The Model of Continuous Improvement requires teams of teachers and administrators to examine student performance data, to design and implement instruction, and monitor results. The curriculum review process engages in a parallel process of continuous improvement. It includes the examination of curriculum, driven by student results over time, to determine what students should know, be able to do and understand, when it should be taught, and when and how it will be assessed. The results of the implementation of the curriculum, provide the necessary "results" to drive on-going curriculum review, revision, and renewal. This process is defined in greater detail below.

Curriculum and Continuous Review

The curriculum review process has been revitalized for the purposes of focusing on curriculum areas annually as well as a more public sharing of progress every five years as part of the process of renewal. The team structures to support this process are discussed later. The process of continuous review requires an analysis of the curriculum in relation to the Indicators of Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum. Those indicators serve as the key criteria from which teams judge the progress of development and determine plans for improvement and renewal.

Annually, at the start of the school year, discipline-based vertical teams meet to analyze curriculum relative to the Indicators of Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum. A vertical team represents a cross section of grades, levels and courses from across the school system. They consider evidence and data related to content, skills and understandings; map, unit or guide development; curriculum alignment; assured learning experiences; and assessments/data collection. The evaluation of curriculum is also a continuous process, where curriculum is continuously assessed and examined to determine what needs improvement, alignment or balancing. The criteria and related rubric for curriculum development are listed below.

During the development and review of a curriculum it is important that the following questions be considered:

- **To what extent have we provided rigorous and relevant curriculum?**

    Is the curriculum comprehensive, including academics, arts, and personal wellness?
    Is the curriculum inquiry-based?
    Does the curriculum provide for 21st century skills, including:

    Problem solving?
    Communication?
    Critical thinking and adaptability?

- **To what extent does the curriculum support high expectations for all learners?**

    Does the curriculum cultivate student interests, strengths and abilities?
    Does the curriculum apply varied styles and approaches?
    Is there evidence of an understanding of preferred strategies?
    Does the curriculum meet individual needs?

- **To what extent does the curriculum support dynamic teaching?**

    Does the teaching promote a student-centered approach?
    Is the teaching skillful?
    Is the teaching engaging?
    Is the teaching data-driven?
    Is the teaching reflective and collaborative?
    Is the teaching personalized?

The Rubric for Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum

	Indicators of Development		
	Needs Improvement	Approaches Expectations	Meets/ Exceeds Expectations
Content, Skills and Understandings: What students are expected to know, understand and be able to do is clearly defined and is *meaningful,* focused on fundamental and relevant knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a global community and reflect *high expectations* for all students.	Little evidence of district/school/ department mission reflected in the identified content and skills	Some evidence of the district/school/department mission reflected in the identified content and skills	District/school/department mission effectively reflected in the selection of content and skills and understandings throughout the document
	State and/or national standards were not used to determine what students should know, understand and be able to do	Some evidence that state and/or national standards were used to determine what students should know, understand and be able to do	Clear evidence that discipline-specific standards, state and/or national standards were used and/or prioritized to determine what students should know, understand and be able to do
	Terminology does not reflect common practice within the discipline and/or current educational research	Some evidence that terminology reflects common practice within the discipline and/or current educational research	Common language accurately articulates accepted practice within the discipline and/or current educational research and promotes the work of the discipline
	Little or no consideration given to the inclusion of 21st century skills	Some consideration given to the inclusion of 21st century skills	Effective 21st century skills are integrated (embedded) throughout the curriculum in order to promote college and career readiness and provide opportunities to extend learning
Maps, Units and Pacing Guides Development: The written documents per grade include key required components, including the scope or breadth of material (how much of what is to be taught should be taught at that particular level within that particular context) and the sequence (the succession of when the information is presented) and how (i.e., spiral, systematic, selective emphasis), providing an *articulated* curriculum across the grades.	Maps or units guide development is inconsistent	Some maps, units or pacing guides are written and standards based	Comprehensive curriculum maps, units and pacing guides that define common expectations by grade level and course have been developed across the discipline
	Maps are not useful or non-existent	Maps are somewhat useful and used	Maps, units and pacing guides are used to drive instruction and curriculum evaluation
	Specific key learnings, assessments and assured instructional experiences for students are not evident in the maps, units or pacing guides	Specific key learnings, assessments and assured instructional experiences for students are somewhat evident in the maps, units or pacing guides	Specific key learnings, assessments and assured instructional experiences for students are evident in the maps, units and pacing guides
	Units are not developed or standards based	Some units are developed and standards based	Units are developed and standards based
	The curriculum is not	The curriculum is somewhat	The curriculum is balanced (i.e.,

The Rubric for Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum

	Indicators of Development		
	Needs Improvement	**Approaches Expectations**	**Meets/Exceeds Expectations**
	balanced	balanced	appropriate amounts per grade, appropriate across the grades and increasingly rigorous—content is not over or under-emphasized)
	Learning is not sequenced and approximate times are not specified	Learning is somewhat sequenced and some approximate times are specified	Learning is sequenced and approximate times are specified to pace instruction appropriately
	Few or no key resources are specified	Some resources may be specified or limited in scope	Resources are specified, relevant and current, including internet resources; year of key texts are specified
Assured Learning Experiences: Key cognitive learning experiences (i.e., specific pedagogical strategies or instructional tasks) that help learners perceive, process, rehearse, store and transfer new learning or tasks that create authentic experience for all students to demonstrate proficiency of the grade level content and understandings are specified. These tasks promote *coherence* and *alignment* across the grades/courses and reflect *high expectations* for all students.	Assured experiences are not specified in the curriculum or are not standards driven	Some assured experiences are specified in the curriculum driven by standards	Assured experiences are specified in the curriculum, including learning experiences that differentiate, bringing meaning to the content, standards and skills
	Assured experiences do not reflect effective teaching strategies and standards for teaching	Assured experiences may reflect some effective teaching strategies and standards for teaching	Assured experiences employ many effective teaching strategies and standards for teaching
	Assured experiences are not aligned with the curriculum, assessments or standards and lack engagement	Some assured experiences are aligned with the curriculum, assessments or standards, reflect some standards, and are somewhat engaging	Assured experiences are aligned with curriculum and assessments, reflect the standards, and are highly engaging, helping learners perceive, process, rehearse, store and transfer new knowledge

The Rubric for Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum

	Indicators of Development		
	Needs Improvement	**Approaches Expectations**	**Meets/Exceeds Expectations**
Assessment/Data: Given the need to measure content knowledge, process skills and understandings, the specified assessments provide the means to determine the level of student learning as delineated in the curriculum documents. Both formative and summative assessments are specified, *aligned* and represent *high expectations*.	Assessments are not clearly linked to standards or common across classrooms Assessment criteria (rubrics) are not developed No levels of performance are described	Many assessments are standards based and common across classrooms Some assessment criteria (rubrics) are linked to standards and/or may or may not be consistently used Some levels of performance are defined	Key assessments are aligned with standards and are common across the school system Assessment criteria (rubrics) are used to link/align assessments to standards and are consistently used Levels of performance are clearly defined (e.g., proficiency, mastery) by stated criteria and exemplars are available to teachers A range of assessments is represented (formative, interim, summative)
	Key formative, interim and/or summative assessments are not identified Assessments are generally all one type and lack variety Assessments focus solely or overly on low level skills without any significant depth of knowledge Data is not collected and/or structures do not support the purposeful use of assessment results	Formative, interim and summative assessments are represented Assessments are somewhat varied and may incorporate authentic tasks/performance task although infrequently Assessments demonstrate some variety in terms of depth of knowledge but may be unbalanced, inconsistent, or lack scaffolding Some assessment data is collected and analyzed. There is a basic structural framework in place to support the use of data in instructional decision making.	A range of assessments (formative, interim and summative) comprises a tangible part of the teaching and learning process Assessments reflect a variety of formats Assessments measure understanding to a variety of depths of knowledge calling for demonstration of critical thinking, problem solving, assessing and managing information, designing or creating and communicating Assessment data (formative, interim and summative) is collected, analyzed, and used to assess student learning and inform instruction and curriculum revision. Structures are well established to support this work

The Rubric for Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum

	Indicators of Development		
	Needs Improvement	**Approaches Expectations**	**Meets/Exceeds Expectations**
Curriculum Alignment: There is a clear match between the written curriculum, taught curriculum and tested curriculum (including local and state assessments) that is consistent with external and internal standards, assessments and best practices, creating *coherence* within and across the grades.	The written, taught and tested curriculum is not aligned The local curriculum is not aligned with discipline-specific, state and/or national standards Local assessments are not aligned with internal or any external assessments	The written, taught and tested curriculum is somewhat aligned The local curriculum is somewhat aligned with discipline-specific, state and/or national standards Local assessments are somewhat aligned with internal or any external assessments	The written, taught and tested curriculum is aligned The local curriculum is aligned with discipline-specific, state and/or national standards Local assessments are clearly aligned with both internal expectations and any external assessments