

Year at A Glance Training Module



Objectives for the day...

- Pre-assess the understanding of the *Year at A Glance* using the PLC Rubric for Curriculum Implementation.
- Identify and know the use of the major components of the *Year at A Glance* document.
- Reconcile course sequences to the district/campus calendar.
- Create a local *Year at A Glance* for a course or grade level content area.

Pre-Assessment of *Year at A Glance* Implementation

Implementation Rubric

PLC Rubric for Curriculum and Assessment Implementation

Prerequisite-----SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION SPECTRUM-----Requisite

Level	State Standards	CURRICULUM			ASSESSMENT/INSTRUCTION	
	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)	Vertical Alignment Documents	Year at A Glance (YAG) & TEKS Verification Document (TVD)	Instructional Focus Documents	Performance Assessments & Sample Unit Assessment Items	Resource Selection/Planning
1	Teachers lack awareness of state standards. Teachers trust instructional resources address state standards at the appropriate cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers lack awareness of vertical alignment and are unable to discern gaps in instruction across grade bands, and/or district instructional resources.	Teachers lack awareness of an appropriate sequence of topics that comprise the course of study. Teachers trust that instructional resources are sequenced appropriately.	Teachers lack awareness of the concept of bundling standards into units of instruction. Teachers trust that district resources meet the cognitive and content specificity of the standards.	Teachers are unaware of diverse and appropriate methods of assessment that allow students to demonstrate what they know. Teachers rely on textbook or resource assessments only.	Teachers are unaware of diverse instructional delivery methods or resources. The textbook is the primary resource; lecture is the primary means of delivery.
2	Teachers are aware of state standards, but lack a thorough understanding of their structure. Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.	Teachers are aware of gaps in learning with incoming or outgoing students but fail to connect achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands. Teachers function individually from grade level to grade level.	Teachers individually attempt to devise a sequence for a course of study but with minimal regard to factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Standards are not consistently bundled within the context of a unit of instruction. Interpretation of the cognitive and content specificity of the standards is left to the individual.	Teachers individually devise assessments based on their instructional delivery but after instruction has taken place and with the intent of only measuring student outcomes.	Teachers are aware of various instructional delivery methods but determination of best practice and selection of resources is left to individual teachers.
3	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure, but there is minimal evidence of teacher collaboration regarding the standards.	Teachers are aware of student achievement gaps. Teachers individually connect student achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands.	Teachers individually attempt to devise a sequence for a course of study by considering essential factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Teachers individually bundle of standards within the context of a unit of instruction and determine the specificity of standards.	Teachers individually devise assessments based on learning outcomes prior to instruction, but with the intent of measuring both student outcomes and instructional effectiveness.	Teachers individually select instructional best practices and varied instructional resources but without regard to demands of the IFD.
4	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure. Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers are aware of student achievement gaps. Teachers collaboratively connect student achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands	Teachers routinely collaborate with other teachers in order to devise a sequence for a course of study with regard to factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Teachers routinely collaborate with other teachers regarding the bundling of standards and their specificity within the context of a unit of instruction.	Prior to instruction, teachers routinely collaborate and use common student assessments at a particular grade level or course, with the intent of measuring both student outcomes and instructional effectiveness.	Teachers routinely collaborate when selecting resources and planning instructional best practices that meet the cognitive and content demands of the IFD.
5	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually articulate current state standards, their structure, and differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually look for and identify student achievement gaps by reflecting on data, the specificity from the VADs/TCDs, and connect gaps to instruction and district resources across grade bands.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC and the YAG, teachers are able to reconcile the course sequence to the district calendar and ensure that essential standards are mastered at appropriate times.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually study the bundling and specificity of the TEKS within the context of a unit of instruction by examining the IFD.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers devise and use a variety of common assessments including Performance Assessments, unit-aligned assessment items, and other local assessments to not only measure learning but shape instructional practices.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers evaluate, calibrate, and construct resources; and plan best practices that meet the specificity on the IFD and the demands of pre-determined common assessments.

PLC Rubric for Curriculum and Assessment Implementation

Prerequisite-----SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION SPECTRUM-----Requisite

Level	State Standards	CURRICULUM			ASSESSMENT/INSTRUCTION	
	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)	Vertical Alignment Documents	Year at A Glance (YAG) & TEKS Verification Document (TVD)	Instructional Focus Documents	Performance Assessments & Sample Unit Assessment Items	Resource Selection/Planning
1	Teachers lack awareness of state standards. Teachers trust instructional resources address state standards at the appropriate cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers lack awareness of vertical alignment gaps and	Teachers lack awareness of an	Teachers lack awareness of the	Teachers are unaware of diverse methods of assessment to demonstrate teachers rely on the assessments	Teachers are unaware of diverse instructional delivery methods or resources. The textbook is the primary resource; lecture is the primary means of delivery.
2	Teachers are aware of state standards, but lack a thorough understanding of their structure. Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.	Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.			Teachers individually devise on their own but after in place and with measuring student	Teachers are aware of various instructional delivery methods but determination of best practice and selection of resources is left to individual teachers.
3	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure, but there is minimal evidence of teacher collaboration regarding the standards.	Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.			Teachers individually devise on learning instruction, but measuring both and instructional	Teachers individually select instructional best practices and varied instructional resources but without regard to demands of the IFD.
4	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure. Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate when selecting resources and planning instructional best practices that meet the cognitive and content demands of the IFD.
5	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually articulate current state standards, their structure, and differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually look for and identify student achievement gaps by reflecting on data, the specificity from the VADs/TCDs, and connect gaps to instruction and district resources across grade bands.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC and the YAG, teachers are able to reconcile the course sequence to the district calendar and ensure that essential standards are mastered at appropriate times.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually study the bundling and specificity of the TEKS within the context of a unit of instruction by examining the IFD.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers devise and use a variety of common assessments including Performance Assessments, unit-aligned assessment items, and other local assessments to not only measure learning but shape instructional practices.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers evaluate, calibrate, and construct resources; and plan best practices that meet the specificity on the IFD and the demands of pre-determined common assessments.

Through professional dialogue in a PLC and the YAG, teachers are able to reconcile the course sequence to the district calendar and ensure that essential standards are mastered at appropriate times.

Overview of the *Year at A Glance*

Major Components

Year at A Glance Documents...

- Represent a *logical* sequence and timeframe of concepts for a particular grade level or course.
- Are designed so that each six weeks period needs *approximately* 25 instructional days.
- Are designed with an *ideal* school calendar in mind.
- Are designed with the state assessment calendar in mind.
- DO NOT account for *anomalies* in the local calendar.

Year at A Glance Documents...

- Represent a basis from which a district can build a sequence that reconciles to the local calendar.
- Are available in 6 and 9 week versions.
- Units on the *Year at A Glance* correspond to unit level documents or *Instructional Focus Documents* that are used to plan instruction.
- Bundled *TEKS* are listed by unit.
- A *suggested* timeframe is given for each unit.

...Let's Navigate!

Reconciling Course Sequence to the District/Campus Calendar

Accounting for Instructional Days

Reconciling Course Sequence to the District/Campus Calendar

Guiding questions for finding areas of discrepancies between the local calendar and the *Year at a Glance*...

- How does my district/campus calendar compare to the timeline of the *Year at a Glance*?
- What does the district/campus calendar NOT show that I need to plan for?
- How will *extracurricular* events affect my instructional time?

Reconciling Course Sequence to the District/Campus Calendar

Possible areas of Discrepancies...

- The *short/long* six weeks
- Assessment days counted as instructional days
 - Regular assessments, six weeks tests, etc.
 - Benchmarking
 - STAAR/EOC
- Early release days
- Teacher leave days
- Intercession days-only certain students are present
- Extracurricular events
- Local celebrations

Creating a Local Year at A Glance

Spreadsheet Tool

Creating a Local Year at A Glance...

Steps...

1. Identify the number of instructional days in the six weeks according to the district/campus calendar.
2. Identify and subtract discrepant days for each six weeks (early release, assessment days, extracurricular events).
3. Compare to six week timeframe (usually 25 days).
4. Adjust unit timeframes based on local consensus of grade level or course teams.

EXCEL Year at A Glance Tool...

- Used to create and format a local Year at A Glance that reconciles to the local calendar.
- Input fields are given for each six weeks' units and instructional days.
- Input fields are given for the number of discrepant days.
- Calculates the balance of days by six weeks, semester, and the year in order to show when and where adjustments will need to be made.

...Let's Practice!

An Example Using 8th Grade Math...

Use the following to reconcile and create a “local” Year at A Glance...

- 8th Grade Math Year at A Glance
- YAGOMATIC Spreadsheet
- Table of sample discrepant days

Cells shaded in gray are input fields. Input the required information to calculate available instructional days, total number of days in TEKS Resource System units, and the remaining balance of days.

Grade Level/Course

1st Six Weeks Start Date (M/D/Y)

1st Six Weeks	End Date (M/D/Y)

Total Calendar Days Available

Non Instructional Days	
------------------------	--

Instructional Days Available	0
------------------------------	---

Unit Number/Title

Days in Unit

Total Days in Units	0
---------------------	---

Instructional Days Available	0
-------------------------------------	---

Balance	0
---------	---

A negative balance indicates that more instructional days are needed than are available .

A zero balance indicates that enough instructional days are available.

A positive balance indicates that more than enough instructional days are available .

Sample 8th Grade Discrepant Days...

Semester 1	Semester 2
1st Six Weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 days – Six Week Exams• 3 days – Unit Assessments	4th Six Weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 days – Six Week Exams• 4 days – Unit Assessments
2nd Six Weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 days – Six Week Exams• 2 days – Unit Assessments• 1 day – Homecoming Event	5th Six Weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 days – Six Week Exams• 2 days – Unit Assessments• 3 days – Spring Benchmark• 1 day - 8th Grade Math TAKS• 1 day – 8th Grade Reading TAKS
3rd Six Weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 days – Six Week Exams• 3 days – Unit Assessments• 3 days – Fall Benchmark• 1 day – Band Concert	6th Six Weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 days – Six Week Exams• 2 days – Unit Assessments• 1 day – 8th Grade Science TAKS• 1 day - 8th Grade Social Studies TAKS• 2 days – 8th TAKS Retest Math/Reading)

Reconciling the Year at A Glance...

Debrief...

- How does identifying discrepant days helps you plan for instruction?
- How does reconciling the Year at A Glance against your local calendar help you plan throughout the year?
- How does creating a local Year at A Glance make you better prepared for the instructional year?

PLC Rubric for Curriculum and Assessment Implementation

Prerequisite-----SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION SPECTRUM-----Requisite

Level	State Standards	CURRICULUM			ASSESSMENT/INSTRUCTION	
	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)	Vertical Alignment Documents	Year at A Glance (YAG) & TEKS Verification Document (TVD)	Instructional Focus Documents	Performance Assessments & Sample Unit Assessment Items	Resource Selection/Planning
1	Teachers lack awareness of state standards. Teachers trust instructional resources address state standards at the appropriate cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers lack awareness of vertical alignment and are unable to discern gaps in instruction across grade bands, and/or district instructional resources.	Teachers lack awareness of an appropriate sequence of topics that comprise the course of study. Teachers trust that instructional resources are sequenced appropriately.	Teachers lack awareness of the concept of bundling standards into units of instruction. Teachers trust that district resources meet the cognitive and content specificity of the standards.	Teachers are unaware of diverse and appropriate methods of assessment that allow students to demonstrate what they know. Teachers rely on textbook or resource assessments only.	Teachers are unaware of diverse instructional delivery methods or resources. The textbook is the primary resource; lecture is the primary means of delivery.
2	Teachers are aware of state standards, but lack a thorough understanding of their structure. Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.	Teachers are aware of gaps in learning with incoming or outgoing students but fail to connect achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands. Teachers function individually from grade level to grade level.	Teachers individually attempt to devise a sequence for a course of study but with minimal regard to factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Standards are not consistently bundled within the context of a unit of instruction. Interpretation of the cognitive and content specificity of the standards is left to the individual.	Teachers individually devise assessments based on their instructional delivery but after instruction has taken place and with the intent of only measuring student outcomes.	Teachers are aware of various instructional delivery methods but determination of best practice and selection of resources is left to individual teachers.
3	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure, but there is minimal evidence of teacher collaboration regarding the standards.	Teachers are aware of student achievement gaps. Teachers individually connect student achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands.	Teachers individually attempt to devise a sequence for a course of study by considering essential factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Teachers individually bundle of standards within the context of a unit of instruction and determine the specificity of standards.	Teachers individually devise assessments based on learning outcomes prior to instruction, but with the intent of measuring both student outcomes and instructional effectiveness.	Teachers individually select instructional best practices and varied instructional resources but without regard to demands of the IFD.
4	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure. Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers are aware of student achievement gaps. Teachers collaboratively connect student achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands	Teachers routinely collaborate with other teachers in order to devise a sequence for a course of study with regard to factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Teachers routinely collaborate with other teachers regarding the bundling of standards and their specificity within the context of a unit of instruction.	Prior to instruction, teachers routinely collaborate and use common student assessments at a particular grade level or course, with the intent of measuring both student outcomes and instructional effectiveness.	Teachers routinely collaborate when selecting resources and planning instructional best practices that meet the cognitive and content demands of the IFD.
5	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually articulate current state standards, their structure, and differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually look for and identify student achievement gaps by reflecting on data, the specificity from the VADs/TCDs, and connect gaps to instruction and district resources across grade bands.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC and the YAG, teachers are able to reconcile the course sequence to the district calendar and ensure that essential standards are mastered at appropriate times.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually study the bundling and specificity of the TEKS within the context of a unit of instruction by examining the IFD.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers devise and use a variety of common assessments including Performance Assessments, unit-aligned assessment items, and other local assessments to not only measure learning but shape instructional practices.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers evaluate, calibrate, and construct resources; and plan best practices that meet the specificity on the IFD and the demands of pre-determined common assessments.

PLC Rubric for Curriculum and Assessment Implementation

Prerequisite-----SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION SPECTRUM-----Requisite

Level	State Standards	CURRICULUM			ASSESSMENT/INSTRUCTION	
	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)	Vertical Alignment Documents	Year at A Glance (YAG) & TEKS Verification Document (TVD)	Instructional Focus Documents	Performance Assessments & Sample Unit Assessment Items	Resource Selection/Planning
1	Teachers lack awareness of state standards. Teachers trust instructional resources address state standards at the appropriate cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers lack awareness of vertical alignment gaps and	Teachers lack awareness of an	Teachers lack awareness of the	Teachers are unaware of diverse methods of assessment to demonstrate teachers rely on the assessments	Teachers are unaware of diverse instructional delivery methods or resources. The textbook is the primary resource; lecture is the primary means of delivery.
2	Teachers are aware of state standards, but lack a thorough understanding of their structure. Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.	Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.			Teachers individually devise on their own but after in place and with measuring student	Teachers are aware of various instructional delivery methods but determination of best practice and selection of resources is left to individual teachers.
3	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure, but there is minimal evidence of teacher collaboration regarding the standards.	Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.			Teachers individually devise on learning instruction, but measuring both and instructional	Teachers individually select instructional best practices and varied instructional resources but without regard to demands of the IFD.
4	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure. Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers routinely collaborate when selecting resources and planning instructional best practices that meet the cognitive and content demands of the IFD.
5	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually articulate current state standards, their structure, and differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually look for and identify student achievement gaps by reflecting on data, the specificity from the VADs/TCDs, and connect gaps to instruction and district resources across grade bands.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC and the YAG, teachers are able to reconcile the course sequence to the district calendar and ensure that essential standards are mastered at appropriate times.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers continually study the bundling and specificity of the TEKS within the context of a unit of instruction by examining the IFD.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers devise and use a variety of common assessments including Performance Assessments, unit-aligned assessment items, and other local assessments to not only measure learning but shape instructional practices.	Through professional dialogue in a PLC, teachers evaluate, calibrate, and construct resources; and plan best practices that meet the specificity on the IFD and the demands of pre-determined common assessments.

Through professional dialogue in a PLC and the YAG, teachers are able to reconcile the course sequence to the district calendar and ensure that essential standards are mastered at appropriate times.

Where do we go from here?

Level 5 implementation of the Year at a Glance requires the reconciliation of course sequences to local calendars.

- The reconciliation process must occur *prior* to the beginning of the year.
- The reconciliation process is *ongoing* throughout the year.
- The reconciliation process must drive the *professional dialogue* of your *professional learning community*.
- The reconciled course sequence must be documented and followed in order to have a viable curriculum.
- Reconciled course sequences agreed upon by a professional learning community provide equity of learning opportunities for *all* students.