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Building Upon a Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State &amp; District Reform</th>
<th>Key Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Providence</td>
<td>• Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Aligned Instruction</td>
<td>○ Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Curriculum Development Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Key Partners</td>
<td>○ Dedicated Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Teacher Writing Teams</td>
<td>○ Tools to focus work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RI Dept. of Education</td>
<td>○ Monitoring and Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Revised Basic Ed Plan</td>
<td>○ Classroom Walkthrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Race to the Top</td>
<td>○ Reflective Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common Strategic Partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Charles A. Dana Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Upon a Foundation
Key Partnerships:
- Curriculum --
- Charles A. Dana Center
- ACT Quality Core
- Implementation—
- America’s Choice
- Cambium/Sopris West

Transition Timeline:
- 2010/11
  - Initial curriculum alignment work
  - Building awareness for transition
  - Training of CCSS Study of Standards Cadre
- 2011/12
  - K, 1, 8, and high school
- 2012/13
  - Identified grades across the 2-7 grade levels
- 2013/14
  - Remaining grades

What we’ve learned so far—
- Crosswalk doesn’t help to build but does inform gaps and training needs
- Resource gaps significant at some levels
- PARCC assessment blueprints needed for continued alignment
### Key Partnerships:
- Curriculum —
- UConn CBER
- Charles A. Dana Center
- ACT Quality Core

### Implementation —
- Pearson

### Transition Timeline:
- **2010/11**
  - Initial curriculum alignment work
  - Building awareness for transition
  - Begin integration of literacy standards into science and history curricula
  - Training of CCSS Study of Standards Cadre
- **2011/12**
  - K-5, 6-8, and high school
  - Continue integration of literacy standards across content areas

### What we’ve learned so far—
- Textual complexity and language development expectations require ongoing attention in written curriculum and training
- Literacy work in science and history critical; building capacity to address work remains a challenge
- PARCC assessment blueprints needed for continued alignment
## CCSS Transition Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Development</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Refinement at Scope and Sequence Level</td>
<td>• <strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Address viability issues</td>
<td>- Study of the Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Align with interim assessments and end-of-course exams</td>
<td>- Increase content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify what is to be mastered, developed and introduced at each level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revise units to reflect lessons learned about CCSS</td>
<td>• <strong>Weekly Collaborative Study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify/Build supporting resources</td>
<td>- Unit Study connected to CCSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop common assessments and rubrics</td>
<td>- Common Lesson Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build supports for special populations</td>
<td>- Analysis of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to build multi-tiered reading and math frameworks</td>
<td>- Reflective Conversations with leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Monthly Leadership Seminars**
  - Continued study of CCSS
  - Focus on effective teaching practices
  - Reflection on Walkthrough data
  - Engage in use of collaborative tools with Teacher Leaders