



**Coordinators:**

Mary P. Braun and Mollie Bolton

**Planning Team:**

Mary P. Braun, Mollie Bolton, and Matthew Traugher

## Program Description

***Purpose or Mandate***

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) requires a written curriculum for all instructional programs that must contain: A rationale, general description of the content, graduate goals, learner objectives, alignment of the objectives to the district’s goals and the Show-Me Standards, instructional activities, specific assessments, scope and sequence and a date of Board review and approval for each curriculum guide. The curriculum committees have developed procedures for writing curriculum to meet the state standards.

***Summary Description of Program***

Content specific committees are formed and meet monthly to write/revise the curriculum. After the curriculum receives Board approval, it is posted on Build Your Own Curriculum or SIS (electronic curriculum management systems). Teachers receive ongoing professional development about using the curriculum. In addition to writing the curriculum, the committee selects the textbooks and instructional materials that will support the curriculum.

Curricula for 30 one- or two-year technical programs are reviewed on a five-year cycle. Technical Curricula are updated as needed in response to market needs, new equipment purchases, and DESE evaluation tools. Curricula for the SSD Schools and academics are reviewed on a four-year cycle.

***Which specific CSIP goals and PCF processes does this Program support?***

CSIP 1.1 Ensure achievement for all students

CSIP 1.2 Ensure that all students are ready to participate in college, career or community programs

CSIP 1.3 Ensure student satisfaction and engagement

PCF 2.1: Develop curriculum

***Who are the Customers/Stakeholders?***

Students

Parents

Staff

Administrators

Board of Education

Taxpayers

Other Missouri Department of Education

***What are the Customer/Stakeholder requirements?***

Teachers expect to have a viable and current curriculum. Students, parents, school board and cabinet require a curriculum that meets the learning standards and that will help to ensure college and career readiness. DESE requires a curriculum that meets state standards.

***What is this program expected to accomplish?***

By continually updating and revising our curriculum, we have a stronger curriculum which leads to better student outcomes and employability.

***Briefly describe how this Program works***

A curriculum committee reviews and analyzes standards in order to identify revisions to the curriculum that may be needed. Revisions to the curriculum are drafted, subjected to teacher review, finalized, then deployed.

The curriculum review process ensures an optimal curriculum that leads to positive student outcomes and aligns with state requirements for accreditation.

***What resources (type and quantity) are required to execute this plan?***

The resources required to execute this plan are an electronic system to house the curriculum, teachers (release time) to help write and revise the curriculum, curriculum coordinators and facilitators to help ensure the alignment of the curriculum both internally and externally, and training time and resources to train teachers on the use of the curriculum.

## Action Plan Summary

***Previous Cycle Goals and Measurable Objectives***

<b><i>2012-2013 Overall Goals (SPED/Courts) *</i></b>	<b><i>2012-2013 Objectives (SPED/Courts)</i></b>
Goal 1: Systematic procedures are used to review and revise the written curriculum.	1.1 Science, Social Studies, Music, Guidance Counseling, Math Extension, and Science Extension will be reviewed and revised according to the Board approved schedule.
Goal 2: Each teacher will have adequate materials to support the curriculum.	2.1 100% of teachers will report by responses to a survey that they have adequate materials.
Goal 3: The curriculum will meet the MSIP 4 process standard, 6.1.	3.1 The curriculum of the SSD schools will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. rationale</li> <li>b. course description</li> <li>c. graduate goals</li> <li>d. measureable learner objectives</li> <li>e. instructional activities</li> <li>f. scope and sequence</li> <li>g. Board review and approval.</li> </ul> 3.2 100% of teachers receive training on the curriculum review and revision process, curriculum alignment and classroom assessment strategies. 3.3 100% of the written curriculum incorporates content and processes related to equity, technology, research and work-place readiness skills.

<b><i>2012-2013 Overall Goals (CTE) *</i></b>	<b><i>2012-2013 Objectives (CTE)</i></b>
Goal 1: Review curriculum on five-year cycle.	1.1 20% of Academic and Technical Curriculum will be reviewed each year. Updates will reflect new tasks deriving from new equipment purchases.
Goal 2: Align academic curriculum with Grade-Level Expectations.	2.1 Maintain 100% alignment of curriculum with Grade-level Expectations.
Goal 3: Review trade curriculum for alignment with Technical Skills Assessments.	3.1 20% of trade curriculum will be reviewed each year for alignment with TSA's in areas which have state approved TSA's.

Goal 4: Skills identified as essential will be covered in each two year program.	4.1 All 2 year programs will cover 100% of essential skills over 4 semesters.
--	---

**2013-2014 Overall Goals**

Goal 1: All SPED and CTE Schools curriculum will be aligned to the Missouri Learning Standards (MLS)/Industry Recognized Standards (IRCs).

Goal 2: Staff will develop a systematic approach to curriculum and development review.

Goal 3: All teachers will implement the curriculum.

**2013-2014 Objectives**

- 1.1 All SPED curricula in Math an ELA will be reviewed and aligned to Missouri Learning Standards on a three year cycle.
- 1.2 100% of curricula in special education schools will incorporate content and processes related to equity, technology, research and work-place readiness goals.
- 1.3 20% of CTE technical curricula will be reviewed as part of 5 year plan cycle. This review will include alignment to DESE approved IRCs.
- 1.4 100% of CTE technical curricula that have DESE approved IRCs will be aligned with IRCs. Tasks identified by this alignment will be incorporated into the ISM task list of essential skills.
  
- 2.1 Unified teams of Special Education and Career and Technical Education teachers will attend professional development together to identify areas of collaboration.
- 2.2 Flow chart of the curriculum review process will be developed.
- 2.3 Technical schools will follow a five-year cycle of curriculum review.
- 2.4 Special Education schools will follow a 3-year cycle of curriculum review.
- 2.5 100% of technical curricula will cover all identified essential skills over 4 semesters.
  
- 3.1 100% of teachers with summative Performance Based Evaluations (PBE) will demonstrate knowledge of content and instructional practices and methods. (PBE 1.a)
- 3.2 100% of teachers with summative PBE will indicate they select instructional goals and objectives based on the board approved curriculum. (PBE 1.c)
- 3.3 100% of teachers with summative PBEs will indicate that they teach the board approved curriculum. (PBE 3.a)

*\*In the 2012-2013 cycle, the special education schools/courts programs and career technical education programs underwent separate curriculum program evaluations. Prior to the current cycle, Curriculum was evaluated annually rather than biennially.*

**Current Cycle Goals and Measurable Objectives**

**2013-2015 Overall Goals**

Goal 1: Technical and Special Education schools will collaborate to review/revise academic curriculum on a 4-year cycle.

**2013-2015 Expected Measurable Objectives**

Subject-specific teachers will meet to review/revise curriculum according the curriculum review calendar.

Goal 2: CTE will follow a 5-year plan for review of CTE courses along with specific requests from industry and instructors for curriculum/training updates.

Program teachers will meet to review/revise curriculum according to the curriculum review calendar and/or specific requests for review.

### ***Current Cycle (2013-15) Action Plans***

#### **Short-term (within the next school year)**

Develop evaluative tools using TSA/IRC pass rates for technical curriculum and item benchmark analysis from MAP/EOC assessments for academic curricula in SPED and Tech Schools.

Investigate the possibility of using the Smarter Balanced intermittent assessments as tools to evaluate curricula as they become available.

Review the curriculum process for systematic improvement using Baldrige tools including the Process Classification Framework section related to curriculum.

#### **Medium-term (1-2 years)**

Review and streamline the process for updating technical curriculum to reduce cycle time and make SSD more agile in responding to changes in technology in the workplace.

Investigate the possibility of using Build Your Own Curriculum (BYOC) software for technical curriculum.

Investigate the possibility of unifying all curriculum cycles for special education and technical curricula.

Analyze PBE data to identify possible interventions to improve the rate of teachers teaching the BOE approved curriculum.

#### **Long-term (3 years and more)**

None

# Evaluation Plan Summary

---

## ***Program Evaluation Authority***

Board Policy IM (adopted 10/28/14). Board Policy notes that curriculum will be reviewed immediately following the scheduled curriculum reviews by staff. The previous evaluation report was approved by the SSD BOE on 1/14/14.

## ***Qualitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used***

- What are the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?
- How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?
- What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?
- How well-aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?
- What is the level of deployment of this program's services?
- How should resources be changed to improve this program?
- How should goals be changed, added, or removed?
- Additional (if any)

## ***Quantitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used***

- What is the status of the program's progress toward achieving its goals?
- What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to planned costs?
- What is the estimated actual benefit-cost or cost-effectiveness of this program?

## ***Quantitative Measures – Criteria for Evaluation***

<b>Measure to be used</b>	<b>2014-2015 Target</b>
1.1 Ratio of the number of academic curriculums that were reviewed compared to the number of curriculums scheduled for review/revision for the academic year.	100%
1.2 Ratio of the number of CTE course curriculums that were reviewed compared to the number of course curriculums scheduled for review/revision for the academic year.	100%



**Coordinator**

**Name** Mary P. Braun and Mollie Bolton

**Planning**

**Team** Matthew Traugher

***Evaluation Summary***

---

***Purpose or Mandate***

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) requires written curricula for all instructional programs that must contain: A rationale, general description of the content, graduate goals, learner objectives, alignment of the objectives to the district's goals and the Show-Me Standards, instructional activities, specific assessments, scope and sequence, and a date of Board review and approval for each curriculum guide. The curriculum committees have developed procedures for writing curricula to meet the state standards.

***Program Description***

Content-specific committees are formed and meet monthly to write/revise each curriculum. After the curriculum receives Board approval, it is posted on Build Your Own Curriculum (BYOC) or the Student Information Systems (SIS) (electronic curricula management systems). Teachers receive ongoing professional development on implementing the curricula. In addition to writing the curriculum, the committee selects the textbooks and instructional materials that will support the curriculum.

Academic and career technical curricula are reviewed on separate cycles. Curricula for one- and two-year technical programs, of which there were 30 in 2014-15, are reviewed on a five-year cycle. Technical Curricula are also updated as needed outside the 5-year cycle in response to market needs, new equipment purchases, advisory committee recommendations, and DESE evaluation tools. Academic curricula are reviewed on a four-year cycle. See Appendix A for a calendar of curricular reviews over a 3-year period.

***What were the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?***

Curricula are written and reviewed according to the curriculum review plan and have been updated to meet state and industry standards. Curriculum structure provides a sequential approach to instruction. The curriculum department has revised and updated curricula in a timely manner in the face of frequently changing standards and evolving best practice guidelines. This enables teachers to use best practices and instruction that aligns to the standards. This alignment helps to ensure a high level of student achievement.

As an illustration of the scope of the curriculum review process, 45 curricula writing meetings were held over the 2013-14 school year for academic curricula areas. 43 such academic curricula meetings were held during the 2014-2015 school year. Given the unique nature of CTE programs, the process of reviewing career/technical curricula varies somewhat from that of academic program review. The curricula of certain CTE programs are reviewed by committees consisting of the curriculum coordinator and 2-8 teachers through 1-2 formal workgroup meetings held throughout the year, supplemented with several additional briefer, informal meetings. For other programs, the curriculum coordinator communicates and/or meets with single teachers across the year to draft and approve curricular modifications. In total, over 50 meetings were held to complete revisions of 13 CTE program curricula over 2014-15.

***How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?***

Inadequate       Approaching Satisfactory       Satisfactory       Excellent

***What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?***

A positive contribution to this ranking is the willingness of our teachers to serve on the curriculum writing committees. Teachers who participate benefit from increased understanding and application of the knowledge gained from the curriculum review process. Of note is the tremendous amount of time the process takes which includes: standards alignment during and after the writing process; selection of instructional materials to support the curriculum implementation; sequencing of the learning targets for the most effective instruction; data entry into the electronic curriculum management systems; and the teacher training required for each update to a curriculum.

One external factor impacting curriculum is the ever-changing landscape of the state’s instructional standards. Curriculum staff struggle to remain current on these changes. As a result, realigning and updating curricula, along with providing curriculum training for teachers, is challenging to accomplish in a timely manner.

***What is the general level of customer or stakeholder satisfaction with this program?***

Not at all Satisfied       Somewhat Satisfied       Very Satisfied       Completely Satisfied

***What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?***

Anecdotally, teachers and administrators appreciate having input in curriculum development and possessing a well-articulated curriculum to guide instruction and ensure standards are met. In addition, stakeholders benefit from flexibility in the curriculum review process that allows for yearly updates to the review cycle in response to changing conditions that necessitate more frequent curricular modifications.

***Evaluation Results***

---

***What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving its goals?***

**Goal 1:** Technical and Special Education schools will collaborate to review/revise academic curricula on a 4-year cycle.

Measurable Objective 1:	Subject-specific teachers will meet to review/revise curricula according to the curriculum review calendar.
Results: The curriculum review calendar has been followed and teachers/coordinators have met to collaboratively review/revise the academic curricula. In 2013-2014, Math and Art were reviewed/rewritten. In 2014-2015, Geography and Library were reviewed and written. In 2015-2016, special education and CTE Academic teachers are collaboratively revising American History, World History and Government curricula. This objective was met with 100% (i.e., curricula were revised as planned based according to the established calendar). See Appendix A.	

**Goal 2:** CTE will follow a 5-year plan for review of CTE courses along with specific requests from industry and instructors for curriculum/training updates.

Measurable Objective 1:	Program teachers will meet to review/revise curricula according to the curriculum review calendar and/or specific requests for review.
Results: Coordinators and teachers have met to collaboratively review/revise CTE curricula. 100% of curricula were reviewed as planned according to the established revision calendar. In some cases, curricula were reviewed and revised more frequently than every five years as necessitated by industry needs or equipment updates. All teachers who informed curriculum staff of such interim revisions/updates needed were involved in resulting curriculum review. See Appendix B.	

**What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?**

**Strengths:**

- *All curricula are reviewed, revised and approved on a consistent basis according to the review/revision schedule.*
- *SPED and CTE academic teachers are collaborating to revise academic curricula.*
- *Ongoing yearly revisions and updates of Technical curriculum have been addressed as needed based on stakeholder requirements.*

**Opportunities/Weaknesses:**

- *Objectively evaluating the effectiveness of curriculum is challenging, and measurable indicators for doing so are limited at present; this remains an opportunity for improvement that can continue to be researched.*
- *Currently there is no systematic process to formally assess teacher and administrator satisfaction with the curriculum development process or the resulting curricula produced.*
- *More systematic training in the curriculum is necessary for teachers to improve implementation (this opportunity was also noted in the previous evaluation report).*

**How well aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?**

The program's priorities and process are well aligned with the goals of the program.

**Deployment Level of Program Services**

- Little or no deployment of program services.
- The program services are in the early stages of deployment in most areas or schools.
- Services are deployed, although some areas or schools are in early stages of deployment.
- Services are well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or schools.
- Services are well deployed, with no significant gaps.
- Services are fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or schools.

**Should resources be changed to improve this program?**

**Yes**

**No**

**If Yes, describe changes.**

Completing curricular reviews on schedule and in response to frequently-changing conditions is challenging given current staffing levels. Adding additional curriculum-related personnel (e.g., facilitators) to support the process would ensure timely revisions to and effective implementation of curricula. It is worth noting that the curriculum process described in this report represents just one of many duties for which key staff who support the process are responsible. For example, the administrator who coordinates the academic curriculum review process (which includes curriculum writing, materials adoption, and teacher training) also supervises the library media centers, develops and delivers district-wide professional learning for teachers, and directs training for and implementation of the Educator Evaluation System for SSD schools.



Should goals be changed, added or removed?

Yes

No

If Yes, describe changes.

The program may benefit from an additional goal to ensure high levels of stakeholder satisfaction with the curriculum review process. In addition, establishing a goal related to fidelity of implementation of curricula might be considered.

### Evaluation Implications

What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to budget?

<b>Total Annual Expenditures:</b>	\$ <u>533,381</u>	<b>Total Annual Budget:</b>	\$ <u>545,839</u>
Staff	\$ <u>441,894<sup>1</sup></u>	Staff	\$ <u>441,894<sup>1</sup></u>
Technology (BYOC)	\$ <u>5,445</u>	Technology	\$ <u>5,445</u>
Curriculum materials	\$ <u>86,042</u>	Curriculum materials	\$ <u>98,500<sup>2</sup></u>

What are the major sources and amounts of funds?

SSD Budget

How many customers (students) are served by this program?

2568 students (i.e., all students at SSD schools are served by curriculum). The program also serves all teachers and administrators at special education and CTE schools.

What is this program's annual cost per customer (student)? \$ 208<sup>1</sup>

#### Estimated Cost Effectiveness

- Mandated program; costs cannot be significantly reduced.
- Mandated program; costs could be reduced (include in Action Plan, below).
- Benefits greatly outweigh costs.
- Benefits outweigh cost, but improvement appears possible (include in Action Plan, below).
- Costs outweigh benefits (include in Action Plan, below).

#### Explanation

n/a

#### General Recommendation Resulting from this Evaluation

- Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- Continue the program as is with specific action plans for improvement.
- Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- Redesign the program.
- Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- Discontinue the program.

## **Action Plans**

---

### **Review of Action Plan progress since last report**

#### **Action Plan 1**

**Opportunity for Improvement:** No objective/quantitative methods or means of evaluating the effectiveness of curriculum

**Action Plan:** Develop quantitative tools for evaluating curriculum using TSA/IRC pass rates for technical curricula and Item Benchmark Analysis for MAP and EOC assessments for academic curricula.

**Progress on Action Plan:** The curriculum department is in the process of researching measurements used by other districts. The Benchmark Analyses are no longer available for state assessments.

#### **Action Plan 2**

**Opportunity for Improvement:** No objective/quantitative methods or means of evaluating the effectiveness of curriculum

**Action Plan:** Investigate the possibility of using the smarter balanced intermittent assessments as a tool to evaluate the curricula as it becomes available.

**Progress on Action Plan:** We are no longer a part of the smarter balanced consortium as dictated by state legislation so this is no longer an option.

#### **Action Plan 3**

**Opportunity for Improvement:** Changes in industrial technology require changes in technical curriculum more often than a 5-year cycle in order to prepare students for successful post-secondary placement. Current capacity for additional review is limited.

**Action Plan:** Review and streamline the process for updating technical curriculum to reduce cycle time and make SSD more agile in responding to changes in technology in the workplace

**Progress on Action Plan:** This action plan has been completed and a process is in place for timely review and revisions based on stakeholder demands.

#### **Action Plan 4**

**Opportunity for Improvement:** Technical and special education curriculum review are on different cycles.

**Action Plan:** Investigate the possibility of using Build Your Own Curriculum (BYOC) software for technical curriculum.

**Progress on Action Plan:** This is currently being investigated and piloted with some technical education curricula.

#### **Action Plan 5**

**Opportunity for Improvement:** Technical and special education curriculum review are on different cycles.

**Action Plan:** Investigate the possibility of unifying all curriculum cycles for special education and technical curricula

**Progress on Action Plan:** This has been investigated and found not to be feasible. All academic reviews are on a combined 4-year cycle and technical programs are reviewed on a 5-year cycle, with the option of earlier review/revision if needed.

### **Action Plan 6**

**Opportunity for Improvement:** Not all teachers are teaching the BOE curriculum

**Action Plan:** Analyze PBE data to identify possible interventions to improve the rate of teachers teaching the BOE approved curriculum.

**Progress on Action Plan:** This data will no longer be as accessible with the new Education Evaluator System. Under the PBE there was a line item that rated implementation of curriculum. Data that are available will be analyzed and used to improve implementation.

### **Action Plan 7**

**Opportunity for Improvement:** Not all teachers are teaching the BOE curriculum

**Action Plan:** Review the curriculum process for systematic improvement using Baldrige tools including the Process Classification Framework section related to curriculum.

**Progress on Action Plan:** The Process Classification Framework has been completed for curriculum.

### **What specific actions are needed in the next evaluation cycle?**

#### **Short-term (within the next school year)**

- Investigate what methods (including objective/quantitative indicators) other districts are using to evaluate the effectiveness of curricula.
- Develop a survey (or other method) to assess teacher/administrator satisfaction with curricula and the curriculum review process.

#### **Medium-term (1-2 years)**

- Assess the effectiveness of curricula through multiple measures.
- Develop a systematic plan for training teachers to improve implementation of the curriculum.

#### **Long-term (3 years and more)**

- Provide additional/enhanced curriculum training to teachers based on the systematic plan developed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes four staff members: A coordinator and facilitator for academic curriculum, and a coordinator and facilitator for CTE curriculum. Note that although entire salaries of staff who support curriculum are listed and used in the cost per student calculation, curriculum development and review represents just a portion of their overall work functions. It is estimated that curricular staff devote less than 50% of their work hours to curriculum activities, broadly defined. Proportional commitment of time to curriculum development is likely somewhat greater for CTE programs vs. academic programs. Any cost of substitute teachers provided to enable classroom teacher participation in curriculum meetings has been excluded from these calculations.

<sup>2</sup> The budget for 2015-16 is \$114,500. Curriculum budgetary needs vary from year to year based on the specific curricula being reviewed and new/expected instructional materials adoptions.

## Appendix A

### Academic Curriculum Schedule, 2014-2016

2013-2014	Type <sup>1</sup>	2014-2015	Type <sup>1</sup>	2015-2016	Type <sup>1</sup>
Math K-12 – collaborative	Writing	ELA Extension K-12 continued	Writing	Journalism	Writing
ELA Extension K-12	Writing	Math Extension K-12 continued	Writing	Newspaper	Writing
Math Extension K-12	Writing	Science Extension	Review	Yearbook	Writing
Art -collaborative	Writing	Geography - collaborative	Review	Character Education	Writing
Music	Review	Forensics	Review	Government - collaborative	Review
PE	Writing	Anatomy & Physiology	Review	American History	Review
Health	Writing	Library collaborative	Writing	World History	Review
Technology	Review			Social Studies K-8	Review
				Social Studies Extension	Review
				Self-advocacy	Writing
				Self-determination	Writing
				Career Education	Writing
				Child Development	Writing
				Human Relations	Writing
				Sociology	Review

<sup>1</sup> The Type column indicates whether the corresponding curricula was reviewed ("Review"), or written completely anew ("Writing").

## Appendix A

### Technical Education Curriculum Review Schedule, 2014-2016

	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
5-Year Scheduled Reviews <sup>1</sup>	<i>English 190 (SLU 1818)</i> <i>Literature and Comp. II</i> <i>Literature and Comp. III</i> <i>Senior English</i> <i>Algebra Essentials (PreAlg)</i> <i>Algebra I</i> <i>Algebra II</i> <i>Geometry</i> <i>Consumer Economics (Personal Finance)</i> <i>Sociology (New)</i> <i>Spanish I</i> <i>Spanish II</i> Architectural Design and Engineering Automotive Technology Court Reporting and Captioning Carpentry CISCO Networking Academy Electrical Trades Electronics and Robotics Engineering IT and Graphic Design/ Computer Application (New)	CEE- Construction CEE – Business and Graphics CEE – Medical and Human Services CEE – Transportation and Advanced Manufacturing Construction Innovations (New) Diesel Technology Early Childhood Education Pre-Professional Health Sciences Academy (New) Veterinary Assistant	Culinary Arts Motorcycle and Small Engine Technology
Off-Cycle Reviews <sup>2</sup>	Diesel Technology	Auto Body Automotive Technology IT and Graphic Design/ Computer Application (New) Web and Computer Programming	Automotive Technology Carpentry CISCO Networking Academy Construction Trades Graphic Design Graphic Production and Printing IT and Graphic Design/ Computer Application Precision Machining

<sup>1</sup> Scheduled reviews for CTE programs occur on a 5-year cycle. Beginning in 2014-15, a 4-year cycle for review of academic programs was established. In addition, one coordinator assumed responsibility for review of all academic curricula (both career technical and special education schools). These academic curricula are italicized in the 2013-14 column.

<sup>2</sup> Off-cycle reviews are necessitated by changes in industry needs and/or equipment updates.