



To: Dr. Mike Riggle
From: Rosanne Williamson
Re: New Course Proposals
Date: December 20, 2017

Recommendation:

I recommend that new courses be presented for Board discussion on Monday, January 8, 2018 and that action on this item occur no later than the Monday, January 22, 2018 Board meeting.

Process:

New courses and curricular changes have been thoroughly discussed in each building by relevant departmental and building-level committees, Instructional Supervisors, Associate Principals and building principals. District-level administrators have also reviewed these proposals. The Board will note that they seek to meet the academic needs and interests of students in keeping with a comprehensive high school program. New course proposals, which may require additional FTE, will be covered within the building's authorized FTE allocation.

Building administrators who were closely involved in the development of these proposals will be available at the Board meeting to address questions from the Board.

Board Policy: Curriculum Planning Strategy 7010 (procedures) is included in the packet so that Board members who wish to review our required timelines and forms concerning our process for new course approvals may do so.

Board Policy 7010 and its procedures identifies not only the process for how proposals shall be submitted for Board approval, but also explains what happens after they are implemented as administrators evaluate the success of the change, reporting back to the Board "no later than the end of the third semester that the course is offered." This third semester follow-up evaluation of previously approved new courses will be contained in curriculum reports presented at a future Board meeting.

To: Dr. Mike Riggle, Dr. Rosanne Williamson
From: Dr. Ed Solis
Cc: Dr. John Finan
Re: Curriculum and Course Adoption Proposals
Date: December 2017

Glenbrook North High School
Curriculum and Course Adoption Proposals for 2018-2019

The Glenbrook North Instructional Leadership Team met on October 18 and October 25 and agreed to recommend the following new course proposals and curricular changes for your approval. In addition, GBN’s Curriculum Council reviewed and approved these proposals on October 18. These courses/changes meet with the approval of the principal and both associate principals. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

I. Glenbrook North proposes the addition of these courses:

Course Proposals	Course Title	Status	Rationale	Impact on Budget, FTE, Facilities	Evaluation
Fine Arts	Advanced Music Theory and Composition 373	New Course (already offered at GBS)	This course is designed for the academically gifted music student. Its content is a continuation of Music Theory and Composition 283 with a focus on arranging, orchestrating, and composing.	Staffing is not anticipated to change and no significant impact on budget is expected. Current facilities meet the needs of this course.	Student performance in the class, enrollment trends and teacher feedback.

Course Proposals	Course Title	Status	Rationale	Impact on Budget, FTE, Facilities	Evaluation
Social Studies	Debate Seminar- C: Congressional Debate	New Course	Congressional debate warrants its own course because it is a very distinct type of debate and is different from the other debate courses that we teach.	Since Lincoln-Douglas will phase out and be replaced with Congressional Debate, there is no impact on budget or FTE.	Student performance in the class, enrollment trends and teacher feedback.

II. Glenbrook North proposes the following level changes for current course offerings:

Course Changes	Course Title	Current level	Proposed level change	Rationale
Business Department	Sports Management 161	10-12	9-12	Provide the opportunity for students to access the curriculum as freshmen to explore their elective choices. The curriculum and skill development is appropriate for freshmen. The level change also provides more room for students to continue the next course or courses in the sequence.
Family and Consumer Science	Fashion & Interior Design	10-12	9-12	Provide the opportunity for students to access the curriculum as freshmen to explore their elective choices. The curriculum and skill development is appropriate for freshmen. The level change also provides more room for students to continue the next course or courses in the sequence.

III. Glenbrook North proposes the following name change for current course offerings:

Course Name Changes	Course Title	New Title	Rationale	Impact on Budget, FTE, Facilities	Evaluation
Fine Arts	Current title: Stagecraft	Technical Theatre	Students will explore various elements of stagecraft including theatrical nomenclature, theatre safety, scenic design, construction, painting, lights, sound, makeup, costumes, and props. Many students have inquired about this type of course and the new course title will draw in even more interest.	The proposed changes will require no additional staffing. The hope is to run one section each semester.	Student performance in the class, enrollment trends and teacher feedback.

IV. Glenbrook North proposes the following courses be archived:

Removal of Course Offerings	Course	Recommended Action	Rationale
Career & Technical Education	Construction Skills for Service 161	Archive course.	There has been no enrollment in this course in the last eight years. It is the opinion of the department that with the current offerings in Technology Education, Construction Skills for Service has lost its relevance to the student body and should be archived indefinitely.

APPLICATION FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE / COURSE PROPOSAL

School: Glenbrook North

Department: Fine Arts

Date: 11/8/2017

Name of proposed curricular change: Advanced Theory and Music Composition

1. Brief description of the curricular change

Grade: 11, 12 Length: Repeatable semester course

Advanced Music Theory and Composition 373 (currently taught as an independent study) is a course designed specifically for the gifted music student who wishes to study music at an advanced and rigorous level. The syllabus includes a focus on advanced music theory concepts (which coincides with a second semester of college-level theory course), critical listening analysis, arranging, orchestrating, composing, and student/instrument-specific assignments such as orchestral excerpt analysis, transpositions, and conducting.

The class would be taught stacked with AP Music Theory 283 and would have a small number of students per year, so it would not affect FTE. This aligns with the Advanced Music Theory and Composition 373 class already taught at GBS.

From GBS Curriculum Guide (where the class is already taught):

This course is designed for the academically gifted music student. Its content is a continuation of Music Theory and Composition 283 with a focus on arranging, orchestrating, and composing.

2. Curriculum planning committee membership

- a) List the members of the committee.

Chad Davidson, Aaron Kaplan, Andrew Toniolo, Robby Shellard, and Rich Chapman

- b) Give the rationale for the membership of this committee.

Aaron Kaplan and Rich Chapman currently teach music theory at GBN. Andrew Toniolo and Robby Shellard teach music theory at GBS. Chad Davidson, IS for Fine Arts, will ensure that the curriculum meets the needs of our department as a whole.

- c) If outside experts or consultants are requested, give rationale for their inclusion, proposed revisions, and the curriculum vitae and fees.

We did not consult any outside consultants.

3. Need for the curricular change

- a) Present and analyze data on student learning that point to a need for change.

Students have indicated that they are interested in continuing to study music theory beyond the AP level. These students typically intend to study music in college, and additional study in this area advances their college readiness.

- b) Present other data (demographic, anecdotal, research, and others) that point to a need for change.

Each year, we have a small number of students (1-3) that have completed the AP Music Theory class and would like additional opportunities to learn and grow their knowledge of Music Theory. This course would allow those students to continue to study and practice Music Theory.

- c) Summarize opinions of experts (researchers, higher educational professionals, business people, parents, community members) who speak to a need for change.

GBN college counselor, David Boyle, agrees that adding this course would be a benefit to those students who seek additional music theory opportunities. Additionally, this course is offered at GBS, and the many students, families, and faculty members who have been involved in this course have seen the benefits of this offering.

4. Rationale for addressing the need through a curricular change

- a) State the purpose of the change, indicating specifically how this curriculum change shall improve student learning by meeting the needs described in #3 above.

Currently, students who wish to continue their study of music theory beyond the AP level can only do so as an independent study. By adding this course, students can avail themselves of an established curriculum with clearly defined goals, activities, and assessments. Not only will this add rigor to the music theory curriculum, but adding this course will more accurately reflect learning on the student transcript.

- b) If the committee has considered other approaches to meeting the needs described above, describe those alternatives and indicate why each alternative was rejected.

Currently, students can access this curriculum only via independent study. We feel that the creation of the Advanced Theory and Composition provides colleges with a more accurate description of what the course is, and what students will be learning.

- c) Delineate the ways in which this curriculum proposal, if implemented, shall complement other courses in the department and the school.

This course will be an extension of the music theory offerings that we currently have. Additionally, this will bring GBN and GBS into alignment with our music theory curricula.

5. Description of proposed change

- a) Describe the students for which this curriculum change has been designed and the approximate size of the target group.

The students would all have completed the AP Music Theory course prior to taking Advanced Music Theory and Composition.

- b) Provide a tentative outline of the proposed course or program.

Unit 1: Secondary Dominants (Harmonic Functions)
Unit 2: Critical Listening (Macro - Recording/Performance Analysis)
Unit 3: Critical Listening (Micro - Orchestral Excerpt Analysis, instrument specific)
Unit 4: Augmented 6th Chords (Harmonic Functions)
Unit 5: Notation Software
Unit 6: Arranging for Large Ensembles (Orchestra, Band, Choir)
Unit 7: Arranging for Small Ensembles (Chamber music)
Unit 8: Orchestration
Unit 9: Music History
Unit 10: Introduction to Jazz Theory

6. Implications of the proposed change

- a) What are the implications of this proposed change for staffing, facilities, and budget?

It would be stacked with AP Music Theory, so there would be no additional sectioning or FTE needs.

- b) What are the implications of this proposed change for other courses in the department and for other departments in the school?

With such a small audience, we do not anticipate impact on other courses.

- c) What additional resources in personnel and money shall be required before this change is implemented? Shall summer curriculum work be required?

Other than summer curriculum work, no additional staffing or funding are needed.

APPLICATION FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE AND COURSE PROPOSAL

School: Glenbrook North

Department: Social Studies

Date: August 23, 2017

Name of proposed curricular change: Introduce Debate Seminar- C: Congressional Debate & phase out of Debate Seminar / Lincoln-Douglas 17300 and Lincoln-Douglas 173S00

1. Brief description of the curricular change

Currently we have upper level debate classes for sophomores, juniors, and seniors where we teach three types of debate: policy, Lincoln-Douglas, and public forum. There is a three-week Congressional Debate Unit in the Introduction to Debate Course and students have expressed interest in an upper level Congressional Debate Course. Congressional Debate warrants its own course because it is a distinct type of debate from the others currently taught. There are currently 15 students enrolled in the first level of Lincoln-Douglas Debate. For 2018-19, GBN will offer one more year of Advanced LD Debate so that those students currently involved in the program as seniors may continue without disruption. For the projected handful of students who will be juniors in Lincoln-Douglas Debate, they will have a year to transition into Policy Debate for their senior year. We will introduce Congressional Debate and that will become an option (along with Policy Debate) for current freshmen who wish to continue in the program. In 2019-20, we anticipate one section of first year Congressional Debate and one section of advanced Congressional Debate, with Lincoln-Douglas Debate archived.

2. Curriculum Planning Committee Membership

- a. List the members of the committee.

Michael Greenstein, Scott Williams

- b. Give the rationale for the membership of this committee.

Michael Greenstein is the head debate coach and the only certified teacher at Glenbrook North that is a member of the debate team coaching staff. This summer (2017) he completed a summer curriculum project where he compiled or created all needed materials for this course. Scott Williams is involved because the change has implications for Social Studies Department staffing and supervision.

3. Need for the curricular change

- a. Present and analyze data on student learning that point to a need for change.

Many area schools already offer Congressional Debate. Congressional Debate is a popular unit of study currently being taught during the introductory debate course.

- b. Present other data (demographic, anecdotal, research, and others) that point to a need for change.

Approximately 130 students are a part of the Glenbrook North debate program. Some have expressed an interest in learning about and engaging in competitive congressional debate. The format of this type of debate is different from other forms. It provides students who do not excel at one type of debate another format that could better fit their skill set and/or interests. On the other hand, interest in Lincoln-Douglas Debate is relatively small, and interest is not growing. Congressional Debate involves learning about Parliamentary rules and simulating Congress and is thus more accessible to mainstream Social Studies teachers, giving GBN more staffing options.

- c. Summarize opinions of experts (researchers, higher educational professionals, business people, parents, community members) who speak to a need for change.

There is a long-standing history of robust Congressional Debate nationally and throughout the state of Illinois. The National Speech and Debate Association and the Illinois High School Association recognize Congressional Debate as an independent debate event at the state and national tournament. When discussing the Congressional Debate Unit in the Introduction to Debate Course with parents at Parent Night in the Classroom, they have expressed interest in making that an advanced debate option for students as it provides unique skill sets distinct from other types of debate. Teachers at Glenbrook South have taught Congressional Debate and students have participated in contests for many years.

4. Rationale for addressing the need through a curricular change:

- a. State the purpose of the change, indicating specifically how this curriculum change shall improve student learning by meeting the needs described in #3 above.

Phasing out Lincoln-Douglas Debate and replacing it with Congressional Debate will introduce a dynamic and very relevant new course that will generate excitement among students and teachers alike, whereas overall enthusiasm for Lincoln-Douglas Debate is low.

- b. If the committee considered other approaches to meeting the needs described above, describe those alternatives and indicate why each alternative was rejected.

The alternative to creating a standalone course is to add Congressional Debate to another upper level debate course that already exists. Trying to teach Congressional Debate while also trying to teach another type of debate in the same

class would spread classroom learning too thin. There would always be a group of students not engaged as a result. The type of teaching and learning that are required for other types of debate are too distinct from Congressional Debate.

- c. Delineate the ways in which this curriculum proposal, if implemented, shall complement other courses in the department and the school.

The format of Congressional Debate requires students to act as if they are members of Congress. They research and write legislation as well as debate if it should pass via real world congressional/parliamentary procedure and rules. The curriculum, content, and skills learned in Congressional Debate can complement all the political science and civics courses offered in the Social Studies Department. Further, anyone who is able to teach political science or civics, could teach Congressional Debate. While Congressional Debate strongly complements civics, it cannot satisfy the Illinois state civics requirement because the scope of civics is much wider than our federal Congress.

5. Description of proposed change:

- a. Describe the students for which this curriculum change has been designed and the approximate size of the target group.

This course would be for students who have taken the Introductory Debate Course and have an interest in focusing on Congressional Debate. The number of students interested would change from year to year but the course would only run if a sufficient number of students were interested. For the last several years, all of the students who take the Introductory Debate Course (50+ students) continue with an upper level debate course. More than half move into Policy Debate and there is no reason to believe that this would not continue. The just under half who currently take Lincoln-Douglas Debate will, we believe, embrace Congressional Debate and with stronger enthusiasm.

- b. Provide a tentative outline of the proposed course or program.

Unit 1: Introduction to Congressional Debate

- How to write and research a bill
- How to write and research a resolution
- How to speak and act like a member of Congress
- Understanding Civics, The Constitution, and Federalism
- Introduction to Parliamentary Procedure
- Introduction to Congressional committees and sub-committees
- Introduction to Party Politics, Lobbying, and Deal-Making

Unit 2: Standard Congressional Debate Simulation Using Illinois Congressional Debate Association Rules

Unit 3: Standard Congressional Debate Simulation Using Illinois High School Association Rules

Unit 4: Congressional Debate Simulation - Foreign Affairs Sub-Committee

Unit 5: Congressional Debate Simulation - Domestic Non-Economic Sub-Committee

Unit 6: Congressional Debate Simulation - Domestic Economic Sub-Committee

Unit 7: Congressional Debate Simulation - Amending the Constitution to Overturn a Supreme Court Decision

Unit 8: Congressional Debate Simulation - Delegation and Non-Delegation Doctrine -Expand or Remove a Specific Executive Agency's Authority

Unit 9: Congressional Debate Simulation - Travel back in time to the Constitutional Convention

Unit 10: Congressional Debate Simulation - Propose a change to GBN or District 225 Policy

6. Implications of the proposed change:

- a. What are the implications of this proposed change for staffing, facilities, and budget?

There are not many implications; however, given the new state civics law the number of people certified to teach civics at GBN will only continue to increase. Anyone with this certification would be qualified to teach Congressional Debate, which will provide the Social Studies Department with greater staffing flexibility.

- b. What are the implications of this proposed change for other courses in the department and for other departments in the school?

We anticipate that the internal trade-off described above will occur. The same number of debate courses will continue, with Congressional Debate replacing Lincoln-Douglas. It is possible that Congressional Debate will prove much more popular than Lincoln-Douglas Debate. If that were to occur, it is possible that the total number of debate sections will increase. Alternately, students may be siphoned away from Policy Debate and the total number of Debate sections would remain stable. We do not anticipate an impact on other departments.

- c. What additional resources in personnel and money shall be required before this change is implemented? Shall summer curriculum work be required?

Perhaps ten-fifteen hours summer curriculum for a new teacher to consult with Michael Greenstein, review the materials he has already compiled, and undertake his / her own preparation.

7. Method of evaluating the success of the proposal after it is implemented:

a. If the proposal is approved and implemented, how shall it be evaluated?

Student enrollment and evaluation by Head Debate Coach Michael Greenstein and Social Studies supervisor Scott Williams.

b. What specific outcomes shall indicate success of the implemented proposal?

Enrollment numbers over time. Classroom evaluations using the Danielson framework. Student participation at Congressional Debate events. Student and parent-reported enthusiasm and satisfaction.

To: Dr. Michael Riggle; Dr. Rosanne Williamson
From: Cameron Muir
Cc: Dr. Lauren Fagel
Re: New Course Proposals
Date: November 28, 2017

The Glenbrook South Administration, with the approval of the Instructional Supervisors Council, recommends the following new course proposals for approval. These recommendations are supported by the Glenbrook South Instructional Council who met on October 11, 2017 and again on October 18, 2017. *The Glenbrook South Administrative Council met on December 5, 2016. Both agreed to recommend the following new course proposals/curricular changes for your approval. The following are the proposed curriculum and course adoptions for Glenbrook South. I am also attaching the new course proposal forms for each new course.*

I. Glenbrook South proposes the following new courses:

Department	Course Title	Status	Rationale	Impact on FTE, Budget, or Facilities	Evaluation
English and Social Studies	<i>The American Experience</i>	New Course (this interdisciplinary course is offered at GBN)	The English and Social Studies Departments propose a full year interdisciplinary course on the American Experience which would integrate the existing curricula from US History and Junior English.	No impact on overall staffing	Student performance, enrollments trends, and teacher feedback

Department	Course Title	Status	Rationale	Impact on FTE, Budget, or Facilities	Evaluation
Special Education	<i>Suburban Studies</i>	New Course	Students who receive support in an instructional setting currently have two social Social Studies classes offered to them: History of World Civilizations and United States History. This course would provide a Social Studies elective at an instructional level. There are many students who plan to attend community college or go straight to work following graduation from GBS without having had instruction about services available through Glenview and surrounding Chicagoland communities. This course would offer an in-depth study of community, state, and federal supports (e.g. transportation, Department of Human Services, social security, local legislation offices).	No impact on overall staffing.	Student performance, enrollment trends, and teacher feedback

II. Glenbrook South proposes the following name changes for courses:

Department	Current Course Title	New Course Title	Rationale
Special Education	<i>Reading 163, 263, 363, 463</i>	<i>Reading Foundations; Reading Comprehension; Reading Enrichment</i>	Students who receive support in an instructional setting currently have the option of Reading 163, Reading 263, Reading 363, and Reading 463. More specific course titles would better communicate the differentiation of reading interventions offered through the courses. Each course provides students with direct instruction, targeting each student's specific deficits in the area of reading.

APPLICATION FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE

School: Glenbrook South **Department:** English and Social Studies **Date:** 10/21/2017

Name of proposed curricular change: The American Experience

1. Brief description of the curricular change:

The English and Social Studies Departments propose a full year interdisciplinary course on the American Experience which would integrate the existing curricula from US history and junior year English.

2. Curriculum Planning Committee Membership

a) List the members of the committee:

Jeannie Logan, Tom Kucharski, Steve Bolf, Stacy Flannery, Lisa Neu, Daniel Hicks

b) Give the rationale for the membership of this committee.

Each member has some background or prior experience with interdisciplinary education and has expressed an interest in potentially teaching the course if it should be approved.

c) If outside experts or consultants are requested, give rationale for their inclusion, proposed revisions, and the curriculum vitae and fees.

N/A

3. Need for the curricular change:

- a) Present and analyze data on student learning that point to a need for change. or
- b) Present other data (demographic, anecdotal, research, and others) that point to a need for change. or
- c) Summarize opinions of experts (researchers, higher educational professionals, business people, parents, community members) who speak to a need for change.

The research in support of interdisciplinary learning and combining English and history in particular is significant. Below is an annotated bibliography of a selection from this research:

- *Interdisciplinary Curriculum: Design and Implementation*, edited by Heidi Hayes Jacobs.
Jacobs' work is supported by the ASCD ([here is a sampling of her work on their website](#)) and addresses the philosophical beliefs around interdisciplinary education. She argues that interdisciplinary courses are particularly effective

in heightening the relevance of content. Students will become skilled and comfortable with thinking more flexibly beyond the parameters of a traditional discipline, while encountering multiple points of view on a topic of study. Jacobs also argues that interdisciplinary study encourages students to reflect more explicitly on the process of learning as well.

- “Two Teacher Educators go to the Source: Teaching an Interdisciplinary Class in an Urban Charter School” by Lorrei DiCamillo and Nancy M. Bailey (2016). The article cites other research which finds that an interdisciplinary curriculum can increase student engagement. The teachers who employed this model found that they became stronger educators while working together at teaching American Studies. Additionally, they argue that the Common Core calls for the integration of complex texts, which the course allowed them to do.
- “Where English and History Meet” by Karen Cobb Carroll, PhD. Carroll argues that students see “connections among elements in our social, cultural and political landscapes,” gaining deeper understanding and seeing greater relevancy of their studies. She believes that the cross curricular approach to writing helped the Advanced Placement History students.
- From, “Concept-based Teaching and Learning” by H. Lynn Erickson
Inherent in more concept-based teaching and learning, which is a key feature of interdisciplinary curricula, is the transference of knowledge, as students become trained to see patterns and connections between concepts, ideas, and situations. This type of learning allows for “personal meaning-making” by students. Erickson argues that concept-based instruction leads to “Synergistic Thinking,” which she defines as the “interplay between the factual and conceptual levels of mental processing.”
- “Having ‘Great Expectations’ of Year 9” by Michael Monaghan
Monaghan, a history teacher, reflects on the incorporation of a unit centered around the nineteenth century and *Great Expectations*. He testifies to the improved historical understanding of his students as well as the personal growth he experienced in becoming engaged with his English colleagues.

4. **Rationale for addressing the need through a curricular change:**

- a) State the purpose of the change, indicating specifically how this curriculum change shall improve student learning by meeting the needs described in #3 above.
 - The student experience of GBS is primarily compartmentalized according to discipline thus limiting opportunities for synthesis. The primary purpose of this course is to promote interdisciplinary and synthetic thinking.
 - Both the English and Social Studies Departments have worked hard to find relevant readings for students in both fiction and nonfiction. Combining the curricula and stressing a thematic approach will allow more opportunities to find relevant, high interest material, while capitalizing on the concentrated focus on reading skills from complementary and overlapping disciplinary approaches; these materials can then be shared throughout our curriculum, not just in the interdisciplinary course.

- Providing students an instructional choice in their course selection supports our organizational goal of nurturing student identity, as it requires student self-reflection informed by teacher guidance, self-awareness of who they are as learners and how they want to learn, and student agency through making reasoned decisions about their academic program.
 - Homework load and student wellness has been a priority of the district. The collaboration of the teachers in a teamtaught course allow for more thoughtful coordination of homework assignments and long-term projects to help alleviate student stress.
- b) If the committee considered other approaches to meeting the needs described above, describe those alternatives and indicate why each alternative was rejected.
- c) Delineate the ways in which this curriculum proposal, if implemented, shall complement other courses in the department and the school.

The proposed course represents an opportunity to provide a different way to frame the study of American history and literature that will complement the current disciplinary approaches. Students would be able to choose between a synthesized approach to various humanities themes in American culture, or more focused study within the conventions of each separate discipline. The proposed course also provides another interdisciplinary learning opportunity for students in addition to the experiences that exist through other departments.

5. Description of proposed change:

- a) Describe the students for which this curriculum change has been designed and the approximate size of the target group.
- Rising juniors who would normally take English 363 and US History 163 (approximately 400 students) would be offered the choice of either the stand alone History and English classes or the interdisciplinary American Experience class.
 - The course would run for one block every day as two simultaneous history and English sections that meet together as much as possible, with 1 English teacher and 1 Social Studies teacher assigned to the group. The commitment would be 0.4 of each teacher's FTE. Class size would mirror those of the current English and Social Studies classes for two sections (approximately 50 total for each "section" of American Experience).
- b) Provide a tentative outline of the proposed course or program.

The following is a tentative outline of possible units of study that integrate US history and American literature:

- Early America and the Contested Terrain of Freedom
- Immigration: The Contest for Terrain Continues/Reemerges
- Growth and Collapse of the American Dream
- Peace, Prosperity, and Progress?: Post-War America
- Civil Rights, Agency, And Social Change

- The Trauma of War: Vietnam

6. Implications of the proposed change:

- a) What are the implications of this proposed change for staffing, facilities, and budget?

Given that we are joining courses junior students would be taking anyway, the proposed combined course with current class size guidelines would have no impact on staffing. Based on enthusiasm from both departments, we anticipate ample volunteers who would be willing and eager to partner with a Social Studies or English colleague to teach the course.

Facilities may be a challenge because of the limited number of rooms that can accommodate combined sections of students (approximately 50). Currently, there are 2 large group spaces that have availability, and we can also offer two separate classrooms for the course without taxing our current room distribution.

We do not anticipate any changes to the budget.

- b) What are the implications of this proposed change for other courses in the department and for other departments in the school?

This course would reduce the enrollment in our current English 363 and US History 163 courses by offering students the combined option, but would not be drawing student enrollment away from other departments. Other courses in our own departments would not be affected.

- c) What additional resources in personnel and money shall be required before this change is implemented? Shall summer curriculum work be required?

This course would require significant summer curriculum work.

7. Method of evaluating the success of the proposal after it is implemented:

- a) If the proposal is approved and implemented, how shall it be evaluated?

We would evaluate the course based on student enrollment, assessment data, as well as potentially using student survey data.

- b) What specific outcomes shall indicate success of the implemented proposal?

The success of the course would be reflected in robust student enrollment via the course selection process, strong student performance on assessments designed to demonstrate synthetic thinking (e.g. student writing that reflects fluid integration of historical, literary, cultural lenses on a topic), and positive student experiences of the course.

APPLICATION FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE

School: Glenbrook South **Department:** Special Education **Date:** 10/23/17

Name of proposed curricular change: Suburban Studies

1. **Brief description of the curricular change:**

Students who receive support in an instructional setting currently have two Social Studies classes offered to them: History of World Civilizations and United States History. This course would provide a Social Studies elective at an instructional level.

2. **Curriculum Planning Committee Membership**

a. List the members of the committee.

- a. Julie Smith
- b. Terry Harris
- c. Jamie Bachmann
- d. Dan Rhoades

b. Give the rationale for the membership of this committee.

Julie is the transition specialist for GBS, focusing on increasing positive post-secondary outcomes for students. Terry and Jamie are current History teachers in the department. Dan is the general education Urban Studies teacher.

c) If outside experts or consultants are requested, give rationale for their inclusion, proposed revisions, and the curriculum vitae and fees. **N/A**

3. **Need for the curricular change:**

Present and analyze data on student learning that point to a need for change.

There are many students who plan to attend community college or go straight to work following graduation from GBS without having had instruction about services available through Glenview and surrounding Chicagoland communities. This course would offer an in-depth study of community, state, and federal supports (e.g. transportation, Department of Human Services, social security, local legislation offices).

4. **Rationale for addressing the need through a curricular change:**

a) State the purpose of the change, indicating specifically how this curriculum change shall improve student learning by meeting the needs described in #3 above.

This course fosters independence by assisting students in developing skills to manage and monitor behavior, academic progress and personal goals. Teachers will work diligently with students to develop self-advocacy strategies, allowing students to access support across educational, vocational and community settings, while maintaining the highest level of dignity for all involved.

b) If the committee considered other approaches to meeting the needs described above, describe those alternatives and indicate why each alternative was rejected.

- c) Delineate the ways in which this curriculum proposal, if implemented, shall complement other courses in the department and the school.
This course would be a one semester course (offered opposite Civics). This course will complement both Civics and Independent Living by offering a more in depth investigation of Glenview and the surrounding communities. The course will offer direct instruction in advocacy, understanding disability rights and local, state and federal legislation related to such rights. It also will offer additional direct instruction in accessing adult service agencies and local service providers (e.g. medical provider, financial institutions, post-secondary educational environments).

5. **Description of proposed change:**

- a. Describe the students for which this curriculum change has been designed and the approximate size of the target group.
This course will be offered to seniors in need of DLS instruction. These students are identified for Special Education services and may have a variety of disabilities (e.g. learning disabilities, cognitive impairments, other health impairments, emotional disabilities). The course would not exceed 13 students (this is the maximum enrollment for a Special Education course).
- b) Provide a tentative outline of the proposed course or program.
Unit 1: History of Glenview (governmental, agricultural, civic, educational)
Unit 2: Disability Rights, Glenview Resources, State Resources
Unit 3: Accessing community resources and agencies
Unit 4: Local Entertainment and Leisure Programs/Park District Programs
Unit 5: Putting it All Together - practical application of skills gained through enrollment in this course along with civics, consumer, living (students will develop individual portfolios to support transition to post-secondary settings)
Portfolio may include: personal information reference (list of doctors, medications, etc), resumes and work history, residential options, transportation references, local government contacts and leisure reference guide.

6. **Implications of the proposed change:**

- a. What are the implications of this proposed change for staffing, facilities, and budget?
This course would be assigned as .1 of a teacher's schedule. This is not an increase in staffing.
- b) What are the implications of this proposed change for other courses in the department and for other departments in the school?
This course will be offered opposite Civics to support a full year of electives for students in need of Special Education instruction.
- b. What additional resources in personnel and money shall be required before this change is implemented? Shall summer curriculum work be required?
Summer curriculum work would be required to develop the curriculum.

7. **Method of evaluating the success of the proposal after it is implemented:**

- a) If the proposal is approved and implemented, how shall it be evaluated?
Evaluations will take place through observations by administrators, such as the Instructional Supervisor of Special Education and the Associate Principal of Curriculum and Instruction, through reflection of the instructors, and through anecdotal student feedback.
- b) What specific outcomes shall indicate success of the implemented proposal?
Students will have opportunity to complete transition activities as listed in the transition plan of their IEPs. They will identify key historical implications of Glenview and the surrounding communities. Students will make progress toward the goals as listed in their IEPs and demonstrate generalization of skills. |

Section A - Introduction

These procedures, outlined below, are intended to facilitate the systematic processing of curriculum development proposals for making modifications in the instructional program of District #225. The curriculum shall be defined to consist of all courses of study offered by the district.

Modifying the curriculum shall be defined as:

1. Adding or deleting a course, an entire sequence of courses, or a program.
2. Significantly changing the goals of an existing course or program.

Decisions concerning the administrative operation of the curriculum shall not be subject to the curriculum planning strategy. Decisions concerning such items as the following shall be made by the appropriate administrative staff:

- 1) assignment of the instructional staff,
- 2) development of the master class schedule,
- 3) assignment of students to classes,
- 4) recommendations concerning instructional materials, subject to the provisions of Policy 7180: Instructional Materials,
- 5) changes in course or program titles,
- 6) utilization of facilities,
- 7) classroom methodology or individual teaching strategies,
- 8) use of new instructional technologies.

Section B - Procedures

1. Each instructional supervisor, in conjunction with the associate principal for instruction and the department staff, shall conduct an annual evaluation of approximately twenty percent (20%) of the department's courses and programs. It is the expectation that all courses within a department will be reviewed at least once during the five-year cycle. The courses and programs to be reviewed will be determined through a collaborative process involving the associate principals for instruction and instructional supervisors at both schools. This review will be used as a base for the Instructional Supervisor Curriculum Report.
2. The impetus for curriculum change may be such factors as, but not limited to, the following: a demonstrated need for learning outcomes not met by current curriculum; data on student learning; demographic data on students; professional expert advice from educational consultants or representatives of higher education; the conclusions of educational research. Upon seeing a curricular need, staff members, students, parents, and members of the community may submit ideas for curriculum changes to the instructional supervisor of the appropriate department. Principals also shall inform parents and members of the community about curricular issues and shall invite representatives to join curriculum planning committees when appropriate. Experts and consultants may be engaged to provide input to the process when deemed appropriately by the respective principals.
3. Upon receiving a suggested change in curriculum, the instructional supervisor may convene an ad hoc departmental curriculum planning committee to address the need for the curricular change. This curriculum planning committee, after studying the perceived need, may write a curriculum proposal. If the proposed change affects more than one department, the principal may convene an ad hoc interdisciplinary committee to address the perceived need.
4. The proposal of the departmental committee must include the need, the rationale, a description, and the implications of the curricular change, as well as a method of evaluating the success of the implemented proposal (Appendix B).
5. All proposals recommended by the departmental or interdisciplinary committees shall be reviewed by the building's instructional supervisors and principal. Accepted proposals shall be acted on successively by the principal, superintendent, and the Board.

The decision or recommendation of each of the above-listed individuals or groups shall be communicated in writing to the committee submitting the proposal. A timeline for the strategy is contained in Appendix A of these Procedures.

6. No proposal shall be implemented unless approved by the principal, the superintendent, and the Board. The instructional supervisors shall serve in an advisory function.
7. Each year proposals shall be submitted to the Board for approval as indicated in the timeline in Appendix A of these Procedures. Under extraordinary circumstances, the superintendent may authorize the submission of a proposal to the curriculum planning process or to the Board at any time during the year.
8. One year after the implementation of a curriculum change, the instructional supervisor and the designated administrator shall evaluate each proposal approved by the Board in order to determine whether the proposal was successful in meeting its goals and fulfilling the educational needs. A report of this evaluation, together with a recommendation as to the continuance or modification of the implemented change, shall be shared with the appropriate committee that had proposed the curriculum change and shall be submitted to the superintendent and the Board no later than the end of the third semester that the course is offered.

APPENDIX A

CURRICULUM PLANNING STRATEGY
ANNUAL TIMELINE *

<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Activity</u>
March 15 to August	Collaboration between instructional supervisors and principal or associate principal for instruction at both schools to review department curriculum in light of data on student learning and to consider curricular changes.
August to October	Instructional supervisors set up committees for suggested curricular changes. Committees meet, plan, elicit input from various constituencies, and write proposal applications.
By November 1	Curriculum planning committees submit applications for curriculum changes to the instructional supervisors.
By November 15	Instructional supervisors review proposals and submit recommendations to the principals.
By December 1	Principals accept or reject proposals and, if accepted, send them to the superintendent including any resource implications.
Prior to Winter Break	Superintendent accepts or rejects proposals and gives rationale for actions.
By February 1	Superintendent informs the Board of Education and submits accepted proposals for Board action.
By March 1	Instructional supervisors submit proposals for summer curriculum work to develop course outlines and instructional resources.

By March 15

Superintendent either approves the proposal for summer project and designates funding for summer curriculum project or rejects the proposal. Instructional Supervisor Curriculum Reports are due to the superintendent. These reports are based on curriculum review conducted or modifications made during the past year and identified curriculum directions for the ensuing year(s). The reports should also include an evaluation and recommendation for any course that has completed the third semester of implementation.

Note: Under extraordinary circumstances, the superintendent may authorize the submission of a proposal to the Board at any time during the year.

*** This timeline will be coordinated with but not limited by the district budget timeline process.**

APPENDIX B

APPLICATION FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE

School:

Department:

Date:

Name of proposed curricular change:

1. **Brief description** of the curricular change
2. **Curriculum Planning Committee Membership**
 - a) List the members of the committee.
 - b) Give the rationale for the membership of this committee.
 - c) If outside experts or consultants are requested, give rationale for their inclusion, proposed revisions, and the curriculum vitae and fees.
3. **Need** for the curricular change:
 - a) Present and analyze data on student learning that point to a need for change.

or
 - b) Present other data (demographic, anecdotal, research, and others) that point to a need for change.

or
 - c) Summarize opinions of experts (researchers, higher educational professionals, business people, parents, community members) who speak to a need for change.
4. **Rationale** for addressing the need through a curricular change:
 - a) State the purpose of the change, indicating specifically how this curriculum change shall improve student learning by meeting the needs described in #3 above.
 - b) If the committee considered other approaches to meeting the needs described above, describe those alternatives and indicate why each alternative was rejected.
 - c) Delineate the ways in which this curriculum proposal, if implemented, shall complement other courses in the department and the school.

APPENDIX B (Continued)

APPLICATION FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE

5. **Description** of proposed change:
 - a) Describe the students for which this curriculum change has been designed and the approximate size of the target group.
 - b) Provide a tentative outline of the proposed course or program.
6. **Implications** of the proposed change:
 - a) What are the implications of this proposed change for staffing, facilities, and budget?
 - b) What are the implications of this proposed change for other courses in the department and for other departments in the school?
 - c) What additional resources in personnel and money shall be required before this change is implemented? Shall summer curriculum work be required?
7. **Method of evaluating** the success of the proposal after it is implemented:
 - a) If the proposal is approved and implemented, how shall it be evaluated?
 - b) What specific outcomes shall indicate success of the implemented proposal?

Adopted: November 21, 1977
Revised: October 9, 1995
Revised: November 27, 2000
Revised: August 11, 2003