



Special School District

Curriculum

Special Education, Court Programs and Career Training

Program Evaluation

Paul Bauer, Chair

Board Approved: November 11, 2008



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Program Evaluation Question(s)

Does the SSD curriculum for each content area meet requirements of the Missouri School Improvement Program?

I. Program/Service Information

1. Name of Program or Services: Curriculum (Special Education Schools, Courts and Career Training)
2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program: Paul Bauer
3. Demographic Description of Program:
 - Location(s):
 - a. Special Education Schools (Southview, Litzsinger, Neuwoehner, Ackerman, Northview, Bridges)
 - b. Court Schools (Lakeside, Juvenile Detention Center, Project Learn)
 - c. Career Training Program

Participants: Participants in the curriculum program consist of parents, students, teachers, staff, and administrators. The review of curriculum guides was conducted by SSD administrators.

Length of program/service: Current curriculum guides were approved by the SSD Board of Education on 2/25/2004.

4. Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):
September - October 2008
5. Goal/Objective of Program/Services:
 - a. The district curriculum will guide the teaching/learning process and ensure that each student has the opportunity to learn and demonstrate mastery of objectives mandated by the state and of objectives developed by the district.
 - b. The district curriculum will guide the teaching/learning process to ensure that district graduates possess the skills and knowledge to be successful after graduation.



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

6. Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards: MSIP Standard 6.1 requires that that school districts implement written curriculum for all of its instructional programs. MSIP Standard 8.1 requires that school districts evaluate their curriculum at least biennially. CSIP Goal I, Objective 1, Strategy B states that the district will align curriculum/instruction to meet state standards through the following action steps:
1. Develop and implement multi-year curriculum review and revision cycle in SSD schools and sites.
 2. Review current curriculum in SSD schools and sites to meet state standards.
 3. Align curriculum with state standards in SSD schools and sites to ensure alignment with Grade Level Expectation/ Course Level Expectation (GLE/CLE) and Alternative Grade Level Expectation (A-GLE).

II. Evaluation Criteria for Program

- Lesson Plans/Curriculum Guides
- MSIP Standard 6.1 Curriculum Indicator Grid

III. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

The curriculum guide review committee consisted of SSD staff with knowledge of the MSIP Standard 6.1 curriculum requirements. Committee members and their respective roles are reported below.

Name	Role
Paul Bauer	Director
Eric Winkles	Assistant Principal
Marilyn Smith	Effective Practices Specialist
Chuck Howard	Assistant Principal
Joy Hasler	Effective Practice Specialist
Lorie Arnsman Schwartz	Principal
Kelly Grigsby	Principal
Leslie Caldwell	Area Coordinator
Dan Kelly	Assistant Principal



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

IV. Results

Background

SSD special education schools and Court Programs utilize a curriculum adopted by the SSD Board of Education in February 2004. This curriculum was cooperatively developed by SSD and the Ferguson-Florissant School District. Content area teachers and specialists from the Ferguson-Florissant School District developed content-specific portions, and SSD teachers developed adaptations and accommodations to the curriculum to ensure access to students with disabilities. This curriculum met Missouri School Improvement Cycle (MSIP) Cycle II standards. Because of that, the curriculum review by the visiting MSIP team was waived in MSIP Cycle III. Since that time, knowledge of curriculum development and content, integration of technology into instruction, and assessment of student growth have all increased in scope through utilization of Depth of Knowledge in curriculum alignment, adoption of common formative assessments, and increased capabilities of teachers to use instructional technology. The presence of these and other elements in the curriculum support teachers in meeting the instructional needs of students and ensuring improved student performance. Although this evaluation of district curriculum is required by MSIP on a biennial basis, it is also an effective practice to ensure the curriculum includes components to improve student performance.

Curriculum Review

Committee members selected sample lessons in curriculum guides from each grade level and content area as follows:

- Science 3-12
- Communication Arts 3-12
- Math 1-12
- Social Studies 3-12
- Health K-9.
- Physical Education K-12
- Integrated Curriculum K-2

Curriculum guide and lesson plan contents were reviewed and compared to indicators outlined in MSIP Standard 6.1 (Curriculum). MSIP Standard 6.1.1 states that all curricula contain specific indicators described in Table 1. Table 2 reflects the MSIP Content and Process indicators (Standard 6.1.3) which should be found throughout a district's curriculum. The committee reviewed the curriculum contents and assessed whether each curriculum guide and each sampled lesson contained information which met the criteria for each indicator outlined in MSIP Standard 6.1. Data was then recorded and percentages were computed indicating areas of relative strengths and weaknesses across curricula, MSIP standards, as well as grade levels.



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Table 1. MSIP Standard 6.1.1 - Curriculum Indicators

Indicator	Description
Rationale	Rationale which relates the general goals of each subject area and course to the district's mission and philosophy
Description	General description of the content of each subject area at the elementary level and each secondary-level course
Goals for Graduates	General goals for graduates in each subject area
Learner Objectives	Specific, measurable learner objectives for each course at each grade level
Alignment	Alignment of measurable learner objectives for each course to the knowledge, skills, and competencies that students need to meet the district's goals and the Show-Me Standards
Activities	Instructional activities for the learner objectives
Assessments	Specific assessments for the learner objectives
Articulation	Evidence that individual learner objectives have been articulated by grade level and course sequence

Table 2. MSIP Standard 6.1.3 – Content and Process Indicators

Indicator	Description
Equity	Evidence the curriculum incorporates content and processes related to equity
Technology	Evidence the curriculum incorporates content and processes related to technology
Research	Evidence the curriculum incorporates content and processes related to research
Workplace Readiness	Evidence the curriculum incorporates content and processes related to workplace readiness skills



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

MSIP Indicators Across Grade Levels

Based on the data reported in Appendix A, Table 3 illustrates the percent of grade-level curricula samples which met specific MSIP Standard 6.1.1 indicators. Table 4 illustrates the percent of grade-level curricula which met Content and Process indicators (MSIP Standard 6.1.3). For example, a score of 100% in the table below signifies that the MSIP indicator was present in each grade level curriculum sample reviewed. Scores less than 100% signify the MSIP indicator was not present at all grade levels.

Table 3. MSIP 6.1.1 - Curriculum Indicators Across Grade Levels

MSIP Component	Percent of Grade Levels Meeting Requirement						
	Science	Comm. Arts	Mathematics	Social Studies	Health	P.E.	Integrated
Rationale	90.0	100.0	100.0	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Description	80.0	60.0	66.7	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Goals for Graduates	60.0	70.0	75.0	60.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Learner Objectives	100.0	100.0	91.7	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Alignment with Standards	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	100.0	100.0
Instructional Activities	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.0	80.0	100.0	100.0
Assessments	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	100.0	100.0
Articulation	30.0	60.0	75.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

A review of the Science curriculum (grades 3-12) indicated that Learner Objectives, Instructional Activities, and Assessments were represented across all grade levels (100%). Conversely, Articulation was the least represented (30%). A detailed review of the Science data grid can be found in Appendix A-Table 1.

A review of the Communication Arts curriculum (grades 3-12) indicated that Rationale, Learner Objectives, Alignment with Standards, Instructional Activities, and Assessments were present at all grade levels (100%). Conversely, the components of Description and Articulation appeared to be the least represented component (60%). A detailed review of the Communication Arts data grid can be found in Appendix A-Table 2.

In the Mathematics curriculum (grades 1-12), the review indicated that Rationale, Alignment with Standards, Instructional Activities, and Assessments were present at all grade levels (100%). Conversely, the component of Description appeared to be the least represented component (66.7%). A detailed review of the Mathematics data grid can be found in Appendix A-Table 3.

A review of the Social Studies curriculum (grades 3-12) revealed that Alignment with Standards and Assessments were present at all applicable grade levels (100%). Conversely, the



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

components of Articulation appeared to be the least represented component (50.0%). A detailed review of the Social Studies data grid can be found in Appendix A-Table 4.

The Health curriculum (grades K-9) possessed the following components across all grade levels: Rationale, Description, Goals for Graduates, Learner Objectives and Articulation. Conversely, the components of Alignment, Instructional Activities and Assessments were less represented (80%). A detailed review of the Health data grid can be found in Appendix A-Table 5.

A review of the Physical Education curriculum (grades K-12) indicted that Rationale, Description, Goals for Graduates, Learner Objectives, Alignment with Standards, Instructional Activities, Assessments, and Articulation were present at all grade levels (100%). A detailed review of the Physical Education data grid can be found in Appendix A-Table 6.

A review of the Integrated curriculum (grades K-2) indicated that the Rationale, Description, Goals for Graduates, Learner Objectives, Alignment with Standards, Instructional Activities, Assessments, and Articulation were present at all grade levels (100%). A detailed review of the Integrated curriculum data grid can be found in Appendix A-Table 7.

Table 5. MSIP 6.1.3 - Content and Process Indicators Across Grade Levels

MSIP Component	Percent of Grade Levels Meeting Requirement						
	Science	Comm. Arts	Mathematics	Social Studies	Health	P.E.	Integrated
Equity	100.0	60.0	100.0	90.0	80.0	100.0	100.0
Technology	30.0	50.0	66.7	40.0	40.0	7.7	0
Research	20.0	10.0	16.7	40.0	30.0	0	0
Workplace Readiness	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	100.0	100.0

As noted in Table 5, the presence of Content and Process indicators are present in varying degrees throughout the curricula in the areas of Equity, Technology, Research and Workplace Readiness. However, some indicators are more applicable to specific curriculum areas compared to others. A detailed review of the data grid can be found in Appendix A: Tables 1 - 7.



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Curriculum Indicators: Grade Level Analysis

Based on the data reported in Appendix A, Table 6 illustrates the percent of MSIP Standard 6.1.1 indicators (n=8, see Table 1) met at each grade level. Table 7 illustrates the percent of Content and Process indicators (n=4, see Table 2) met at each grade level (MSIP Standard 6.1.3). For example, a score of 100% in the table below signifies that that all indicators were met in the grade level curriculum sample reviewed. Scores less than 100% signify the grade level curriculum assessed did not demonstrate all indicators.

Table 6. MSIP 6.1.1 - Curriculum Indicators by Grade Level

Curriculum	Percent of MSIP Indicators Met: Grade Level												
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Science	*	*	*	87.5	87.5	87.5	75.0	100.0	87.5	62.5	87.5	62.5	75.0
Comm. Arts	*	*	*	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	75.0	75.0	87.5	75.0
Mathematics	*	100.0	100.0	87.5	100.0	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	75.0	75.0	62.5
Social Studies	*	*	*	100.0	62.5	100.0	100.0	75.0	100.0	75.0	62.5	75.0	62.5
Health	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	62.5	62.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	*	*	*
Phys. Ed.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Integrated	100.0	100.0	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

* Not Applicable

As noted above, the following grade specific curricula samples met all indicators outlined in MSIP Standard 6.1.1: Science (7), Communication Arts (7, 8), Mathematics (1, 2, 4, 8, 9), Social Studies (3, 5, 6, 8), Health (K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9), Physical Education (K-12) and Integrated (K-2). Although the remaining curricula samples reviewed met the majority of MSIP indicators, relative weaknesses (i.e., less than 75% of indicators met) were noted in the following areas: Science (9, 11), Mathematics (12), Social Studies (4, 10, 12), and Health (5, 6). A detailed review of the data grid can be found in Appendix A: Tables 1 - 7.



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Table 7. MSIP 6.1.3 - Content and Process Indicators by Grade Level

Curriculum	Percent of MSIP Indicators Met: Grade Level												
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Science	*	*	*	100.0	100.0	75.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	75.0	75.0
Comm. Arts	*	*	*	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	75.0	75.0	100.0	75.0	50.0	50.0
Mathematics	*	75.0	75.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	75.0	75.0	50.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0
Social Studies	*	*	*	100.0	75.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	75.0	75.0
Health	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	0	0	50.0	100.0	75.0	*	*	*
Physical Education	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Integrated	50.0	50.0	50.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

* Not Applicable

As noted in Table 7, the presence of Content and Process indicators are present in varying degrees throughout the grade specific curricula in the areas of Equity, Technology, Research and Workplace Readiness. As noted earlier, some indicators are more applicable to specific curriculum areas compared to others. A detailed review of the data grid can be found in Appendix A: Tables 1 - 7.

V. Discussion

Strengths

- Based on the samples reviewed, analysis suggests relative strengths across grade levels and curricula in the following component areas related to MSIP Standard 6.1.1: Rationale, Description, Goals for Graduates, Learner Objectives, Alignment with Standards, Instructional Activities, and Assessments.
- Assessment of MSIP curricula standards and indicators for specific grade levels indicated the majority of samples reviewed met all MSIP Standard 6.1.1 indicators.
- The following curriculum samples were in full compliance with all MSIP Standard 6.1.1 indicators: Science (7), Communication Arts (7, 8), Mathematics (1, 2, 4, 8, 9), Social Studies (3, 5, 6, 8), Health (K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9), Physical Education (K-12) and Integrated (K-2).
- Content and Process indicators (MSIP Standard 6.1.3) are present in varying degrees throughout the curriculum.



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Concerns

- Based on the samples reviewed, analysis suggests the MSIP Standard 6.1.1 indicator of Articulation is a relative weakness.
- Although most curricula samples reviewed met the majority of MSIP Standard 6.1.1 indicators, relative weaknesses (i.e., less than 75% of indicators met) were noted in the following areas: Science (9, 11), Mathematics (12), Social Studies (4, 10, 12), and Health (5, 6).
- Although curriculum guides clearly stated articulation among grade groups (for example, K-2, 3-6, 5-8) there was no clear articulation or scope and sequence that included all grade levels (K-12).
- Curriculum Guides contained no reference to Depth of Knowledge (DOK). Depth of Knowledge is a system to examine curriculum goals, objectives, activities, and assessments in terms of cognitive demands and complexity. Depth of Knowledge is tied to student learning, state assessments, and MSIP.

Recommendations

The district must implement steps to develop/review/ and revise curricula to support teachers in instructing students. A five-year plan (Appendix B) has been developed to accomplish this recommendation. This plan includes use of outside consultants to immediately address curriculum needs as well as to develop the knowledge and skills of district staff to implement long-range curriculum improvement.

Person responsible to champion action plan: Paul Bauer

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education: Annually (June)

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

APPENDIX A

Curriculum Data Tables: MSIP Indicators



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Appendix A – Table 1. Science Curriculum Results

MSIP Component	Grade Level													%	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Rationale	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	90.0
Description	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	80.0
Goals for Graduates	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	60.0
Learner Objectives	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Alignment with Stds.	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	90.0
Inst. Activities	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Assessments	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Articulation	*	*	*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	30.0
%	*	*	*	87.5	87.5	87.5	75.0	100.0	87.5	62.5	87.5	62.5	75.0		
Equity	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Technology	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	30.0
Research	*	*	*	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	20.0
Workplace Readiness	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
%	*	*	*	100.0	100.0	75.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	75.0	75.0		

Note: Y=Yes, N=No, * = NA

Appendix A-Table 2. Communication Arts Curriculum Results

MSIP Component	Grade Level													%	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Rationale	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Description	*	*	*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	60.0
Goals for Graduates	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	70.0
Learner Objectives	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Alignment with Stds.	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Inst. Activities	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Assessments	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Articulation	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	60.0
%	*	*	*	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	75.0	75.0	87.5	75.0		
Equity	*	*	*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	60.0
Technology	*	*	*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	50.0
Research	*	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	10.0
Workplace Readiness	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
%	*	*	*	25.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	75.0	75.0	100.0	75.0	50.0	50.0		

Note: Y=Yes, N=No, * = NA



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Appendix A-Table 3. Mathematics Curriculum Results

MSIP Component	Grade Level													%
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Rationale	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Description	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	66.7
Goals for Graduates	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	75.0
Learner Objectives	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	91.7
Alignment with Stds.	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Inst. Activities	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Assessments	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Articulation	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	75.0
%	*	100.0	100.0	87.5	100.0	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	75.0	75.0	62.5	
Equity	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Technology	*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	66.7
Research	*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	16.7
Workplace Readiness	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
%	*	75.0	75.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	75.0	75.0	50.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	

Note: Y=Yes, N=No, * = NA

Appendix A-Table 4. Social Studies Curriculum Results

MSIP Component	Grade Level													%
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Rationale	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	90.0
Description	*	*	*	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	80.0
Goals for Graduates	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	60.0
Learner Objectives	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	90.0
Alignment with Stds.	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Inst. Activities	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	90.0
Assessments	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Articulation	*	*	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	50.0
%	*	*	*	100.0	62.5	100.0	100.0	75.0	100.0	75.0	62.5	75.0	62.5	
Equity	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	90.0
Technology	*	*	*	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	40.0
Research	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	40.0
Workplace Readiness	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
%	*	*	*	100.0	75.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	75.0	75.0	

Note: Y=Yes, N=No, * = NA



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Appendix A-Table 5. Health Curriculum Results

MSIP Component	Grade Level												%	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Rationale	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	100.0
Description	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	100.0
Goals for Graduates	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	100.0
Learner Objectives	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	100.0
Alignment with Stds.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	80.0
Inst. Activities	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	80.0
Assessments	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	80.0
Articulation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	100.0
%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	62.5	62.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	*	*	*	
Equity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	80.0
Technology	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	*	*	*	40.0
Research	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	*	*	*	30.0
Workplace Readiness	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	80.0
%	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	0	0	50.0	100.0	75.0	*	*	*	

Note: Y=Yes, N=No, * = NA

Appendix A-Table 6. Physical Education Results

MSIP Component	Grade Level												%	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Rationale	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Description	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Goals for Graduates	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Learner Objectives	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Alignment with Stds.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Inst. Activities	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Assessments	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Articulation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Equity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
Technology	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	7.7
Research	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	0
Workplace Readiness	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100.0
%	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	

Note: Y=Yes, N=No, * = NA



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Appendix A-Table 7. Integrated Curriculum Results

MSIP Component	Grade Level												%	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Rationale	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Description	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Goals for Graduates	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Learner Objectives	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Alignment with Stds.	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Inst. Activities	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Assessments	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Articulation	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
%	100.0	100.0	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Equity	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Technology	N	N	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0
Research	N	N	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0
Workplace Readiness	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
%	50.0	50.0	50.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	

Note: Y=Yes, N=No, * = NA



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

APPENDIX B

5-Year Curriculum Action Plan



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation

Action Plan

Evaluator (Program Evaluation Chair): Paul Bauer

Program/Service: Curriculum (Special Education Schools, Courts & Career Training)

Action Plan Date: November 11, 2008

Program Findings	1. CURRICULUM GUIDES DO NOT MEET MSIP STANDARDS NOR PROVIDE INFORMATION TO SUPPORT INSTRUCTION.
------------------	---

Action Plan Goal	Action Plan Objectives	Expected Completion Date and Persons Responsible	Follow-Up
1. By 2013, curriculum in every content area will meet MSIP standards and provide information to teachers for implementation.	1. Identify outside consultants to revise Comm. Arts curriculum	1. 11/08 (Paul Bauer)	Completed
	2. Review Comm. Arts curriculum needs with outside consultant and develop consultant's plan to revise curriculum	2. 12/08 (Paul Bauer)	
	3. Comm. Arts curriculum revisions completed for review by SSD staff	3. 5/09 (Paul Bauer)	
	4. Comm. Arts curriculum presented to Board of Education to request adoption	4. 6/09 (Paul Bauer)	
	5. Identify outside contractor to provide professional development to SSD staff in curriculum review/revision process.	5. 11/08 (Paul Bauer)	In Process
	6. Identify SSD staff to serve on curriculum committee	6. 1/09 (Paul Bauer)	
	7. Provide professional development to SSD staff in curriculum Review and Revision process	7. 5/09 and annually thereafter (Paul Bauer)	
	8. Implement curriculum committee to follow curriculum plan	8. 7/09 and ongoing until 2013 (Paul Bauer)	



Curriculum

Special Education, Courts & Career Training

Standard Program Evaluation
