



# **Special School District**

**Curriculum**

*Career and Technical Education*

**Program Evaluation**

Randy Dillon, Chair

Board Approved: November 11, 2008



# Curriculum

## *Career and Technical Education*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

### Program Evaluation Question

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
2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program: Randy Dillon
3. Demographic Description of Program:
  - Location(s): North Technical High School, South Technical High School
  - Participants: Participants in the curriculum program consist of parents, students, teachers, staff, program advisors, 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 within the last five years.
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.
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 technical schools and sites.
  2. Review current curriculum in technical schools and sites to meet state standards.



# Curriculum

## *Career and Technical Education*

# Standard Program Evaluation

- Align curriculum with state standards in technical schools and sites to ensure alignment with Show-Me Standards, Grade Level Expectation/ Course Level Expectation (GLE/CLE) and End of Course Examinations.

## II. Evaluation Criteria for Program

MSIP Standard 6.1 Curriculum Indicators  
Curriculum Guides/Lesson Plans

## 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
Randy Dillon	Director of Technical Education
Shane Trafton	Administrator, Curriculum & Instruction
Mary P. Braun	Facilitator, Curriculum & Instruction
Dave Baker	Principal, South Technical High School
Mike Powers	Principal, North Technical High School
George Neimeyer	Assistant Principal, South Technical
Eric Wilhelm	Assistant Principal, South Technical
Gina Bell-Hill	Assistant Principal, North Technical
Kim Beals	Assistant Principal, North Technical
Jim Hieger	Assistant Principal, North Technical
Sheila Green-Samuel	Mathematics – Department Chair
Sandy Ash	Social Studies – Department Chair
Nick Detering	Language Arts – Department Chair
Karista Koehler	Science – Department Chair

## IV. Results

### Background

The Career and Technical Education curricula 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. New and revised curricula have been board approved 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



# Curriculum

## *Career and Technical Education*

# Standard Program Evaluation

MSIP on a biennial basis, it is also an effective practice to ensure the curriculum includes components to improve student performance. To address CSIP Goal I, Objective 1, Strategy B, the Technical Education Division aligns curricula to state standards using the Student Information System (SIS) and the DESE supported Electronic Alignment Tool (EAT). To meet state expectations on End of Course (EOC) examinations, faculty will develop lesson plans appropriate to content standards. Assessments are a component of the SIS lesson plan format which is a curriculum indicator on MSIP.

### Curriculum Review

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 Content and Process indicators which should be found throughout a district’s curriculum (MSIP Standard 6.1.3). 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

Table 1. MSIP Standard 6.1.1 - Curriculum Indicators

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Description</b>
Rationale	Rationale which relates the general goals of each subject area and course to the district’s mission and philosophy
Course Description	General description of the content of each subject area at the elementary level and each secondary-level course
Graduate Goals	General goals for graduates in each subject area
Learner Objectives	Specific, measurable learner objectives for each course at each grade level
Alignment to Show-Me-Standards	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
Instructional Activities	Instructional activities for the learner objectives
Assessments	Specific assessments for the learner objectives
Board Approved	School Board has reviewed and approved curriculum
Articulation	Evidence that individual learner objectives have been articulated by grade level and course sequence (Scope & Sequence)

Table 2. MSIP Standard 6.1.3 - Content and Process Indicators

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

## *Career and Technical Education*

# Standard Program Evaluation

### MSIP Indicators Across Courses

Table 3 illustrates the percent of courses which met specific MSIP Standard 6.1.1 indicators. Table 4 illustrates the percent of courses which met MSIP Content and Process indicators (Standard 6.1.3). For example, a score of 100% signifies that the MSIP indicator was present in each course curriculum. Scores less than 100% indicate the indicator was not present in each course.

Table 3. MSIP Standard 6.1.1 - Curriculum Indicators

MISP Component	Percent of Courses Meeting Requirements							
	Science	Language Arts	Mathematics	Social Studies	Health/ P.E.	Fine Arts	Foreign Language	CTE
Rationale	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Course Description	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Graduate Goals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Learner Objectives	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Alignment to Show-Me Standards	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Instructional Activities	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Assessments	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Board Approved	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Articulation	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

All academic courses and Career Technical Education (CTE) courses meet MSIP Standard 6.1 for the required elements of Course Rationale, Course Description, Graduate Goals, Learner Objectives, Alignment to Show-Me Standards, Instructional Activities, Assessments, Board Approval, and Articulation.

Table 4. MSIP Standard 6.1.3 – Content and Process Indicators

MISP Component	Percent of Courses Meeting Requirements							
	Science	Language Arts	Mathematics	Social Studies	Health/ P.E.	Fine Arts	Foreign Language	CTE
Equity	36.0	15.0	0	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Technology	72.0	46.0	63.0	20.0	33.3	60.0	100.0	100.0
Research	100.0	84.0	75.0	50.0	66.6	40.0	100.0	100.0
Workplace Readiness	0	62.0	25.0	30.0	66.6	40.0	0	100.0

As noted in Table 4, the presence of Content and Process indicators are present in varying degrees throughout the Technical Education Division curricula in the areas of Equity, Technology, Research, and Workplace Readiness. However, some indicators are more applicable to specific curriculum areas and courses compared to others.



# Curriculum

## *Career and Technical Education*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

In addition to meeting the MSIP Standard, the courses identified for End of Course (EOC) Exams for the 2008 – 2009 school year (i.e., Algebra I, English II, Biology) are going through the revision process to meet Course Level Expectations (CLE). In addition to the three courses named above, American History, American Government, and Algebra II will be revised to meet the CLE for the 2009 – 2010 End of Course Exams.

### **V. Discussion**

#### Strengths

- Based on the curriculum review, all academic and career technical courses contain the required elements of: Rationale, Course Description, Graduate Goals, Learner Objectives, Alignment to Show-Me-Standards, Instructional Activities, Assessments, Board Approval, and Articulation.
- Content and processes related to Equity, Technology, Research, and Workplace Readiness are present throughout the CTE and academic curricula.
- Academic curricula are aligned to Grade Level Expectations (GLE) and Course Level Expectations (CLE).
- CTE curricula are aligned to industry-based standards and are reviewed annually by the advisory committee for each program.

#### Concerns

- SIS and Electronic Alignment with DESE standards will necessitate funding for staff to input and maintain curriculum and lesson plans.
- Lesson Plan Training and continuous assessment of instruction and curriculum will require additional staff time.

#### Recommendations

Continue to revise applicable End of Course Exam courses annually as End of Course Exams are implemented by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE).

Person responsible to champion action plan: Randy Dillon

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education: Annually

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation**