

## Curriculum Planning Matrix

	Understanding by Design	Common Pacing/ Teachers Plan Specifics	Common Pacing/ Common Units	Comprehensive Curriculum
<b>Description</b>	Teachers develop their own materials using the backward design process. The two key ideas are: 1) focus on teaching and assessing for understanding and learning transfer, and 2) design curriculum “backward” from those ends.	A pacing guide is sometimes referred to as a curriculum map, scope and sequence, standards schedule, instructional calendar, or road map. It is specific to a particular content area and level (e.g., 9th grade Algebra 1) and details when particular content standards should be taught and/or assessed. Teachers select and design individual lessons.	Calendar based description of what teachers teach in a particular grade or course; the order in which it is taught, and the amount of time dedicated to teaching this content – accompanied by a curriculum framework which specifies the learning expectations to be met by students at each grade level and in the major high school courses.	Comprehensive curriculum includes pacing, units, & lessons. This can be developed, purchased or open source. The goal is to implement the same curriculum across classrooms with fidelity with little to no deviation in day-to-day instruction.
<b>Pros</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows teacher autonomy in planning to meet student needs</li> <li>• Allows for greatest degree of professional judgment &amp; expertise</li> <li>• Encourages personalization in instructional planning for each student</li> <li>• The process (when done well) deepens teacher understanding of content expectations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a skeletal road map with consideration toward learning progressions – facilitates alignment to the standards.</li> <li>• Provides for efficiency &amp; predictability by emphasizing or de-emphasizing the amount of time for certain units</li> <li>• Specific benchmarks identified to assist in planning &amp; progress monitoring to avoid gaps in learning.</li> <li>• Teacher autonomy in planning units and daily lessons</li> <li>• Embodies what many experienced teachers do when they plan their curriculum for the year: They chunk it, put topics in a sensible order, determine what resources to draw on, and develop a good sense of how long different elements will take. Also may allow for some unpredictability depending on the particular mix of students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fidelity to learning progressions ensures coherence through both pacing and common units of instruction</li> <li>• Common units provide opportunities for collaborative planning and review of student work</li> <li>• May enhance the capacity of instructional leaders to support, promote, lead and sustain professional learning that advances teaching practices, learning outcomes and achievement for all students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well selected curriculum can better guarantee comprehensively designed approach across time and grades</li> <li>• Focuses teacher attention on execution of lessons, not planning and design</li> <li>• May be helpful for novice teachers who do not have the skills to do the design work</li> <li>• Offers more focused tools to progress monitor at scale</li> <li>• Ensures equity of access for all students in the district</li> </ul>

<p><b>Cons</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult for novice teachers</li> <li>• Potential to disregard learning progressions or achieve coherence across units and grades</li> <li>• Potential inequity based on varying strength of teacher planning skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaging students in more time-consuming, cognitively demanding activities that nurture deep understanding tends to fall by the wayside in order to adhere to pacing calendar</li> <li>• Potential to disregard learning progressions or achieve coherence across units and grades</li> <li>• Potential inequity based on varying strength of teacher planning skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum may become too restrictive and stifle teacher creativity</li> <li>• Potential for one size fits all implementation</li> <li>• Can become teacher-centered rather than student-centered</li> <li>• Potential for PD to focus on “covering” rather than learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum may become too restrictive – teachers may focus on delivery rather than learning</li> <li>• Potential for one size fits all implementation</li> <li>• Can be teacher-centered vs. student-centered</li> <li>• Weak curriculum will lead to weak instruction across the board</li> </ul>
<p><b>Resource Requirements</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District must provide structures, systems and resources to ensure success: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ All teachers must have deep understanding of both the standards and the design process</li> <li>✓ All teachers must have understanding of content, pedagogy and best practices for instructional planning</li> <li>✓ Teachers need content feedback on plans prior to instruction to ensure quality</li> <li>✓ Access to quality resources to choose from</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District must provide structures, systems and resources to ensure success: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Teams developing the pacing guides must have deep understanding of the standards, coherence relationships and learning progressions</li> <li>✓ Teams must have deep understanding of assessment development</li> <li>✓ Time and budgetary resources to support design teams</li> <li>✓ Teams ideally need content feedback on plans prior to instruction to ensure quality</li> <li>✓ Time and support to train all teachers on the pacing guide, rationale and decision points</li> <li>✓ Revision protocol identified for continuous improvement</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District must provide structures, systems and resources to ensure success: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Teams developing the pacing guides and units must have deep understanding of the standards and learning progressions</li> <li>✓ Teams must have understanding of content area pedagogy and best practices for instructional planning</li> <li>✓ Teams must have deep understanding of assessment development</li> <li>✓ Time and budgetary resources to support design teams</li> <li>✓ Teams ideally need content feedback on plans prior to instruction to ensure quality</li> <li>✓ Time and support to train all teachers on the pacing guide, rationale and decision points</li> <li>✓ Revision protocol identified for continuous improvement</li> <li>✓ Investment in professional learning and follow-up support</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District must provide structures, systems and resources to ensure success: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Commit resources to produce, purchase or print materials and assessments</li> <li>✓ Time and resource to ensure teacher training for implementation</li> <li>✓ Time and resources for leaders training to support progress monitoring</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Assessment &amp; Progress Monitoring Implications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers should be developing assessment as part of the backward design process</li> <li>Districts should not have competing assessments on top of this as it will create tension.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District must provide structures &amp; systems to ensure high quality assessment design.</li> <li>Assessments should be developed in tandem with the guides. Off-the-shelf assessments may effect pacing.</li> <li>District must determine how assessments will be implemented and monitored – classroom, school or district level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District must provide structures &amp; systems to ensure high quality assessment design.</li> <li>If common assessments are used, then they should be developed prior to the units.</li> <li>If off-the-shelf assessments are used, it might effect pacing</li> <li>Teachers must have access in order to plan effectively</li> <li>District must determine how assessments will be implemented and monitored – classroom, school or district level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers should be using the assessments provided within the program.</li> <li>Districts can develop a system to monitor, but not layer on additional assessments as this may cause mis-alignment with the curriculum.</li> <li>If additional assessment, must ensure alignment.</li> </ul>
<b>Considerations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Success depends on teachers deeply understanding the standards.</li> <li>Teachers must receive content-based feedback on units.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Success depends on articulating the district’s curricular philosophy in a transparent way</li> <li>Success depends on the design and how district and school leaders use them – alignment to standards is critical.</li> <li>Feedback from all stakeholders is imperative for the guides and assessments prior to implementation so changes after the fact are minimal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Success depends on articulating the district’s curricular philosophy in a transparent way</li> <li>Success depends on the design and how district and school leaders use them – alignment to standards is critical.</li> <li>Feedback from all stakeholders is imperative for the guides, common units and assessments prior to implementation so changes after the fact are minimal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Success depends on articulating the district’s curricular philosophy in a transparent way</li> <li>Success depends on choosing a curriculum that is just as rigorous as the standards. If the rigor is not aligned, there will be a gap.</li> <li>District assumes the blame if students are not successful</li> </ul>
<b>Research</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>McTighe &amp; Wiggins (UbD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guskey, T.R., &amp; Jung, L.A. (2013). <i>Answers to Essential Questions about Standards, Assessments, Grading, &amp; Reporting</i>. California: Corwin.</li> <li><a href="http://ASCD.org">ASCD.org</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>McTighe &amp; Wiggins (UbD)</li> <li>Schmoker, M. (2011). <i>Focus: Elevating the Essentials to Radically Improve Student Learning</i>. Virginia: ASCD.</li> <li>Reeves, A.R. (2011). <i>Where Great Teaching Begins: Planning for Student Thinking and Learning</i>. Virginia: ASCD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/06111518/CurriculumMatters-report.pdf">https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/06111518/CurriculumMatters-report.pdf</a></li> </ul>

\*\*\*\*See the appendix to review process guides for each approach.