

DRAFT Proposed Language Changes in Curriculum Review Phases

Phase 1:

What is our intended curriculum in each content area, by course or grade level, across sites?

How do we intend to evaluate what is delivered?

(This work will include mapping of “intended” curriculum, standards; comparison of that intended curriculum across grade levels or courses; current intended evaluation strategies; discussion on areas of focus; pacing.)

Phase 2:

What is the taught curriculum in each content area, by course or grade level, across sites? How is content delivered?

What does the data tell us about instructional practices across courses/grade levels?

(This work will include mapping of “taught” curriculum, across building grade levels at the elementary and by course at the secondary; discussion on formative assessment across building grade levels at the elementary and by course at the secondary; analysis of the viability of the intended curriculum; pacing)

Phase 3:

What are our gaps? Where are we gaining and where are we lagging in student achievement?

Using the data available, how do the instructional practices translate across sites and grade levels in regards to student achievement and available resources?

What more is needed to move forward?

(This work will include use of the analytics available through the Atlas Mapping Tool; PLT discussion; evaluation of instructional strategies, necessary resources, and materials.)

Phase 4:

What worked and what didn't?

What other modifications do we need to move forward to increase student achievement?

Suggested sequence of department involvement:

To be determined