

**OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL**  
**201 North Scoville Avenue**  
**Oak Park, IL 60302**

**INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING**  
**Tuesday, June 18, 2013**

An Instruction Committee of the Whole Board of Education meeting was held on Tuesday, June 18, 2013. Dr. Gevinson called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, John Phelan, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Dr. Tina Halliman, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Director of Community Relations and Communications; Cheryl L. Witham, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations and Treasurer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Dr. Chala Holland, Assistant Principal of Instruction; Matt Kirkpatrick, Division Head for Science Randy Braverman, OPRFHS Director of Security; Ron Johnson, Purchasing Coordinator; Norb Teclaw of Percy Julian, Daphne LeCesne, Mary Haley of the League of Women Voters, and Robert Wroble of Legat Architects.

**Science Research Opportunities/Percy Julian Symposium Update**

Mr. Kirkpatrick presented a PowerPoint presentation titled “Authentic Research Experience for Students.” When he arrived last August, he was greeted with curriculum maps that were created over the summer in which teachers assured him that the high enrollment courses were aligned to the Illinois State Learning Standards, the Advanced Placement Recommended Syllabi, the Next Generation Science Standards, the Common Core Standards, and the Regional Office of Education Essential curriculum. While it appears as if progress has been made in the last few years regarding consistency between sections of the same course, there is little vertical alignment and he suspected that experiences between sections of the same course were still very different.

During the science division first meetings, he led the staff through exercises asking them to identify the items that students can acquire in science that would be critical to their success after leaving. The staff was consistent, concise, and unified on those items and they were incorporated into the division’s mission:

The Science and Technology Division of Oak Park and River Forest High School exists to assure all of our graduates possess the ability to:

1. Execute Investigations using scientific methods in order to solve relevant problems
2. Evaluate and communicate information
3. Apply Mathematics
4. Appreciate the Value of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics by exposing them to STEM applications and professions
5. Collaborate with others

The National Research Council, the National Science Teachers Association, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Achieve collaborated on development of the NGSS, which is to science what Common Core is to English and Math. The NGSS will be the basis for any future standardized testing that occurs in science. Common ground was found between the division’s initial

analysis of the standards and its internal mission. Yet, many teachers had not seen the NGSS prior to the development of the division's internal mission.

The action verbs in the previous Illinois State Learning standards were heavily centered on students being able to demonstrate understanding of science content. Students typically started the year with an instructional unit on science methods only to spend the rest of the year memorizing already established content and plugging and chugging their way through math problems. The NGSS action verbs are written in a way that truly requires the process of science to be a part of the instructional process as students construct their understandings for Science concepts. The NGSS will also contain engineering standards and expects that these and their Earth/Space standards be delivered to all students.

Previous Illinois State Learning Standard 12.D.3a:

Explain and demonstrate how forces affect motion (e.g. action/reaction, equilibrium conditions, and free-falling objects).

Related NGSS Student Performance Expectation:

Analyze data to support the claim that Newton's 2nd Law of Motion describes the mathematical relationship among the net force on a macroscopic object, its mass, and its acceleration.

The division now has a common vision for what students should get vertically as they move through the science courses. The division also believes that it has outside validation for the importance of the priorities established. The science division is looking for the Board of Education's support as it works to proliferate the research and inquiry experience to a wider range of students.

The Division has increased its efforts to promote research and inquiry throughout the entire division. Next Year, new models will be lanced in the curricular sequence. Not only will these courses be taught by instructors officially trained (two weeks) in the modeling instructional methodology, students will be able to enroll in these classes the opportunity to complete a year-long research project for Honors credit. The technology staff has been inspired by what is being accomplished in the IRBI class. An extended engineering design project will be instituted for IED students which will be the precursor towards plans to add a capstone PLTW engineering course which involves engineering internships for students. The science division is fortunate to have supportive administration that will work with us formally to create a space for compensated teachers to provide mentorship, supervision, and support to students working on research projects outside of school hours. A partnership will be launched with the R&D learning exchange next year which will provide student access to professional mentors and special real world challenges. OPRFHS is also lucky to have its Institute for Science Education and Technology (ISET) partners who were ahead of the curve with the Percy Julian Symposium. Many OPRFHS students have competed in the symposium and the District was happy to host this event.

Mr. Kirkpatrick recognized the following people:

- Allison Hennings, creator of the IRBI course and tireless advocate for bringing research to students.
- John Costopoulos, teacher and ISET member who devotes a great deal of time to organizing the Percy Julian Symposium.
- Phil Prale and Nate Rouse, administrative and budgetary supporter to keep moving this work forward
- Amy McGrail, Leigh Kramer, Kevin McKittrick, and Ben Cain, teachers who have given up two weeks of their summers to attend official training on modeling instructional methodology.

Mr. Kirkpatrick introduced Norb Teclaw, a retired physics teacher at OPRFHS and who had helped sponsor the centennial birthday party for Percy Julian in 2000 and a member of ISET. Mr. Teclaw recognized the members of The Institute for Science Education and Technology as sponsors for this work. They were:

Tynese McDaniel	Austin Harton	Barth Riley
Lee Baglemann	Darrick Hooker	Fred Sanders
Lascelles Anderson	Chap Kusimba	Jason Tyszko
David Boulanger	Daphne LeCesne	Tomas Zielinski
John Costopoulos	Jimmy Prude	
Lorenzo Gholston	Sherlynn Reid	

The process for running the symposium has now been standardized and it now requires enlisting up to 40 judges and moderators to announce the students as they give presentations. Dr. Lee acknowledged the huge amount of work involved.

**Parent-Teacher Advisory Committee Report (Formerly Joint Committee on Student Discipline) Recommendations for the 2013-14 School Year (including Code of Conduct Matrix)**

Mr. Rouse referred to the Parent-Teacher Advisory Committee’s recommendation for 2013-14 in the packet. Board Policy 7:190, Student Discipline, requires the formation of a Parent-Teacher Advisory Committee known as the OPRFHS Joint Committee on Student Behavior and Discipline. This committee reviews the District’s discipline policies and procedures, annually reviews the Code of Conduct, and makes recommendations to the Board of Education regarding changes. He acknowledged the members of the committee: student Kamille Brashear, parent Aleta Clardy, Dean of Discipline Jim Goodfellow, Student Intervention Directors Alisa Walton and Jonathan Silver, Math Teacher and Student Council Sponsor Katie DePasquale, Behavior Intervention Specialist Tom Tarrant, counselor Kris Johnson, Fine & Applied Arts Teacher Mark Collins, History Teacher Matt Maloney, Principal Nathaniel Rouse, and Board of Education member Sharon Patchak Layman.

After the Committee reviewed the role of the committee, the Code of Conduct and other policies and procedures related to student behavior and discipline. The committee decided to focus on the following topics: the 2013-14 Code of Conduct Matrix and Suspension Reduction Program Changes, the increased efforts surrounding overall building climate, and communication campaign for students and parents regarding Code of Conduct and its anticipated changes. The matrix outlines the process when an infraction occurs. Definitions and understandings exist for each one of the categories; that is part of the due process with the Student Intervention Director (SID) and the students with the Student Handbook. The committee had agreed that the District must be more explicit when talking about behaviors than in past years and to set the “tone” at the beginning of the year. One member suggested having a full discussion on an A-period that did not take away from academic classes.

With the Suspension Reduction Program, students must understand that if they partake in any of specific behaviors, they will be jeopardizing their education. Based on the intent alone, students could have police consequences as well. This is an opportunity for students to come back into the building at a faster pace and balance the needs of the buildings’ safety. Mr. Phelan had learned that the system does not have to be perfect. He understood that the pendulum had swung too far in the opposite direction and he believed that this recommendation will make the system better. Mr. Weissglass supported this recommendation and thought about the individual students who the District is trying to teach and support as well as the overall safety and climate in the building. Anecdotally, he believed that changes would probably be more supportive of the students and not improve safety within the building. How will the District measure safety? The District administered end of the year surveys to teachers, parents, and students. The faculty

expressed concerned about how quickly some students returned to the building because of the nature of the consequence. The Feeling of safety is an emotional issue. The administration will talk more about the Code of Conduct with students and what it means to the District and to the student behaviors. The administration is supportive of both students and the learning environment.

Dr. Gevinson appreciated the comments of both Mr. Phelan and Mr. Weissglass. He supported this work in progress. His comments included:

- 1) Mr. Rouse had clarified the 1:1 model as he was confused by the name. He suggested the name be changed to Progressive Discipline Model.
- 2) The hall pass rule is problematic and he discussed teacher prerogative, but that is the standard way that they do it anyway.
- 3) He concurred with Ms. Patchak-Layman's previous statements that peer resolution might be effective as well as other items, e.g., requiring them to write a written response.
- 4) Adults in the hall during passing periods and effecting PBIS will work if implemented, but that will take effort – block groups.
- 5) Data gathering would be important. To base a change on the perception that the District is going from 0 to 60 should be based on data versus perception.

It was the consensus of the Committee members to approve these recommendations at its next Board of Education meeting.

### **Data Snapshot**

Ms. Hill referred to her written report providing the Committee with the current snapshot of data noting that she would adjust the formatting and make it more user-friendly so that each of the areas defined will reflect the current Board of Education goals. This information would likely change based on the goals and action steps identified in the Strategic Plan.

Dr. Lee wanted to see the data that addressed the extent to which there has or has not been a change in racial predictability. He believed the data emphasized academic achievement of the student body but not the measurable academic achievement between black and white students. He wanted to see concrete examples of that and what the District has changed as a result of those observations, as he believed the answers to those questions could give a solid view of what the District is doing. While Dr. Lee's questions were worthy, the scorecard whose data the Board of Education had agreed upon was not designed to answer them. Dr. Lee questioned what conclusions could be drawn from the data provided, understanding that is not easy to discern. A response from another Board of Education member was that to post something on the website as to a conclusion as to what was happening would be difficult. The District acknowledges that there is an achievement gap. While a suggestion was made to list the efforts that the District took over past years and include data, that might still not show the effect of the actions. Dr. Lee wanted to know the criteria for which decisions were being made. Dr. Isoye noted that the District does assess students in programs and gives programs time to mature. The District has been working on a clearing house that would allow anyone to get data about the school, data about climate, academic areas, and finances, similar to the Code of Conduct matrix. However, many programs fit in between those boxes. Much of the data presented to the Board of Education is present in the scorecard. This is the Districts first attempt at a data scorecard. The benchmarks of the achievement gap need to be selected and they may change. Dr. Isoye suggested that this may be an action for a task force. The measures will have to be developed and some may be similar and some not and that will provide an opportunity for discussion.

A suggestion was made to put this information in the About Us section of the website. Dr. Moore believed more discussion should occur about what the numbers mean in terms of disparities.

The District is looking at creating a dashboard. A suggestion was to include athletic participation data.

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

Dr. Holland and Ms. Hill provided the annual report on professional development (PD) activities, which include institute days in August and January; staff development days in August and November; and ongoing Teacher collaboration Teams (TCT) meetings on late arrival Wednesdays. In addition, new PD components were added to address prior areas: five Learning Strands, optional literacy coaching, training in executive functions for selected faculty and staff; co-teaching training; and training for teachers and TAs in the reading program. Additionally, teachers and divisions pursued discipline-specific activities, and individual teachers were able to apply for Teacher Grants to support PD activities of their own choosing. The plan was informed by received feedback and much analysis.

### Teacher Collaboration Teams

Teacher Collaboration Teams are course-alike teams that center student work to engage in inquiry-based processes and discussions to make improvements in teaching and learning. In the past, TCTs focused on developing and assessing learning targets. With clearly defined learning targets, teachers were able to take their TCT work to the next level by analyzing student assessment data and using the data to consider how it informed teaching and student learning. This year, the TCTs engaged in the TCT cycle of inquiry, focused on understanding course student achievement data and responding to the data. At the end of the school year, TCTs submitted electronic portfolios reflecting the collective work of their team.

TCT portfolios are divisional documents of course expectations and learning. They will provide a launching point for the work of TCTs during the 2013-2014 school year. TCT portfolios from 2012-13 are under review by Division Heads, who will provide TCT leaders and divisional members with feedback regarding the portfolios at the start of the 2013-14 year. The Division Head's end-of-year analysis will inform the work that takes place in each division next year.

As part of the portfolio documenting their work in 2012-13, TCTs submitted mid-year and year-end check-ins and reflections. The feedback demonstrated high levels of collaboration amongst TCTs and satisfaction with the usefulness of the time. TCTs continue to explore the intersection of race and achievement within the classroom and also to identify evidence that the work taking place in TCTs is having a direct impact on student learning and achievement outcomes. A summary of TCT members' feedback is included in the appendix.

### Learning Strands

This year, five Learning Strands were incorporated into the PD model: Data-Driven Problem Solving, Literacy, Racial Equity, Seven Strategies of Assessment for Learning, and Social Emotional Learning. The strand topics were selected based upon student achievement data, culture and climate data, and goals developed by the Board of Education. Learning Strands offer cross-divisional opportunities for teachers and staff to engage in year-long learning on a specific area of focus. There were six 90 minute strand sessions held throughout the school year. The strand facilitators included 12 faculty members and three Division Heads.

Overall, learning strand participants responded positively to the experience. In the final evaluation of the year, 86% of respondents said the materials and activities supported their understanding and engagement, and 78% said the work was helpful or extremely helpful in improving learning and achievement for all students. A summary of participant responses to the year-end evaluation is included in the appendix. TCT portfolios are divisional documents of course expectations and learning. They will provide a launching point for the work of TCTs during the 2013-2014 school year. TCT portfolios from 2012-13 are under review by Division Heads, who will provide TCT leaders and divisional members with feedback

regarding the portfolios at the start of the 2013-14 year. The Division Head's end-of-year analysis will inform the work that takes place in each division next year.

#### Executive Functions Implementation Team

During the 2012-2013 school year, the Educational Services Department at Rush NeuroBehavioral Center (RNBC) worked with teachers and counselors at Oak Park River Forest High School to implement various aspects of the Executive Functions Program. In this effort, staff from RNBC conducted professional development sessions, observed classrooms, consulted with teachers and taught Executive Functions lessons with students. Rush provided three half-day workshops and four on-site coaching days. Topics included classroom structures and systems, materials and time management, study strategies, goal setting, decision making, and learning strengths.

The RNBC team also visited OPRFHS classrooms to conduct lessons and facilitated teacher meetings to promote the implementation of Executive Functions strategies and practices in the classroom. During these visits, students and teachers learned about setting up and using a materials management system, using a planner, task analysis for long-term projects, note taking and organizing information, creating a study plan, following directions and setting SMART goals. During the classroom visits, an RNBC staff member took the lead-teacher role while the classroom teachers assisted in making connections to content. In addition to classroom lessons, an RNBC staff member also facilitated teacher meetings and encouraged teachers to find cross-departmental consistency through collaboration and based on the needs of the students. Dr. Holland explained that the District looks at the work in portfolios, reviews feedback and check-in reflections and midyear reflections that address applications and portfolios. These are not external. There is much evidence of students analyzing where they are in skill development and then begin to explicitly name the learning targets they have yet to master. It is a process of then taking that information and going through a process of re-teaching, meeting with students, and sharing the outcomes, and the results of the next assessment. Students are participating in creating their own paths in many instances.

#### Literacy Coaching

OPRFHS is fortunate to have two literacy coaches, Catherine McNary and Sarah Rosas. With .8 release for coaching, the coaches worked with teachers and division heads to better infuse explicit literacy supports within classes to improve student reading and comprehension. With a comprehensive reading program in place offering Tier 2 and 3 supports for students and PD for teachers, literacy coaching serves as a Tier 1 support for students and support for teachers across academic levels.

Teachers at every academic level (from Advanced Placement to Special Ed self-contained) requested literacy coaching. The literacy coaches supported 34 individual teachers and three TCTs across five divisions, including English/Reading, History, Math, Science, and Special Education. The majority of coaching took place among English and Reading teachers. Literacy coaches supported teachers in a wide range of areas, including but not limited to creating and using reading assessments, annotation, text engagement, differentiation, reading strategies, reading/literature circles, literal vs. independent thinking, scaffolding difficult text, and vocabulary. A request was made for the names of the volunteers and committee members.

#### Divisional Professional Development

OPRFHS was more intentional about making sure the PD experiences of the divisions were directly aligned with the Board goals. An array of PD opportunities was offered to teachers within the building but they also had opportunities to receive training and support outside of the school. Some of the experiences teachers participated in during the 2012-2013 school year in addition to their TCTs and Learning Strands were listed in the appendix.

Collaborative Professional Development Committees/Teams

Planning and on-going review of professional development activities takes place within a number of collaborative committees. Membership of each committee is summarized in the table below. A request was made for the names of the volunteers and committee members.

**Institute Days for 2013-14**

Ms. Hill provided information about the 2013-14 Institute days. The Board of Education will approve these dates at its next meeting on the consent agenda.

**Adjournment**

Dr. Gevinson adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Dr. Jackie Moore  
Secretary