, brief questions and comments will be welcome, but more lengthy participation should be arranged in advance with the chair.
- D. **Time Management**
  - 1. All agendas, written reports, and supporting materials will be sent out several days prior to the committee meeting date, so that board members who have extensive and/or complex questions can contact the appropriate person in advance of the meeting to gain more information.
  - 2. The chair will have broad authority to set time limits on presentations, questions, and comments, and will assure that board members who have not had the opportunity to be heard on an issue be able to do so within the allotted time.
  - 3. A board member who cares to do so may formally move to have his/her speaking time extended by a specific amount of time. If the motion receives a second, the chair will immediately take a vote by show of hands of the board members in attendance. A specific amount of additional time will be allocated by a majority of those board members present voting in favor of the motion.

TO: Board of Education  
FROM: Phil Prale and Attila J. Weninger  
DATE: August 19, 2009  
RE: Annual MSAN Conference and Governing Board Meeting Report

---

The Minority Student Achievement Network held its 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference, “Accelerating Growth: Aligning Beliefs and Actions” in Dearborn, Michigan from Tuesday, June 23 to Thursday, June 25. The Ann Arbor and Farmington Public School Districts hosted the conference which was attended by the following representatives from OPRFHS – D200: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Amy McCormack, Nathaniel Rouse, Carolyn Ojikutu, Devon Alexander, Jessica Stovall, Neal Weisman, Amy Hill, and Phil Prale. The conference began on Tuesday, June 23 with two pre-conferences that ran concurrently. The first was titled *Engaging Minority Students in Algebra* which featured a keynote presentation from Dr. Deborah Lowenberg Ball, Dean of the School of Education for the University of Michigan. The second focused on motivating students and featured Ian Smith who has written and presented internationally on effective strategies to increase student self-motivation and engagement.

The MSAN Governing Board attended sessions on the first day of the conference and held its annual meeting and on the second day. At the annual meeting agenda topics included a report on the Board Assembly meeting by Karen Bolsen, Farmington, MI, board member with a focus on how the GB and BA can work more closely together and communicate effectively to support each other’s goals/work; a report on the work of the Research Practitioner’s Council (RPC), with a focus on reorganization of committees and logistical issues; an update on the progress of the electronic teacher newsletter, which will be coming online this school year; a presentation by Hardy Murphy, Superintendent of Evanston 65 on its new teacher appraisal system; an update on the development of a summer leadership institute for current/sitting leaders to begin in summer 2010; an update on the student conference to be hosted by Evanston Township High School and OPRFHS in September; budget discussion; Executive Committee Election, and a few miscellaneous items such as the MSAN website.

On Wednesday, June 24, Dr. Madeline Hafner, MSAN Executive Director, and Dr. Sue Zurvalec, Superintendent of the Farmington Public Schools, welcomed participants to the main conference. The first keynote speaker was Dr. John Diamond of the Harvard Graduate School of Education who presented his recent research on how race, ethnicity, and social class intersect with school leadership, practices, and policies to shape student educational opportunities and outcomes. On the second day of the conference, Bonnie Davis discussed how to improve literacy outcomes with students who have varying learning styles. The second day also included a keynote from Horacio Sanchez who provided a powerful presentation that examined the intersection of student socio-emotional learning needs and brain research.

For the second consecutive year, OPRFHS English teacher, Devon Alexander, presented at the conference. Devon’s breakout session was titled *Navigating the Roadblocks: The Pedagogy of Critical Race Theory for White Educators*. The session was extremely well attended as Devon moved participants through a dialectic focusing on how race affected their lives as educators and the experiences of their students in our schools. Other conference breakout sessions included sessions on improving equity and access for minority students, implementing successful literacy and math programs, and sponsoring academic and behavioral support programs year round. On Thursday and Friday, June 25-26, the MSAN Research Practitioner’s Council met to discuss the upcoming student conference in Evanston, Illinois, September 23-26. This conference will be co-hosted by Evanston Township High School and Oak Park and River Forest High School.

# Oak Park and River Forest High School District 200

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

TO: Board of Education Instruction Committee  
FROM: Amy Hill  
DATE: August 19, 2009  
RE: 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status Report

---

## BACKGROUND

In early August, the state published the 2009 AYP Status Report for each public high school and district in Illinois. The attached report indicates the proportion of the school's students who took state tests in 2009 and the proportion of students who met or exceeded state standards in Reading and Math, including results for 755 juniors who took the Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE) and six juniors who took the Illinois Alternate Assessment (IAA). In order for the school as a whole to make AYP, we must make AYP in the aggregate and in each of our subgroups in the areas of accountability listed above. For comparison, the 2008 AYP Status Report is also attached.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### Percent of juniors tested on state tests (State AYP Minimum Target: 95%)

Ninety-nine percent of all juniors were tested in the spring of 2009, including 100% of all students with IEPs. Thus, the school made AYP in this area.

### Percent of juniors meeting or exceeding state standards (State AYP Minimum Target: 70% or Safe Harbor)

In reading, all subgroups had higher proportions of students who met or exceeded standards compared to 2008. At 75.1%, our overall reading performance in 2009 was nearly eight percentage points higher than in 2008; for girls and for African American students, the difference was more than ten percentage points higher; the Hispanic subgroup jumped nearly 24 percentage points. The Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) subgroup had an increase sufficient to make AYP through Safe Harbor provisions. Students with IEPs had a higher proportion of meets/exceeds reading test results this year compared to last year, but the increase was not sufficient to make Safe Harbor. As a result, the school did not make AYP in reading.

In math, the proportion of students meeting or exceeding standards was incrementally higher this year (69.6%) compared to last year (68.6%). Results among the subgroups were mixed: the Hispanic, African American and White subgroups had modestly higher performance compared to last year, while the IEP and FRL subgroups had fewer students who met or exceeded standards compared to last year. Though higher percentages of Hispanic and African American students met or exceeded standards this year, neither group achieved AYP; nor did the IEP or FRL groups. Thus, the school did not make AYP in math.

### Graduation Rate (State AYP Minimum Target: 75%)

We made AYP in this area with an overall graduation rate of 91.2%.

## FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As a result of not making AYP this year, we will implement the Restructuring Plan approved by the Board of Education at its regular June 2009 meeting. The plan outlines six strategies: 1) expanding academic interventions in reading and math; 2) implementing a District-wide Response to Intervention Model; 3) developing District-wide Response to Intervention Coach roles; 4) increasing and improving coordination of community outreach; 5) reorganizing building leadership to focus on student welfare and success; 6) restructuring Information/Instructional Technology Services. We will also develop and submit a new School Improvement Plan with strategies designed to target our AYP deficiencies. We will collect student performance data to monitor the effectiveness of each strategy and report results to the Board of Education.

## 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status Report

Calculated based on 08/04/09 Approved Assessment Data and E-report Card 86-43 Data

Is this school making AYP?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specification of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this school making AYP in reading?	No	2009-10 Federal Improvement Status	Restructuring Implementation
Is this school making AYP in mathematics?	No	2009-10 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 3

	Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standard*						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target**	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target**	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
<b>State AYP Minimum Target</b>	95.0		95.0		70.0			70.0			90.0		78.0	
<b>ALL</b>	99.0	Yes	99.0	Yes	75.1		Yes	69.6		Yes			91.2	Yes
<b>White</b>	98.9	Yes	98.9	Yes	89.5		Yes	85.5		Yes				
<b>Black</b>	98.6	Yes	98.6	Yes	42.9	41.2	Yes	34.2	40.7	No			88.0	
<b>Hispanic</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	69.2		Yes	58.5		No				
<b>Asian/Pacific Islander</b>														
<b>Native American</b>														
<b>Multiracial/Ethnic</b>														
<b>LEP</b>														
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	39.2	47.5	No	24.5	40.9	No			98.2	
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	97.4	Yes	97.4	Yes	35.0	39.3	Yes	23.8	39.3	No			100.0	

Four conditions required for making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) are:

1. At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
2. At least 70.0% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 70.0% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions.\*\*\*
3. For schools not making AYP solely because the IEP group fails to have 70.0% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
4. At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 78.0% graduation rate for high schools.

\*Includes only students enrolled as of 5/01/2008

\*\*Safe Harbor Targets of 70.0% or above are not printed.

\*\*\*Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.

**2008 ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP) Status Report**

Is this school making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?	No	Has this school been identified for School Improvement according to the AYP specifications of the federal No Child Left Behind Act?	Yes
Is this school making AYP in Reading?	No	2008-09 Federal Improvement Status	Restructuring
Is this school making AYP in Mathematics?	No	2008-09 State Improvement Status	Academic Watch Status Year 2

	Percent Tested on State Tests				Percent Meeting/Exceeding Standards *						Other Indicators			
	Reading		Mathematics		Reading			Mathematics			Attendance Rate		Graduation Rate	
	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target **	Met AYP	%	Safe Harbor Target **	Met AYP	%	Met AYP	%	Met AYP
State AYP Minimum Target	95.0		95.0		62.5			62.5			90.0			75.0
All	99.2	Yes	99.2	Yes	69.6		Yes	70.6		Yes			94.3	Yes
White	96.9	Yes	96.9	Yes	84.8		Yes	84.6		Yes				
Black	100.0	Yes	100.0	Yes	34.7	39.6	No	34.1	36.6	No			67.9	
Hispanic														
Asian/Pacific Islander														
Native American														
Multiracial /Ethnic	98.1	Yes	98.1	Yes	75.5		Yes	71.4		Yes				
LEP														
Students with Disabilities	97.6	Yes	97.6	Yes	45.7	45.6	Yes	34.3	43.9	No			78.2	
Economically Disadvantaged	99.0	Yes	99.0	Yes	32.6	42.8	No	32.6	31.6	Yes			83.9	

Four Conditions Are Required For Making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

- At least 95% tested in reading and mathematics for every student group. If the current year participation rate is less than 95%, this condition may be met if the average of the current and preceding year rates is at least 95%, or if the average of the current and two preceding years is at least 95%. Only actual participation rates are printed. If the participation rate printed is less than 95% and yet this school makes AYP, it means that the 95% condition was met by averaging.
- At least 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards in reading and mathematics for every group. For any group with less than 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, a 95% confidence interval was applied. Subgroups may meet this condition through Safe Harbor provisions. \*\*\*
- For schools not making AYP solely because the EEP group fails to have 62.5% meeting/exceeding standards, 14% may be added to this variable in accordance with the federal 2% flexibility provision.
- At least 90% attendance rate for non-high schools and at least 75% graduation rate for high schools.

\* Includes only students enrolled as of 05/01/2007.

\*\* Safe Harbor Targets of 62.5% or above are not printed.

\*\*\* Subgroups with fewer than 45 students are not reported. Safe Harbor only applies to subgroups of 45 or more. In order for Safe Harbor to apply, a subgroup must decrease by 10% the percentage of scores that did not meet state standards from the previous year plus meet the other indicators (attendance rate for non-high schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the subgroup. For subgroups that do not meet their Safe Harbor Targets, a 75% confidence interval is applied. Safe Harbor allows schools an alternate method to meet subgroup minimum targets on achievement.