

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

INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEETING
February 16, 2016

An Instruction Committee meeting was held on February 16, 2016. Dr. Gevinson called the meeting was called to order at 4:36 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Fred Arkin, Dr. Steve Gevinson, and Dr. Jackie Moore. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Dr. Ruhland, Director of Human Resources; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors

Sara Spivy, Board of Education member; John Hoerster, John Condne, Caroline Schoenbeck, OPRFHS Faculty; Lincoln Chandler, Educational Consultant; John Duffy and Mary Bird, community members; and Filmmaker Steve James and his staff.

Public Comments

John Duffy asked the Instruction Committee to recommend that the Finance Committee appropriate \$1,000 so that the administration can purchase 50 copies of *On the Same Track* which would allow the opportunity to dynamically expand the dialog around race, equity, and curriculum. This One Book project could take the noble efforts around Courageous Conversations and tie it to goals to a wider public conversation around race and educational equity. He felt it responded to some of his interpretations of the questions being asked by the Instruction Committee:

- 1) In what ways does curriculum track placement freshman year enhance or inhibit or predict growth in student achievement?
- 2) How do classroom environment, socio-economic status, socio-emotional health and students' individual executive skills contribute to the placement?
- 3) Is stereotype threat a phenomenon that might be generalized to all school/classroom contexts?
- 4) To what degree is there mobility up or down the curriculum tracks, does tracking accomplish its intended purpose of providing the particular learning situation for all groups of students that ensures their greatest possible achievement.

Minutes

Dr. Gevinson moved to approve the minutes of the January 19, 2016, Instruction Committee meeting as presented; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Sabbatical Leave Recommendations

The Instruction Committee unanimously recommended that the Sabbatical Leave applications of Carolina Schoenbeck and John Condne for the 2016-17 school year be forwarded to the full Board of Education for review and approval at its next regular Board meeting on February 25, 2016. The purpose of offering sabbaticals is to expand teachers' experiences to enhance their instruction at the high school. The administration supported these applications. Both applicants spoke about their intended sabbaticals.

John Condne stated that the purpose of his sabbatical was to research, learn, collaborate and plan lessons that would prepare all of his students, but especially students of color to immediately enter the professional world of television and film and to prepare students who plan to go to college with the skills necessary to get a job in the business while attending college. He wants to redesign two classes, TV Production and Newscene, so that they will run as a professional television studio. He spoke about his

background and work experience over 20 years and the fact that people in this business do not need college; they need referrals and appropriate skills. A sound person or camera person can make \$650 per day working on productions. OPRFHS has a studio with state-of-the-art equipment that provides students access to current technology. He has found it often difficult in his professional career to find people of color to fill crew positions on his sets. Students in all races and levels start in the Introduction to Broadcasting class, but they trail off. Why? Could it be about equity, racial consciousness and not being the “only”? Through this sabbatical, he intends to gain the knowledge and skills necessary as well as the industry connections to help students to enter this field whether right after high school or after college. One member asked how his endeavor would fit with the Strategic Plan and how this would be marketed to females and students of color. Suggestions for marketing included contacting black organizations that represent media, journalists, and technical people, etc., and working with the counselors and asking for help. A group from Columbia College are doing the same kind of program in Oak Park.

Ms. Schoenbeck’s motivation for requesting a leave is to investigate and develop institutional protocols to assist students with special needs who have Individual Education Plans (IEPs), identify their interests, and create transition plans for their lives after high school. Thirty-three percent of OPRFHS students with IEPs report that they do not attend a postsecondary institution after graduation. Many of her Learning Development (LD) and Emotional Development (ED) students fail to continue to post-secondary institutions and struggle after they leave high school. She has worked with her Transitional Teacher Collaboration Team (TCT), counselors, and administrators to enhance career planning at OPRFHS. The current curriculum does not sufficiently assist students who have plans other than attending a two- or four-year college. This summer she worked on a course curriculum project to add several courses to the LD/ED self-contained curriculum. She obtained a list of the graduating class of 2015 and their reported future plans. She also looked at the list of students in that class with IEPs who were not in the low incidence programs of TEAM or CITE and matched the data gathered by the District on the class’ post-secondary plans. She separated the list into 3 categories that matched the school’s collection: 1) attending a 4-year institution, 2) attending a 2-year institution, and 3) having no plans. In last year’s graduating class, 33% of students with IEPs reported having no post-secondary plans. She plans to

- 1) Explore how to facilitate meaningful transition planning with students.
- 2) Identify tools to utilize with students for career mapping.
- 3) Work individually with students with IEPs first semester to help them identify areas of interest for his/her post-secondary plans.
- 4) Accompany students second semester on tour programs that are offered at community colleges, trade schools, internship programs, etc.
- 5) Reach out to Devin Hughes at Triton regarding dual credit course opportunities.
- 6) Create a partnership for a college fair specifically directed to students with IEPs, who will need supports and accommodations from their post-secondary schools. One such fair does exist; it is called Choices and takes place in the northern suburbs, but few local families are able to attend.
- 7) Develop a pre- and post-survey on plans for life after high school for students with IEPs. They will assess a student’s knowledge of career interest, post-secondary plans, identified contacts, and available supports in place.

This sabbatical will allow her the time to accomplish what she is not able to do while teaching. One member observed that this seems not be a hole in the services that are already provided.

Review of Spring Standardized Testing Plans and PARCC Results

The Instruction Committee unanimously recommended that the report on the Spring Standardized Testing Plans be moved to the full Board of Education as an information item at its regular February meeting.

This report summarizes plans for state and District testing this spring, including ACT, PARCC, an Instructional ACT for sophomores, and the new state Science Assessment. The report also provides an overview of 2015 PARCC test results.

2016 Testing Plans for State and District testing will take place in April and May. PARCC tests have been consolidated from two administrative windows to one that will occur in the fourth quarter. Testing will begin on April 19, the date of the District ACT plus Writing test. No classes will meet on the first day of testing and students will complete tests according to grade level and current course enrollment (for PARCC Algebra I only). Students will be dismissed upon the completion of their tests. Seniors and juniors will not attend April 19.

Tuesday, April 19

- Seniors will not attend
- Juniors: ACT Plus Writing
- Sophomores: Instructional ACT (I-ACT) and Illinois Youth Survey
- Freshmen: PARCC ELA (2 of 3 units) and Algebra I (1 of 3 units)
- Faculty and TAs will serve as test administrators.

Wednesday, April 20-Monday, April 25

- We will operate on a block schedule to provide time for students to complete their PARCC tests (ELA unit 3; Algebra units 2-3). Please see Appendix A, Spring Testing Calendar, for more details. Grade 9 English teachers and Algebra 1-2 teachers will administer tests to their own students according to the block schedule.
- Students in non-tested classes will also follow the block schedule.
- Seniors will take the Illinois Youth Survey in their English classes.

May date(s) TBD: state science assessment for all students enrolled in Biology courses—including all levels of Biology 1-2 and AP Biology. Administration details are somewhat limited for this 90-minute, online assessment. We will keep the Board apprised of new information as it becomes available.

PARCC 2015

The aggregate results of the first operational PARCC assessment will serve as a baseline measure for future growth. Based on ISBE and PARCC indications that the assessments were designed to be more rigorous than the previous state assessments, lower percentages of students were anticipated to meet or exceed standards and did so. Appendix B showed that 53.7 % of English Language Arts 9 students scored in the Meets or Exceeds levels while 18.3% of Algebra 1-2 students did so (freshmen, sophomores, and juniors). Those meets/exceeds rates are approximately 20 points and 36 points lower, respectively, than the results from the last administration of the Prairie State Achievement Exam in 2014. That data is being explored, particularly in math. Understanding the comparative sense of the data is challenging because the 2015 tests assessed ninth grade English students and students enrolled in Algebra 1-2, including 45% of the freshman class and 27 sophomores and juniors. In past years, state assessments were administered to juniors regardless of their course enrollments. State-wide data used for comparisons on the Illinois Report Card website (www.illinoisreportcard.com) include all tests at all grade levels 3-11, making for an apples-to-oranges comparison. High schools were allowed to choose which tests to administer last year: ELA 9 and Algebra I; ELA 10 and Geometry; or ELA 11 and Algebra II. High school PARCC data available on the Illinois Report Card website include results for all of these test levels, and it is not possible to drill in more specifically to determine how our Grade 9 ELA and Algebra I students compare to their Illinois peers. Results for students taking the PARCC paper-based assessments were noticeably better than for students taking the online assessments. This difference has been covered in the national education press and is evident in a set of comparative data collected from member districts of the Chicago Area Directors of Curriculum and Assessment (CADCA). In the CADCA data, the

difference in ELA was a 9 percentage point advantage for paper-based testing (in the aggregate) and an 11 percentage point advantage for Algebra I2.

Discussion ensued. Also unavailable are the differences by race, IEPs, etc. The male/female differences are marked in the ELA data. The percentages of who took which test will be included in the report to the full Board of Education. Juniors will be informed of the results both electronically and via regular mail within two weeks. The state has signed an agreement with the College Board to provide assessment, but the question for the administration is whether to have a transition year with District support for the ACT test next year, transitioning away from it the following year. A suggestion was to stay with the ACT until the bugs were worked out of the SAT test, as it has some new format problems. From a national perspective, Illinois is one of the few states going to the free SAT, rather than providing juniors with the ACT. Another factor is whether the state will or will not require schools to give a college administration test. The two days of standardized testing will interrupt instruction. If the school choose not to give the test, the question would be one of equity. The ACT test costs \$47,000. One member supported paying for the test because of the equitable argument. Discussion ensued about the longevity of the PARCC test, as 22 states offered it a year ago but now only 6 states and the District of Columbia offer it. While the District does not have the option to opt out of giving the PARCC test, students can refuse to take it.

High schools were allowed to choose which tests to administer last year: ELA 9 and Algebra I; ELA 10 and Geometry; or ELA 11 and Algebra II. For most schools, a test administered to Geometry or to Algebra II students would include multiple levels of courses, including honors and college prep, and the likely result would be higher rates of meeting and exceeding compared to Algebra I, where courses are typically college prep level. High school PARCC data available on the Illinois Report Card website include results for all of these test levels, and it is not possible to drill in more specifically to determine how our Grade 9 ELA and Algebra I students compare to their Illinois peers.

Technology – Device, Management, Staff

The Classroom Technology Integration Plan (CTIP) report first provided the background on what had been accomplished from 2010-2014: piloting online textbooks, piloting 1:1 netbooks, providing faculty with dedicated devices and projectors in classrooms, improving wireless infrastructure, and improving internet bandwidth. In 2014, Chromebook carts were provided and in 2016, the number of Chromebook carts doubled, and 400 students were able to take Chromebooks home. Next year the plans it to have every student take a Chromebook home.

The key components for a successful Phase 3 include the devices, training and professional development for students and faculty, infrastructure, communication, and policies, procedures, and practices, which include fees, acceptable use, etc.

The Board of Education's role is to approve and support the next step as the budgeted devices and infrastructure, professional development and student training, space, and additional support personnel has a financial impact. The Board of Education must also provide input and feedback on the communications plans, fees, and guidance on policies and procedures related to 1:1 devices.

This proposal affects Board of Education policy, FTE, instruction, and instructional approaches. It was presented to the Instruction Committee first as this has been a vision that has been developed over time. Currently, 58 teachers are piloting charomebook in their classrooms and a smaller group has been using 1:1 technologies. A request will be made for 1.5 additional FTE and space for the new person to support students. One member wanted to see the data that authenticated hiring an additional 1.5 FTE given the current students' experiences of taking the computers home. Is it because the devices are breaking? Are they not working well? Is this the best device? For communication purposes, it was suggested that every report contains the rationale and how this idea has evolved. Does professional development support

teachers who are comfortable with technology or is it brain curriculum that is technology-based? How is that incorporated into lesson plans, etc.? In addition, what is the input/data on the pilot that showed what students were doing and what teachers and families were saying? How is the device being tracked by the school and the student? If someone already has this device, do they have to obtain another one? What if someone does not have internet capability? Would having a book be better? What information does the district have a result of the pilots? What kinds of professional development are being and will be provided? Why is additional space being requested? How many teachers using the devices have their own websites? If few, why has not professional development been more effective? The administration will provide the answers to these questions.

Adjournment

At 5:45 p.m., on Dr. Gevinson moved to adjourn the Instruction Committee meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Submitted by
Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board