An Instruction Committee meeting was held on March 15, 2016. Dr. Gevinson called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Fred Arkin, and Dr. Steve Gevinson, and Dr. Jackie Moore. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Jennifer Cassell and Tom Cofsky, Board of Education member; Toni Biasello, Earliana McLaurin, Chris Thieme, Amit Martin, Lisa Vincent, Jason Dennis, Richard Mertz, Josh Weintraub and Jonathan Silver, faculty and staff members.

Public Comments
None

Minutes
Dr. Gevinson moved to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2016, Instruction Committee meeting, as presented; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Update on Plans for 1:1
The Instruction Committee unanimously recommended moving the Update on Plans for 1:1 to the full Board of Education as an informational item at its regular March meeting. The Classroom Technology Integration Plan (CTIP) is part of the Board’s goal of continuing to develop the District’s instructional technology initiative. The District is committed to facilitating digital collaboration, creativity, communication, and critical thinking for all students. The District’s focus is to engage students as global citizens in and beyond the classroom. To do that, the District intends to 1) provide each student a dedicated device and allow him/her to make responsible and effective use of the technology and 2) provide the faculty with the tools, knowledge, and training to support student success. A video showed what teachers and students were saying about how they are using technology. Two students were asked if the Chromebooks allowed them to do more than they could before having them. For one of the students, this was the first time to have a computer, having previously only used his/her phone. Now he/she has the print capability. Another student said it helped with organization. One con is that learning occurred more easily with writing than keyboarding.

Lisa Vincent, an occupational therapist, spoke about Google classroom and how learning technology supports had been used in the past. For the struggling readers, it is about accessible reading materials, text to speech software, and audio books. For those students who cannot speak, it is about augmentative communication devices. For students who struggle with writing, voice dictation and word prediction are options. Many pieces were reserved for students with special needs such as Read and Write for Google,
voice dictation, digital annotation tools, etc. Trainings are being given for general and special education classes. These tools are enhancing the level of all students in these classes. The ability to hand in assignments via technology is improving student performance.

Tech related professional development (PD) activities in 2015-16 included Lunch and Learns, quarterly pilot meetings, Institute Days and Staff Development Days, and off-site conferences. Planned PD in 2016-17 will be include teacher Chromebook orientation, summer intensive training, quarterly pilot meetings, Lunch and Learns, Institute Days and Staff Development Days, and off-site conferences.

Measurements to use as to what impact technology has had on the classroom will include tracking of the ISTE Standards Approached. For students these cover: creativity and innovation, communication and collaboration, research and information fluency, and technology operations and concepts. For teachers these cover: facilitate and inspire student learning and creativity, design and develop digital-age learning experiences and assessments and model digital age work and learning. Focus areas will also include ISTE Standards for students: critical thinking, problem-solving, decision-making and digital citizenship. For teachers: promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility and engage in professional growth and leadership.) The summary showed the 2015-26 chromebook pilot goals snapshot.

The timeline was provided for CTIP implementation. Phase 3 will be initiated in July 2016 based on the Board decision on whether or not the District is going 1:1. The District is ready to move forward with this if the Board of Education approves the 1:1 project.

Discussion ensued. The pilots have not focused on the more needy students. Anecdotal comments regarding performance results of the student pilot programs include: a math teacher asserts higher test scores, no diminished learning, and higher homework submission rates. A science teacher says the grades his students are earning are as good as or better than other chemistry teachers.

It was noted that filtering can be applied to the Chromebooks so that students do not get through the District’s firewalls. Concerning internet access, the District is working on solutions to provide access to all students, as staff focuses on the issue of equity. A question about access will be asked at the time of registration. Discussion ensued about allowing students who presently do not have computers at home to take the Chromebooks home now. The District does that now; however it is a management issue as to what criteria would be used and how to manage it. Part of the reason for going to 1:1 is just that, providing each student with access to a computer. Ms. Vincent has a protocol as to who qualifies for a device under assistive technology. This year she had 7 to 10 students who asked for computers. Ms. McLaurin stated that it was an equity issue with teachers as well. Teachers share rooms and carts, and if there are no carts available, students do not get access. If more carts and devices are added, then why not go to a 1:1 program. As the take-home devices are allocated, other teachers are asking for carts. Giving a computer to everyone is a logical solution.

Discussion ensued regarding the cost of providing high-speed access to the students. It was estimated that 20% of the students may have that need. Solutions are being sought. Sprint offers access at under $100 per year per student, and the District is getting further details. Another vendor offers the service at $30 to $50 per month per student. Last year, this year, and next year, the District will spend approximately $3.1
on infrastructure. The next year it will be a steady state of approximately $865,000 in addition to the 1.5 FTE to support the 1:1 program. The District looked at the Hay Group study to determine the level of pay. The District will spend approximately $1 million per year to maintain the 1:1 program. Dr. Gevinson noted his support as this was an investment in equitable practices.

Semester 1 Report on MENTA
This agenda item was tabled to April due to time limitations.

Update on Civics Course Development
The Instruction Committee unanimously recommended forwarding the Update on Civics Course Development to the full Board of Education as an informational item at its March 2016 regular meeting. The Board of Education had approved a new civics course in the History Division for the 2016-17 school year as a result of legislation. Included in this update was a summary of the Civics Curriculum Outline and included ideas that were brought up by a Board of Education meeting regarding sexual citizenship.

Model question: what does it mean to be a model citizen and within that question, agreed that you could have a conversation about the relationship, being in a family, school, the larger community, digital, government and skill to understand, look to multiple perspectives.

Equal Opportunity Schools’ (EOS) Letter of Intent
The Instruction Committee unanimously recommended forwarding the information about the Equal Opportunity Schools Letter of Intent to the full Board of Education as an informational item at its March 2016 regular meeting. Dr. Isoye had signed a letter of intent to participate in a multi-district grant (approximately 20 schools) through the Illinois State Board of Education to partner with Equal Opportunity Schools (EOS), an organization focused on closing the AP access gap for students not equitably represented in the District’s AP courses. The grant would fund approximately half of the $50,000 cost. OPRFHS was selected for the AP Equity & Excellence Project technical assistance; a 1-year goal will be set for growing all of the District’s AP programs to reflect the school’s diversity while raising performance in those courses. EOS provides support in surveying and identifying students and monitoring progress. The District will have to provide additional support for teachers and students; options include summer professional development opportunities for teachers, ongoing curriculum writing support for teachers, and utilization of counselors as key advocates to guide students to AP courses. The District will be asked to approve a Memorandum of Understanding at its Special Board meeting on April 19. Two MSAN districts are participating. It is estimated that 300 more students could be enrolling in AP courses. EOS identifies the students and shows the District how to engage and support them. Ms. Hardin, as an AP teacher and a racial equity Learning Strand leader, supported it because she is interested to see the work with alignment. Classroom teachers will be helped to target and hone in on skills heard from another perspective. The College Board says in that if in 7th grade the focus is X, then four years later they would do better in Y. It is important for her to get the information. EOS builds with the current programs; it is not replacing them. Dr. Gevinson noted that it was not easy to identify AP work.
Adjournment
At 5:40 p.m., on March 15, 2016, Dr. Gevinson moved to adjourn the Instruction Committee meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.
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