**Assessment 3: Curriculum Analysis Project**

**Part 1**

**a. Assessment**

All Master’s and Post-Masters candidates in Educational Leadership are required to complete a Curriculum Analysis Project. TCNJ faculty designed this assessment for candidates to demonstrate their ability to influence teaching and learning through the design of coherent curriculum and systems of instruction by evaluating the various elements of a curricular unit and making recommendations for improvement. Candidates complete this assessment once toward the end of the required course CURR 514. Results and feedback are shared with the educational leadership candidates using the Canvas, TCNJ’s electronic learning management system.

The rubric derives its validity from alignment to the NELP standards and agreement by a panel of five experts in the field of educational leadership. Inter-rater reliability by two assessors was 83%.

**b. Alignment to Standards**

The Curriculum Analysis Paper is aligned to the following standards:

ELCC Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2

NELP standards: 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 6.3

**c. Analysis of Data Findings**

This assessment was first used in Spring 2019. All students performed in the acceptable or target ranges for standards 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4. One student was in the unacceptable range for standard 6.3 during the summer semester. Overall, students in the summer semester scored lower than students in the spring semester.

**d. Interpretation of Evidence for Meeting Standards**

Most candidates performed at acceptable or target levels on all of the standards assessed. The lower performance in the summer semester is most likely due to the course being compressed into a five-week period. Students in the spring semester have more time to complete the assessment and are given opportunities to revise and resubmit the assessment after receiving feedback.

**Part 2**

**e. Assessment Too**

The College Of New Jersey

Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education

**Curriculum Analysis Project**

**The Assignment**: For this assignment you will evaluate various aspects of a curricular unit and make suggestions to improve it.

**The Purpose of the Assignment**: You will demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the skills necessary to evaluate, develop, and implement coherent and standards-aligned systems of curriculum, instruction, data systems, supports, and assessment (NELP Standard 4: Learning and Instruction).

**Directions:**

Choose a curricular unit relevant to your work. The unit’s length should fit within a range of two weeks to three months. Ideally, you should be familiar with this unit as it is planned, taught, supported, and assessed.

Your task is to **evaluate** the coherence of a curricular unit and its alignment with required standards, **analyze** how it fosters the success of each student, and **develop** suggestions for improving its effectiveness and capacity to provide equitable opportunities for each student to learn.

You will be assessed in six areas.

Part 1:

# Evaluate the curriculum by explaining the hallmarks of quality as described by experts in the field, providing evidence from your curricular unit (e.g., quotations, screen shots, vivid descriptions), and explaining how the unit reflects these hallmarks in each of the following areas:

1. Standards alignment: Analyze the extent curricular objectives, learning activities, and assessments are aligned to appropriate grade level NJ Student Learning Standards and reflect important knowledge, skills, and understandings. (NELP 6.3; CAEP A.1.1.f)
2. Assessment efficacy: Analyze the technical soundness, cultural responsiveness, and instructional utility of the unit’s formative and summative assessments. (NELP 4.3; CAEP A.1.1.a)
3. Pedagogical appropriateness: Analyze the extent instructional strategies, resources, technologies, and supports are evidence-based and likely to engage each student in challenging and meaningful learning. (NELP 4.2; CAEP A.1.1.b)
4. Equitable opportunity: Analyze the extent instructional technologies, strategies, and/or content are differentiated appropriately to accommodate language, learning, and cultural differences. (NELP 3.2; CAEP A.1.1.e)
5. Coherence: Analyze the unit’s coherence in terms of real-world relevance and cross-grade level connections. (NELP 4.4)

Part 2:

1. Evaluations and improvements: Develop a minimum of two recommendations that align with the curricular analysis and provide specific, detailed, and actionable means for revising or successfully implementing the curricular program. (NELP 4.1; CAEP A.1.1.c)

**Assignment Format:**

# Along with your completed template, you must submit a copy of or links to the unit for the instructor to view.

# Specifics:

# This is professional work rather than a scholarly paper. Therefore, you do not need to follow APA formatting. You must include appropriate references when citing expert works other than those provided by the instructor.

# As an evaluation assignment, please write in first person voice.

# Your work should be free from error, concise, uncluttered, and easy to read. Please see the uploaded examples for guidance.

**f. Scoring Rubric**

# The College of New Jersey

Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education

### Grading Rubric Curriculum Analysis Project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Components** | **Unacceptable** | **Acceptable** | **Target** |
| 1. Standards Alignment NELP 6.3 | Inaccurately assesses or fails to provide evidence of the extent curricular objectives, learning activities and assessments are aligned to NJ Student Learning Standards. | Accurately assesses and provides supporting evidence of the extent curricular objectives and assessments are aligned to appropriate NJ Student Learning Standards. | Accurately assesses and provides detailed supporting evidence of the extent curricular objectives, learning activities, and assessments are aligned to NJ Student Learning Standards and fully reflect key knowledge, skills, and understandings.Revises the curriculum to bring the unit to closer to standards of quality in this area. |
| 2. Assessment EfficacyNELP 4.3  | Inaccurately assesses or fails to provide evidence of the technical soundness and cultural responsiveness of the unit’s summative assessments | Accurately assesses and provides supporting evidence regarding the technical soundness, instructional utility, and cultural responsiveness of the unit’s summative assessments | Accurately assesses and provides detailed supporting evidence regarding the technical soundness, cultural responsiveness, and instructional utility of the unit’s formative and summative assessments.Revises the curriculum to bring the unit to closer to standards of quality in this area. |
| 3. Pedagogical AppropriatenessNELP 4.2 | Inaccurately assesses or fails to provide evidence of the extent instructional strategies are evidence-based and likely to engage each student in meaningful learning. | Accurately assesses and provides supporting evidence of the extent instructional strategies are evidence-based and likely to engage each student in meaningful learning. | Accurately assesses and provides detailed supporting evidence of the extent instructional strategies, resources, technologies, and supports are evidence-based and likely to engage each student in challenging and meaningful learning. Revises the curriculum to bring the unit to closer to standards of quality in this area. |
| 4. Equitable OpportunityNELP 3.2 | Inaccurately assesses or fails to provide evidence of the extent instructional strategies and/or content are differentiated appropriately to accommodate language, learning, OR cultural differences. | Accurately assesses and provides supporting evidence of the extent instructional strategies, strategies, and/or content are differentiated appropriately to accommodate language, learning, and cultural differences. | Accurately assesses and provides detailed supporting evidence of the extent instructional technologies and strategies and/or content are differentiated appropriately to accommodate language, learning, and cultural differences.Revises the curriculum to bring the unit to closer to standards of quality in this area. |
| 5. CoherenceNELP 4.4 | Inaccurately assesses or fails to provide evidence regarding the curricular unit’s cross-grade level coherence. | Accurately assesses and provides some supporting evidence regarding the curricular unit’s coherence and the extent the unit is part of a cross-grade level system or plan. | Accurately assesses and provides detailed supporting evidence regarding the curricular unit’s coherence and the extent the unit is part of a cross-grade level system or plan. Revises the curriculum to bring the unit to closer to standards of quality in this area. |
| 6. Evaluation and ImprovementsNELP 4.1 | Evaluative statement and/or recommendations are missing, lack specificity, or are misaligned with the prior analyses. | Makes an appropriate evaluative statement regarding overall curricular quality and provides two concrete and specific suggestions for revising or successfully implementing the curricular program that align with the prior analyses. | Makes an appropriate evaluative statement regarding overall curricular quality and provides two or more concrete and specific suggestions for revising or successfully implementing the curricular program that align with the prior analyses.Implements one or more of the suggestions in a school context. |

**Rubric Validity**

Lawshe’s Content Validity Ratio (5 panelists)

Standards Alignment 1.0

Assessments 0.2

Pedagogy 0.6

Equitable Opportunity 0.6

Cross-curricular connections -0.2 before revision, 0.6 after revision

Evaluation 0.6

**g. Data Tables**

Inter-Rater Reliability: Two assessors = 83%

**Spring 2019**

Master’s *n* = 6 Post Masters *n* = 1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |  |
| Standard | Master’s | Post Mast. | Master’s | Post Mast. | Master’s | Post Mast. | % Target |
| 6.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 100 |
| 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 100 |
| 4.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 100 |
| 3.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 71 |
| 4.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 100 |
| 4.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 100 |

**Summer 2019**

Master’s *n* = 7 Post Masters *n* = 2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unacceptable (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |  |
| Standard | Master’s | Post Mast. | Master’s | Post Mast. | Master’s | Post Mast. | % Target |
| 6.3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 56 |
| 4.3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 67 |
| 4.2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 67 |
| 3.2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 78 |
| 4.4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 78 |
| 4.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 67 |