



Special School District

Curriculum Special Education Schools and Court Programs

Program Evaluation

Paul Bauer, Chair

Board Approved: January 25, 2011



Curriculum Standard Program Evaluation

Executive Summary

As required by the Missouri School Improvement Plan (MSIP) standards, school districts must evaluate Curriculum biennially. The focus of the present report is: *Do SSD Curricula meet MSIP standards? Has the district implemented recommendations from previous curriculum evaluation? What is the level of curriculum implementation?* Based on stakeholder review of the data, strengths, concerns and recommendations are noted.

Strengths

- Communication Arts curriculum for all students grades K-12 is available to teachers.
- Mathematics general education curriculum for students grades K-12 was written to National Mathematic Standards and is scheduled for full implementation in the 2011-12 school year.
- New curricula have been written for Life Skills and Computer Skills and are being used by staff.
- The district is on schedule to review/revise all curricula.

Concerns

- While 86% of teachers reported using the Communication Arts (GLA) curriculum, this is short of full implementation.
- Although the district plans to review and revise curricula for several content areas, those curricula do not currently meet MSIP standards.

Recommendations

- The district should continue the review/revision process for all curriculum content areas. The MSIP process requires that districts have a current viable curriculum for all content areas. More important, up-to-date and complete curriculum guides are necessary for teachers to use to help students achieve district goals for graduates and achieve designated content standards and outcomes required by DESE and the district CSIP.
- The district should provide adequate materials and professional development for teachers to be able to implement curricula.
- The district should continue to dedicate at least part of a position to leading curriculum review and revision. Failure to do so will result in the lack of district leadership to provide teachers current and viable curricula.
- In addition to providing teachers the support they need to implement curricula, administrators must use the existing teacher evaluation process to ensure curriculum implementation. The first criterion of the teacher evaluation form includes the expectation that the teacher will update knowledge of curriculum and consult curriculum guides in planning lessons. District administrators must provide teachers the materials and professional development they need to use the curriculum, but teachers must use these tools to do so.



Curriculum Standard Program Evaluation

Question(s)

Do SSD Curricula meet MSIP standards?

Has the district implemented recommendations from previous curriculum evaluation?

What is the level of curriculum implementation?

Program/Service Information

1. Name of Program or Services: Curriculum

2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program: Paul Bauer

3. Demographic Description of Program:

Location(s): Special Education Schools (Southview, Litzsinger, Neuwoehner, Ackerman, Northview, Bridges), Court Schools (Lakeside, Juvenile Detention Center, Project Learn)

Number of Staff: 155 teachers

Participants: Participants in the curriculum program consist of parents, students, teachers, staff, and administrators.

4. Date of Evaluation: January 2011

5. Objective of program/service: 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. The district curriculum will guide the teaching/learning process to ensure that district graduates possess the skills and knowledge to be successful after graduation. Review of district curricula is important to ensure that (a) curriculum content enables students to acquire knowledge and skills to meet district goals, (b) curriculum guide formats facilitate staff using the curriculum guides to plan instruction, and (c) curriculum content and guides meet MSIP requirements. This evaluation of district curriculum is required by MSIP. More important, review of curriculum is appropriate to ensure that it includes components to improve student performance.

6. Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards: MSIP Standard 6.1 requires that the district implement written curriculum for all of its instructional programs. In addition, CSIP Goal I is to “Develop and enhance quality educational/instructional programs to improve performance and enable students to meet their personal, academic, and career goals.” One contributor to meeting this goal is a written curriculum.



Curriculum Standard Program Evaluation

II. Evaluation Criteria

- Committee members reviewed the process staff used to (a) revise Communication Arts and Mathematics curricula, and (b) develop curricula for Life Skills, Computer Exploration, and the Communication Arts Extension to determine whether teams addressed all components required by DESE.
- Teachers completed a survey addressing the Communication Arts curriculum approved by the Board of Education in 2009.

III. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

The review of curriculum guides was conducted by SSD administrators with teacher input via survey.

The following staff conducted the review:

Paul Bauer, Director
Marsha Myers, Administrator
Jenna Heinlein, Facilitator

IV. Results

SSD Curricula: MSIP Standards

The MSIP Standards and Indicators list the following requirements for each curriculum:

1. Each written curriculum guide must include the following components:
 - a rationale which relates the general goals of each subject area and course to the district's mission and philosophy
 - a general description of the content of each subject area at the elementary level and each secondary-level course
 - general goals for graduates in each subject area
 - specific, measurable learner objectives for each course at each grade level
 - alignment of the 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 and specific assessments (including performance-based assessments) for the learner objectives
 - evidence that individual learner objectives have been articulated by grade level/course sequence
 - date of board review and approval for each curriculum guide.
2. Teachers receive training on the curriculum review and revision process, curriculum alignment, and classroom assessment strategies.



Curriculum Standard Program Evaluation

3. The written curriculum incorporates content and processes related to equity, technology, research, and workplace-readiness skills.
4. Systematic procedures are used to review and revise the written curriculum.

The previous evaluation of district curriculum in 2008 found that the district's curricula did not meet current MSIP requirements. Starting with the 2008-2009 school year, staff have implemented a process of reviewing and revising district curriculum guides with the purposes of (a) bringing curricula into compliance with MSIP requirements and (b) having a viable curriculum for staff to implement. In order to provide a viable curriculum to all students, staff have implemented the process for each content area in two steps: The first is revision of the curriculum for students who participate in the Missouri Grade Level Assessments (GLA). The second is an extension of that content area curriculum for students who participate in the MAP-A. Since 2008-09, staff have accomplished the following:

- Completed revision of K-12 Communication Arts curriculum (for GLAs)
- Completed revision of K-12 Mathematics curriculum (for GLAs)
- Developed an extension of K-12 Communication Arts curriculum to include DESE alternate standards (for MAP-A)
- Developed Computer Exploration curriculum
- Developed Life Skills curriculum
- Currently revising K-12 Science curriculum (for GLAs)
- Currently developing K-12 Mathematics extension (for MAP-A)

Of the above, Communication Arts and Mathematics revisions were accomplished by SSD staff with ongoing consultation, support, and approval from staff from the Show-Me Curriculum Administrators Association. This organization works closely with DESE to develop curriculum standards and conducts curriculum reviews of the MSIP process. Those curriculum guides meet MSIP guidelines; the Mathematics guide surpasses DESE guidelines in that it is written according to national mathematics standards rather than state standards.

The district does not currently have a staff position dedicated to curriculum for the special education schools. All staff members working on curriculum do so in addition to their other job responsibilities. The Communication Arts curriculum revision was led by outside consultants hired by the district. The Communication Arts extension was written with the consultation and support of an outside curriculum consultant who is associated with a university teacher education program and is currently supporting the State Schools for the Severely Disabled.

The Computer Literacy curriculum was written by SSD staff and meets MSIP requirements as well as the standards of the National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS-S). The Life Skills curriculum is written to meet MSIP standards.



Curriculum Standard Program Evaluation

In 2008, SSD performed a review of curriculum in the areas of Science, Communication Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, Physical Education, Health, and K-3 Integrated Curriculum. Curriculum guides in those areas met MSIP Cycle III requirements. However, they did not meet all requirements for MSIP Cycle IV. Each content area curriculum and the reasons it did not meet these requirements follows:

- a. Science (Currently being revised)
 - No course description at grades 6 and 8
 - No goals for graduates at grades 9 – 12
 - No alignment with standards at grade 11
 - No articulation in grades 3 – 6 and grade 9
 - Use of technology not specified in grades 6 – 11
 - Use of research skills not specified in grades 5 – 10 and grade 12

- b. Social Studies
 - No curriculum rationale at grade 10
 - No course description at grades 4 and 7
 - No goals for graduates at grades 9 – 12
 - No learner objectives specified at grade 12
 - No articulation in grades 4 and 9 – 12
 - No activities to teach equity at grade 8
 - Use of technology skills not specified at grades 4, 7, 8, and 10
 - Use of research skills not specified at grades 6, 7, 9 – 12

- c. Physical Education
 - Use of technology skills not specified at grades K – 8 and 10 - 12
 - Use of research skills not specified at grades K – 12

- d. Health
 - No alignment with standards at grades 5 – 6
 - No instructional activities listed at grades 5 – 6
 - No assessments listed at grades 5 – 6
 - No activities to teach equity at grades 5 - 6
 - Use of technology skills not specified at grades 1 - 2 and 4 – 7
 - Use of research skills not specified at grades 1 – 2, 4 – 7, and grade 9
 - Use of workplace skills not specified at grades 5 – 6

- e. Integrated Curriculum Grades K – 2
 - Use of technology skills not specified
 - Use of research skills not specified

Because this review focused on 1) academic core content areas and 2) Physical Education/Health



Curriculum Standard Program Evaluation

because of core data reporting in that area, Family and Consumer Science, Guidance, and Fine Arts curricula were not included. However, the district plans to revise these curricula.

2008 Program Evaluation: Recommendations

The previous curriculum evaluation included the following recommendation:

The district must implement steps to develop/review and revise curricula to support teachers in instructing students.

This recommendation has been implemented in the following ways:

- a. The district has collaborated with the Show-Me Curriculum Administrators Association and with outside consultants to complete revision of Communication Arts K-12 and Mathematics K-12 curricula. The Board approved the K-12 Communication Arts curriculum in June 2009. A pacing guide to facilitate implementation with fidelity was developed in summer 2010 and provided to staff. The district has identified materials and provided professional development to teachers to achieve full implementation.
- b. The Board of Education approved the K-12 Mathematics curriculum in June 2010. A committee is currently reviewing materials to implement the curriculum and providing professional development in Math and the curriculum to staff. Target implementation is August 2011.
- c. During the 2009-2010 school year, curriculum teams developed Computer Exploration, Communication Arts K-12 Extension, and Life Skills curricula. These curricula are currently being implemented.
- d. The district is currently revising Science K-12 and Mathematics K-12 extension curricula.
- e. The district plans to revise the following curricula per the following schedule:

a. Guidance	2011-2012
b. Science extension	2011-2012
c. Social Studies	2011-2012
d. Social Studies extension	2012-2013
e. Fine Arts	2012-2013
f. Health/Physical Education	2012-2013
g. Family and Consumer Science	2012-2013



Curriculum Standard Program Evaluation

Curriculum Implementation

Teachers of general education Communication Arts (using the Communication Arts GLA curriculum) completed a survey about curriculum implementation in October 2010. Twenty-nine teachers responded. According to the survey, 90% of teachers (all but three teachers) have used the communication arts curriculum guide this year; 81.5 stated it has been a valuable resource for their instruction; 81.5% said they have the necessary materials/resources to implement the curriculum. Since October, teachers have participated in additional professional development activities for using the curriculum, and the Classroom Learning Systems model has been implemented. This model includes identifying and posting learning targets and learning goals in each classroom; the targets and goals are derived from the curriculum. While not at 100% implementation, the 90% figure compares favorably to implementation reported in other studies: A 1998 report of Mathematics curriculum implementation reported 90% non-implementation, a 2007 study of physical education curriculum reported 25% non-implementation, and a 2006 report on implementation in general reported non-implementation of 90%. In addition, Parkway School District reports that “Not All” of the teachers responding to a survey use their Online Curriculum Guide, and a report from University of Missouri-Columbia states that teachers implement between 27% and 47% of the intended curriculum.

Although these results indicate that the majority of teachers are using the latest approved curriculum, the district should expect that all teachers do so. The curriculum is aligned to DESE Grade Level Expectations, many of which comprise State Assessments: if students are to perform well on the assessments, they must be taught the curriculum.

V. Summary

Based on the above findings, the following strengths, concerns and recommendations are made:

Strengths

- Communication Arts curriculum for all students grades K-12 is available to teachers.
- Mathematics general education curriculum for students grades K-12 was written to National Mathematic Standards and is scheduled for full implementation in the 2011-12 school year.
- New curricula have been written for Life Skills and Computer Skills and are being used by staff.
- The district is on schedule to review/revise all curricula.

Concerns

- While 86% of teachers reported using the Communication Arts (GLA) curriculum, this is short of full implementation.
- Although the district plans to review and revise curricula for several content areas, those curricula do not currently meet MSIP standards.



Curriculum Standard Program Evaluation

Recommendations

- The district should continue the review/revision process for all curriculum content areas. The MSIP process requires that districts have a current viable curriculum for all content areas. More important, up-to-date and complete curriculum guides are necessary for teachers to use to help students achieve district goals for graduates and achieve designated content standards and outcomes required by DESE and the district CSIP.
- The district should provide adequate materials and professional development for teachers to be able to implement curricula.
- The district should continue to dedicate at least part of a position to leading curriculum review and revision. Failure to do so will result in the lack of district leadership to provide teachers current and viable curricula.
- In addition to providing teachers the support they need to implement curricula, administrators must use the existing teacher evaluation process to ensure curriculum implementation. The first criterion of the teacher evaluation form includes the expectation that the teacher will update knowledge of curriculum and consult curriculum guides in planning lessons. District administrators must provide teachers the materials and professional development they need to use the curriculum, but teachers must use these tools to do so.

Person responsible to champion action plan: Paul Bauer, Director of Special Education Schools

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education: Biennial

Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation