

Curriculum Board Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: March 6, 2017 @5:00 p.m. – SSC

Members:

Attendance

Annette Johnson	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Kimberly Hatchett	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Ken Darby	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Beatrice Reyes Childress	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Dr. Carla Johnson	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Suzanne Bement	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Dr. Marion Hoyda	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Heather Kincaid	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Jennifer Dalrymple	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Brenda Analy Gonzalez	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Ashley Ringler	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Christopher Heath	Yes	<u> x </u>	No
Libby Schwaegler	Yes	<u> x </u>	No

Ms. Hatchett opened the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

I. Curriculum Cycle and Program Evaluation

Dr. Johnson led committee through current curriculum cycle and plans for the next few years.

The five phases of the cycle are as follows:

- Phase I: Assess, Study, Evaluate, Research
- Phase II: Design, Develop, Present, Propose
- Phase III: Apply, Implement, Document
- Phase IV: Validate, Review, Monitor, Document
- Phase V: Monitor, Document, Reflect

Ms. Hatchett asked if the district is in Phase III regarding the three curriculum areas implemented last year; Dr. Johnson confirmed. She explained that each phase is approximately one year.

Phase II includes a PD plan, reviewing technology plans, etc.

Phase III (implementation year one): includes surveys, reflection, etc.

Phase IV (implementation year two): review student achievement data (which becomes much more meaningful), continuing implementation of PD plan.

Phase V (year three of implementation): rate effectiveness, develop recommendations for future actions, and start looking at next curriculum cycle.

Ms. Kincaid said that in terms of math and ELA, PARCC allows comparison across school years; and STAR 360, which includes local and national comparison. Next year, goal is to roll out summative unit assessments which are tied to Illinois learning standards which then map to PARCC. Ultimate goal is to build a more comprehensive assessment system that will provide local, state, and national metric data.

Dr. Johnson explained that curriculum renewal cycles are planned as follows:

Language Arts/Math (K-12): 2016-17

Career and Tech (K-12):	2017-18
Fine Arts/World Languages (K-12):	2018-19
PE-Driver's Ed-Health/Social Studies (K-12):	2019-20
Science/LA/Math (K-12):	2020-21

Dr. Johnson may recommend, based on future data, that in 2020-2021, one of those three curriculum areas up for review be bumped to 2019-2020 instead of having the three together again.

She added that for many content areas, a thorough cycle hasn't been done up to this point, so the district is a bit behind in those areas to really implement an aligned, K-12 cycle.

A couple things will happen outside the cycle – AP textbook renewal, which the College Board requires, so that may be out of order; also, state-mandated requirements.

II. Assessment within Core Resources

Dr. Johnson introduced curriculum facilitators Chris Heath (science and social studies); Ashley Ringler (language arts); and Libby Schwaegler (math).

Currently, some district assessments are under review to ensure we have all we need – for example, some assessments we used last year aren't being used this year, and vice versa. The only real quantitative data available is PARCC, given both years.

Content-area assessments are being developed. Each facilitator will discuss their particular area but each assessment is based on the emphasis and focus of the standards; thus they're each developed slightly differently. Teacher surveys addressing each content area have gone out and another will go out this week.

Ms. Hatchett asked if the data from the new assessments from this year will be available to the committee to view as a baseline. Dr. Johnson said they will be available next year after they're given.

Ms. Kincaid added that PARCC comparison data from SY 15-16 to SY 16-17 and STAR data from this year serve as the baseline to compare with next year. STAR data is given fall, winter, and spring so we can look at the progression of student growth during that time span.

Ms. Kincaid explained that that one of her goals for this year is ensuring before the end of the year, teachers have some historical data to view in Infinite Campus.

Ms. Ringler walked the committee through the ELA assessment plan specific to ReadyGEN and Biliteracy Pathways. Teachers are required this year to give the assessment and turn them in to the district. ReadyGEN/Biliteracy Pathway offers two assessments: one is the performance-based assessment (given twice per unit) and the other is the end-of-unit assessment given either paper/pencil or online through the Realize platform. The end-of-unit assessment mimics PARCC. Ms. Ringler is working with the Pearson consultant to become more familiar with it. It is standards-based so, for example, after unit one, it gives a list of standards the students should have mastered. Ms. Ringler has been working with the council to build their assessment literacy. ReadyGEN has the end-of-unit assessments and they can be given online. The Biliteracy Pathway has the end-of-unit assessments but no online capability at this time.

Ms. Heath presented on science. Science is not assessed through STAR, either last year or currently. So we're looking at the end-of-unit assessments for data. Eventually we would like to look at the state assessment, although data isn't currently available. Ms. Kincaid last year was the first time standardized science tests were administered at grades 5, 8, and biology at the high-school level. The data is still not available from the state, however. Year two of the state science testing will occur at the end of April.

Mr. Heath said for science it'll be a lot of the unit assessments. STEMScopes also has some online assessments that we can gather data from. For K-5, will be primarily looking at the end-of-unit

assessments provided by STEMScopes; for middle school, end-of-unit assessments written in-house have been implemented since those provided by STEMScopes were not aligned with what the earlier grades were doing. The ultimate goal is to start collecting data through Mastery Manager.

Ms. Schwaegler presented about math assessments. Currently using the Go Math! assessments K-8 which are more concentrated at the chapter level than the unit level. So we saw a need to develop unit assessments that were really assessing the major work of the grade at the units. At this time, K-5 only has performance-based assessments for the end-of-unit; and then the end-of-chapter is where you'll find the traditional math test. Using the major work of the grade – those focused-area standards -- the curriculum council is taking each chapter assessment and looking at them to determine which problems best highlight the major works of the grade for a unit assessment. They're modifying the assessment questions so that teachers still have the freedom to use the chapter assessments as they're instructing. Grades 6-8 do have end-of-unit assessments but they're very long and are almost entirely multiple choice so we're not seeing that rigor we've talked about in the past. So also creating unit assessments for 6-8 grades.

K-2 only has three units total. For Kindergarten, it was decided to break end-of-unit assessments into three summative assessments to track progression along the way. Grades 4 and 5 have three units. Grades 6-8 have about six units per grade level so we want an assessment per unit at the middle school. The council is also creating assessments for the honors math classes at the middle school level.

III. Calculating High School Graduation Rates

Ms. Kincaid said the state looks at the adjusted graduation cohort. The graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of graduates by the number of graduates plus the number of non-graduates. Starting in 2011-2012, the report became part of an automatic pull from IWAS, the state student information system. What became vital was how students were exited when they left the school year. What we look at when we say "adjusted graduation cohort" is any student whose exit status is "graduate" counts as part of the overall graduation rate.

We start with the number of first-time 9th graders. So the first year that that student is a 9th-grader, we have that cohort of students. As of the 2015-2016 school year, the district must report, and the state puts on our school report card, graduation rates for four-year, five-year, six-year, and seven-year cohort data.

Any students that move in are added to the cohort; students can be removed from the cohort are as follows:

- Transfer to Home Schooled
- Transfer to Private School
- Transfer to another Public School in Illinois
- Transfer to another Public School out of Illinois
- Moved out of the US
- Death

Any other exit code does not remove a student from the adjusted graduation cohort. These include:

- Promotion
- Expulsion
- Dropped Out
- Transfer to GED program
- Moved, not known to be continuing
- Retained in same grade
- Aged Out
- Certificate of Completion

- Victim of a Violent Crime
- Change in Serving School

Ms. Kincaid stated there is a significant difference between the graduation rate and the dropout rate, which is also recorded on our school report card. The “dropped out” code, the “transfer to GED program,” and the “moved, not known to be continuing” are the codes that determine the dropout percentage. Currently, for the SY 2014 1st time in 9th grade adjusted graduation cohort, we have not had any students exited with the “Dropped Out” code during the 2016 – 2017 school year. We have had some students exited with “Dropped Out” in previous years for this cohort, however, but none during this school year.

As of last week (3/1/2017) there are 995 students in the SY 2014, four-year Adjusted Graduation Cohort:

- 53 Students have been removed from the Cohort
- 41 Graduates (through early graduation)

As of last week (3/1/2017), there are 129 students in the SY 2014, four-year Adjusted Graduation Cohort that are confirmed not Graduates:

- 84 Moved, Not Known to Be Continuing
- 36 Transfer to GED program
- 9 Dropped Out

In terms of our five-year graduation cohort (students whose first year in 9th grade was SY 2013, as of last week (3/1/2017), there are 920 students in the SY 2013 5-year Adjusted Graduation Cohort:

- 99 Students have been removed from the cohort
- 604 Graduates

As of 3/1/17, there are 183 students in the SY 2013 5-year Adjusted Graduation Cohort that are confirmed not Graduates

- 74 Moved, Not Known to Be Continuing
- 63 Transfer to GED program
- 30 Dropped Out
- 16 Certificate of Completion (transition students who are part of special education program)

The state reports four, five, six, and seven-year graduates. For example, Ms. Kincaid said students who started as freshman in 2012, our four-year graduation rate was 64.3%; and then last year, that cohort with a five-year graduation rate was 71.4%. So it is going up.

Ms. Johnson said on the school report card, that information is not easily found; Ms. Kincaid said that information is currently located right beneath the four-year graduation rate. Four, five, six, and seven-year starting last school year is all viewable on the state report card.

Ms. Kincaid said the high school has put in additional steps throughout the year not only for transcript verification but also to look at the high school exit codes. The next step to dig into is our promotion and retained students. Questions have arisen regarding what happens if a student moves during the summer. How are they then exited if they were promoted at the end of the school year but moved elsewhere during the summer?

The dropout calculation is very different than that of the graduation rate. The dropout rate takes all of the students currently enrolled at the high school and looks at those codes -- the “moved, not known to be continuing,” the “transfer to GED program,” the “dropped out,” and the “aged out” – and it’s not just seniors. It could be first year, second year, third year and fourth year. So total number of students who

fall under those dropout codes vs. the total number of students. The dropout rate is for any given school year whereas the graduation rate is calculated over the life of that cohort. Over the past four years, district has not had any students who have aged out. Dropout rates have improved – in 2012, it was 8.9% on the state report card; in 2016, it was 5.2%. Our graduation rate from 2012 to 2016 has improved from 60.1% to 64%, and our five-year has improved from 66.4% to 71.4%. We are showing positive trends in both four-year and five-year graduation rates and also in our dropout rate.

State comparison: in 2012, we were 8.9% dropout rate; the state rate was 2.5%. Last year, for 2016, the dropout rate was 5.2%; the state rate was 2.0%. Ms. Hatchett said we had fewer dropouts but more expulsions. Ms. Kincaid said expulsions do not get removed from the cohort so they count as a non-graduate.

IV. New Business

April curriculum committee meeting will cover the following:

- a) Textbook adoption and new electives in technology, foreign language, art, and music at the high school
- b) Dual language update
- c) Summer school update
- d) Health Requirement update
- e) Benchmark data update

May curriculum committee meeting will cover the following:

- a) Assessment update

V. Public Comments

None.

VI. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.