

From: Held,Erik
Subject: Fwd: Carol Baker concerns
Date: Sunday, December 8, 2019 9:05:47 AM

Regards,

Erik M. Held
D86 Board of Education Member

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, December 8, 8:50 AM
Subject: Re: Carol Baker concerns
To: Pollak,Nancy, Camden,Kevin, Hirsman,Kathleen, Chval,Keith, Hanson,Cynthia, Held,Erik, Turek,Marty, Walsh,William, Hurt,Jessica

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

You should also know I just received this via Facebook messenger. I do not know the person who sent it to me This is real. We are not making this up. And when the board president and superintendent attend a department meeting to ask for opinions that's not called discussion. It's called "intimidation"

Thank you for your post just now on fb. You are right that people do not want to speak out for fear that their children will be targeted.

I wanted to tell you that my oldest child, who is currently in xxxxxx (took out course name for privacy reasons) told me that they discussed the impending science changes in class. The teacher announced that he/she will arrange fo retire before this new track is entirely phased in, that is how disastrous he/she views it.
So no, they do not have 100% teacher support.

[REDACTED]

On Dec 7, 2019, at 4:58 PM, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Dear members of the Board of Education:

Let me preface this by saying I am terrified to send this letter to you. I know that you are elected officials and certainly hope that no repercussions should occur to

my children or family because of this email, but I fear that we could be targeted by members of the administration. I am not alone in feeling this way. There are many in the community that feel as strongly about what is going on, but refuse to voice their positions for fear of repercussions or fear that they or their children will be reprimanded and dismissed by you. This is reality.. Please listen to us.

I want to make you aware of a letter I received over the Thanksgiving holiday (attached). Our community keeps hearing from you and the administration that parents are on board with these changes, and that all the teachers are 100% behind the changes happening. **That is not what I and many others in the community are hearing from many different and varied sources, including this correspondence.**

Hearing from current and former D86 teachers, as well as current and former teachers from other school districts in Illinois and around the country, provides a much different story than what has been communicated by building and district administrators, and some Board members, at BOE meetings and other public events such as the 8th grade transition meeting at Central.

As someone who has been very critical of these changes, **I realize you may not want to take what I am saying seriously. That is your choice. However, like many of you, my ultimate goal in being involved is to assure the best opportunities for all D86 students,** I would be remiss if I did not share with you all this information. I usually do not pay attention to anonymous letters and communications, however, some activities of Dr Baker at her previous district have been sent to me and are being circulated in the community (links below), and it is worthwhile to bring them to your attention.

My main concern is that Dr. Baker has circumvented established process and taken steps to quash the recommendations of respected and experienced faculty who have worked in this district far longer than she has. Dr. Baker was hired less than 18 months ago, and in that short period of time has pushed radical changes through by failing to follow the required three year process for creating new courses documented on the district website and in the faculty handbook. The attached letter raises serious concerns about the steps that Dr. Baker went to in order to have the Science Department Chairs change course from the multiple strand science sequence alignment plan that they submitted to her last December and which was included in documents that were provided to you at the January 7, 2019 board meeting. At that meeting, President Pollak indicated that she liked the proposed science plan, but wanted to know what it would cost. Others on the board agreed and the administration was asked to bring that information forward. **That did not happen, and the next time she presented the science alignment plan, it bore no resemblance to what the Department Chairs had recommended, yet none of you ever publicly asked why the plan had so radically changed, or ask why Dr. Baker had not provided you with the requested financial information on the multiple strand sequence. Very few questions about this change were asked in public at all - something else that completely mystifies people who are trying to understand the logic and reasons behind the rapid and incomplete implementation of this plan.**

In addition to the attached letter, **I have also been informed that at the 8th grade transition meeting (with over 800 people in attendance) there was over an hour of questions about the new Science curriculum and that 90% of the parents asking questions were parents who have not been publicly involved in these discussions to date. According to other parents who were there, there was not one positive comment about this new sequence and there was significant concern and questioning about these rapid changes and the ability of parents to make a decision about their children's science path.**

I am wondering if any of the building or district administrators who were present at the 8th grade meeting communicated to the BOE about the number of questions and the significant concern of parents with incoming students? If not, I believe that they should have as this is just one more data point of many that point to the fact that **this new Science sequence roll out at Central should be delayed for at least a year. No one is ready for it, including, most importantly, teachers and parents.**

Further, at the last board meeting, both Ms. Pollak and Mr. Chval referenced a survey that apparently you gave to the science faculty regarding the proposed plan and Mr. Chval indicated that there was full support by the teachers. I have FOIA'd the survey results and my FOIA was declined, however, I believe that you are required to produce the survey results since they were mentioned during the meeting and therefore the exception that you are relying on to deny the response does not apply. However, even if you don't produce the results to me, I would urge you all to look at the results, as I have been advised that the results do not show 100% support by the science teachers. Also worth noting, while the survey was dubbed as "anonymous", I was told that teachers were asked to put down what subject they taught - so it wasn't quite the anonymous poll that you were led to believe.

I hope that you will read this email and the four attachments with an open mind and understand that the concern that I and hundreds of others have with this plan stems only from the desire to ensure that all of our students have the best possible educational experience in Science next year and in the future.

These documents have been circulating around the community for a few weeks. This is why people do not believe the teachers are 100% behind this.

see public item VI Citizen

Statements <https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicItemDownload.aspx?mk=50236634&fn=minutes.pdf>

<https://chronicleillinois.com/news/cook-county-news/lyons-school-board-member-claims-intimidation-gains-supporters/>

<letter.jpg>

<envelope.jpg>

From: [Pollak,Nancy](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 2020-01-09 BOE Public Comments
Date: Thursday, January 16, 2020 5:18:30 PM

I realized I owed you a response. I'm available for the rest of the week/weekend. Let me know what works for you.

Board Member
HTHS D86

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2020 10:57 PM
To: Pollak,Nancy <npollak@hinsdale86.org>
Subject: RE: 2020-01-09 BOE Public Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

Sounds good. I'll be out of town on business travel the first half of next week. I can call you late next week or this weekend. Please let me know some preferred days & times. Thanks.

[REDACTED]

From: Pollak,Nancy <npollak@hinsdale86.org>
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2020 12:49 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 2020-01-09 BOE Public Comments

Would love to catch up. Give me a call when it works for you at [REDACTED]

Thanks.

Nancy

Board Member
HTHS D86

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2020 6:47 AM
To: BOE <boe@hinsdale86.org>

Cc: Prentiss,Tamara <tprentis@hinsdale86.org>; Baker,Carol <cbaker@hinsdale86.org>; Pokorny Lyp,Arwen <apokorny@hinsdale86.org>; Walsh,William <wwalsh@hinsdale86.org>
Subject: 2020-01-09 BOE Public Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

D86 Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at the Board meeting last night. Embedded below is a copy of my public comments.

[REDACTED]

Physics seems to be a difficult topic for our community. AP Physics C is a rigorous course, covering three topics: mechanics, electricity, and magnetism. It's equivalent to one full-year of physics in an engineering school. Only Calculus BC students qualify to take AP Physics C. We have 123 Calculus BC students at Central and only 44 of them are enrolled in AP Physics C. For the rest, their only AP Physics alternative is AP Physics 1 which will not be recognized by engineering schools, no matter how well they do on the AP exam, because it is algebra-based physics.

Lost in the rhetoric over the new science sequence is the recognition of a new AP Physics course added to the curriculum this school year, at Hinsdale South. It's called AP Physics CM. Described in the Program of Studies, CM focuses an entire year on the mechanics portion of AP Physics. It's open to students concurrent with Honors Precalculus or Calculus AB.

Under the new curriculum, AP Physics CM offers more students an opportunity to acquire AP Physics credit, credit recognized by engineering schools because it is calculus-based, not algebra-based. At Central, we have 218 students enrolled in Pre-Calculus Honors and another 204 students in Calculus AB. That's 422 students currently enrolled at Central who, under the new science curriculum could have a shot at AP credit in Physics at an engineering school, an opportunity they do not have today. District 86 may finally be catching up to the many forward-thinking schools throughout the country, already offering AP Physics CM. Slowing the rollout of the new science sequence means more students will miss out.

I am very disappointed to read misinformation and half-truths about the new science curriculum on multiple Facebook pages. I don't think I've read a single post from the self-appointed science education experts in our community, on the addition of AP Physics CM and the strong value it

provides pre-engineering students in the middle of the spectrum. Dr. Baker, worked to uncover and fix curriculum problems like this in District 86. Not renewing her contract is a huge mistake. Dr. Baker has focused on curriculum review, alignment, and renewal in line with the most current standards, which District 86 desperately needs. I hope there is a clear plan to stay the course and bring equal opportunities to all students in the District. Equity is the right thing to do, and I expect this Board knows it's a legal requirement in Illinois. Thank you.

From: [Hanson, Cynthia](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: How will D86 meet students where they are?
Date: Friday, January 17, 2020 12:45:44 PM

Thank you, [REDACTED]!

Cynthia

Cynthia Hanson
Board Member
Hinsdale TWP High School District 86

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 16, 2020, at 6:49 PM, [REDACTED] > wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

Cynthia,

Happy New Year! Thank you for responding and for asking questions. I am really passionate about education at all levels - helping students maximize their learning potential.

Currently students at Central can choose the science that interests them. Freshman year they choose from Earth science and Biology both with 3 tiers: G, Regular, and Honors. Students in Alg 2 Trig or higher can choose Honors Chemistry. [REDACTED] started in Bio on opposite ends of the spectrum: [REDACTED] took G Bio and [REDACTED] took Honors Bio.

- [REDACTED]: G Bio, Traditional Chem, Meteorology & Astronomy/ Geology & Oceanography
- [REDACTED] Honors Bio, Honors Earth Science, AP Physics. 1, AP Physics. C

With the NEW sequence, my [REDACTED] would not have gone on to take a 4th year of science, and may not have even chosen a 3rd year; and my [REDACTED] who took chemistry in 8th grad would not be able to take 2 AP Physics classes. I have talked with lots of families whose children excelled in Science and none feel the new Sequence meets students where they are. My [REDACTED] took both of the most rigorous science classes at Central, and it was the first place he felt he truly belonged – with peers who see the world the way he does. Yesterday when I picked up my [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] best friend who is a [REDACTED] – they were talking about how Honors Earth Science (a mix of freshmen through seniors) is the best class either has taken. When they were getting ready for finals Saunders said [REDACTED] had an

advantage because he took Honors Bio with Mr. Page last year so he had to have incredible study habits. One of my [redacted] friends will graduate from Michigan's Honors Physics program – a 5-year program in 2 years; [redacted] is Pre-Med and took Honors Bio, Honors Chem, AP Physics 1, and AP Bio. My friend's [redacted] who will complete 6 APs took Freshman Honors Chem (Ap Exam), Soph AP Physics 1, Jr. double up on AP Bio and AP Physics C; Sr. Seminar & Research. [redacted] [redacted] graduating this year are both taking APES and AP Stats, but the one going into nursing took Bio, Chem, AP Biology; the other took Honors Bio, Honors Chem, AP Physics 1. I am sure that when proposing the change to curriculum the Science Team looked at what science courses students took and if they would be able to achi – and where they went to college. Of all the students I talked to, the curriculum means less opportunity, not more.

For some kids Science is like an elective and they should be given the opportunity to choose what fits them. There are definitely things that can be done to improve science, but eliminating choice clips students' wings. I have spent a lot of time looking at what other schools offer, and what pre-requisites are required. No high performing district replaces Honors Bio with AP Bio for all students at grade level; with New Trier's highly selective PCB (only 25% qualify), only a small % go straight to AP Bio. South is not maximizing students' science potential – the low rate of 4s and 5s (As and Bs) suggests students do not have the preparation to be successful in the class. This is a lot like Learning for all where all students were accelerated – and many students are still struggling due to the holes it created. Many schools give double GPA bumps for AP classes if students take the exam. Other districts more clearly define the goals of supported classes. I like South's designation AR (Academic Reading), because it identifies the skill being targeted.

I am really concerned with 2-tiers especially with a 70/30 split at South (currently, 65/35) and a 55/45 split at Central (currently, 21-25% Honors). If you watch the Science presentation Jan 23 2017, Julie Gaubatz raves about the success of the AR courses, which have been eliminated. Honors science should not be targeting grade level – it should be an opportunity for those to excel to move forward at a rapid pace. Currently at Central, around 14% are in G Level.

As the discussion begins on math, look at the populations that are currently taking math. There is a difference in distribution that cannot be ignored: an additional 8% in Algebra at South, which is offset with an additional 3% Pre-Calc and 7% Calculus.

Thank you for your service!

[redacted]

MATH 2019-2020	Central		South	
Slower Pace		10%		12%
Algebra	208	7%	213	15%
Geometry	401	14%	272	19%
Algebra 2 Trig	647	23%	308	21%
Pre Calc	463	16%	186	13%

Calculus	348	12%	67	5%
Other	517	18%	219	15%

These numbers are based on when the master schedule was pulled.

On Jan 16, 2020, at 2:39 PM, Hanson, Cynthia
<chanson@hinsdale86.org> wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

Happy New Year and thank you for your communication. I had a few questions that if you could please clarify would help me very much and might be helpful for others in this response string as well.

For common context, I am assuming you are communicating with reference to pathways under the historic HCentral science course content and not the courses in the new D86 science sequence.

*Under your third section, when you reference your [REDACTED] can you please tell me what pathway sequence [REDACTED] is pursuing in science and what two AP physics courses [REDACTED] is targeting?

*Also under the third section, when you reference the freshman who started in HNRS CHEM and hopes to take 6AP science courses, I am assuming those are AP CHEM, AP BIO, APES, AP PHYS (if you could, please let me know which one), and then the two AP Science Capstone, Seminar & Research? If that is incorrect, can you please let me know which six AP science classes that student is targeting.

Thank you in advance,

Cynthia Hanson
Board Member
Hinsdale TWP High School District 86

On Jan 16, 2020, at 7:57 AM, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86

System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

Please consider these questions as you re-evaluate science and look at equity. Before each department attempts to achieve equity ask the stakeholders what they like / dislike about their curriculum, then share the results in town hall meetings that discuss D86 goals and what equity means in each department. By researching what other schools provide I learned that there are as many ways to serve students as there are schools.

What's wrong with D86 NEW Science Curriculum, PCB?

- • D86 did not follow its own procedure for adopting a new curriculum – a clearly laid out process that takes more than 3 years.
- • A single-strand Physics First (PCB) with two tiers (Regular/Remedial and Honors/Regular) that offers no choice until Senior Year does not meet students where they are. Students at Central are more than 2X as likely to take AP Physics and of those who take the class almost 2X as likely to receive college credit. Students at South are more than 3X as likely to take AP Bio, but those who take it are less than ½ as likely to score 4 or 5.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->

Will PCB best meet the needs of high achievers?

- • As recently as January 23, 2017 both DC Lisa Fernandez and DC Julie Gaubatz recognized that Physics First would NOT serve Central students. The rationale to PCB at South was to increase participation of students reluctant to take science.
- • In that same presentation, the DCs stated the core classes at both schools cover the same material (EQUITY) just in a different order. With further discussion of Equity, [REDACTED] commented you wouldn't put braces on a kid that doesn't need them.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->

Why eliminate choice for students who are interested in science?

- • At Central, many high achievers start in Honors Chem, others Honors Bio, and still others Honors Earth Science. Without doubling up my [REDACTED] will have 3 years college level science, including 2 AP Physics. Under the new program, [REDACTED] would only have 2 college level courses, and only one would be in his chosen field. Last night I was with a parent whose Freshman took Honors Chemistry and supplemented it to take the AP Chemistry Exam; that student will graduate with 6 AP science classes.
- • Science is also where a lot of kids find peers who share your interest, a place where they fit in. The rigorous Honors Bio with less than 25% students helps often awkward students find people they connect with. D86 allows students to follow their passion in Art, Business, Engineering – why not allow Science students to do the same.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->

What are D86 measures of success?

- • If you look at the different measures of success, while Central reports the number of students receiving college credit based on a 3rd party assessment (or the number of AP Science tests a student passed), South reports participation in the class (number of AP classes taken).
- • For students needing support, while Central reports raw reading scores, South reports growth in Reading. Will it best meet the needs of students who need support?
- • In that same presentation, DC Julie Gaubatz shared how successful the AR Science classes (Academic Reading, equivalent to G level) were at helping students close the gap as reported in significant elevation in Reading Score growth . Why did South eliminated these classes that were so successful? What was the impact of elimination? Doesn't this elimination parallel the 10 point drop in IL Science Proficiency scores?

<!--[if !supportLists]-->

AP courses are college level - why does D86 ignore College Board's pre-requisites / preparation for anyone at grade level?

- • Over the past 5 years on average only 26% South students score 4s or 5s on AP Science Exams. Some of this could stem

from ignoring College Board's pre-requisites:

- • High school bio before AP Bio: In our district, 22% without HS Bio and 59% with HS Bio score 4 or 5. The preparation of HS Bio more than doubles your chance of getting a 4 or 5 (A or B).
- • Alg 2 Trig concurrent with AP Physics 1: In our district, almost no students in PCB take AP Physics 1, because 80% the material is covered by Honors Physics so only those who take Geo Physics qualify to take it. Averaged over the past 5 years only 3 students with Physics First compared to 66 students with not prior exposure to physics will score a 4 or 5.
- • Calculus concurrent with AP Physics C (most schools require AP Physics 1 before C): With AP Physics 1 & concurrent Calc (or pre-requisite), 67% and 51% Central score 4 or 5 on the AP Physics C M and EM exams respectively, at South those fall to 38% and 29%.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->

With the rise in 5 and 6 year graduation rates, choice becomes even more important. To me, there are simple answers Bio before AP Bio is a College Board pre-requisite so South needs to offer Honors Bio, which means AP participation will drop 141 students, almost half of the 306 AP Science students.

Respectfully,



From: [Camden, Kevin](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Proposed changes to Science sequence for D86
Date: Monday, November 25, 2019 4:06:51 PM

Reasonable question to ask. Thx

Kevin P. Camden
Hinsdale Township High School District 86

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 3:47 PM
To: Camden, Kevin <kcamden@hinsdale86.org>
Subject: Re: Proposed changes to Science sequence for D86

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

Thanks for acknowledging my email Kevin. I am hoping to get to the meeting tonight to hear more about where the BOE's head is regarding this possible curriculum change. What I did not include in my email that is nuanced is that both of my [REDACTED] have had a science teacher who they struggled with at times. They managed to get through it and did fine, but this brings another concern to the forefront... that the admin says that they have enough teachers to teach physics.... but I strongly suspect that without good new and / or seasoned physics teachers, those kids in the first years (like my [REDACTED]) run the risk of having a poor learning experience, due to teachers trying to fill the need for physics.

On Mon, Nov 25, 2019 at 3:37 PM Camden, Kevin <kcamden@hinsdale86.org> wrote:

Thank you for your communication.

Kevin P. Camden
Hinsdale Township High School District 86

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 12:39 PM
To: BOE <boe@hinsdale86.org>
Subject: Proposed changes to Science sequence for D86

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Hinsdale D86 System. Do not click links or open attachments

unless you recognize the sender's email and know the content is safe.

D86 Board of Education members,

First a little overview/background on me & my family –

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] –

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I personally supported the last two versions of the referendum and contributed money and significant amounts of time to canvassing and talking to friends and neighbors about how critical the referendum was to the entire district. As I hope you all know, the 'process' for getting the referendum approved was not an easy or quick endeavor – it took patience, forethought, strength, community sessions and a LOT of communication.

In all the years I have had kids at [REDACTED]; I do not think I have taken the time to write a letter to the BOE. I have attended a number of BOE meetings over the years and have spoken up when I thought was needed.

I have been following the recent developments regarding the science track changes that are being proposed for D86. Having an [REDACTED] [REDACTED] that will have to make a choice on what sequence [REDACTED] needs to pick at Hinsdale Central for [REDACTED] year - I really have one underlying question regarding these possible changes – WHY??

I am not short sighted to think that changes in curriculum don't need to occur. I also realize the D86 is balancing two different high schools and moving to a similar curriculum sequence for both Central and South likely makes things easier to manage and possibly more equal.... HOWEVER.... Knowing the science program my [REDACTED] have had and looking at the rankings of the Central science program in the State of IL and national lists – I scratch my head as to why the administration and the BOE would make such fundamental change to the VERY successful existing science track. I understand that this is a much bigger change at Central, but I also understand that it will require changes at South (which has an excellent Science program too).

Has anyone explored and elaborated on the risks of implementing this new track? What if it doesn't work?? I attended the meeting at Hinsdale South and still have yet to hear anyone other than the administration talk favorably about this change. Supposedly there were teachers and parents involved with the administration in reviewing the options – but again I am not hearing any parents who think this is a GREAT idea and will benefit all the kids.

I did have to endure the changes in the D181 'learning for all' curriculum which by everyone's account was a failure. I do think the proposed science track changes at D86 are being rushed. There are many more unanswered questions on possible additional options that could be brought to both Central and South.... I would like to see those better explored and at minimum not rush to implement a sequence that seems to be very controversial and not widely used at other top tier high schools. Similar to the referendum – there needs to be much better communication about any proposed changes.

Thanks for your attention to this important issue.

[REDACTED]

Hinsdale

--

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]