One District’s Collaborative Journey To Common Core Implementation
JURUPA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

- Jurupa Valley
- Western Riverside County

- 16 Elementary
- 3 Middle
- 3 High Schools
DEMOGRAPHICS

- 19,577 Students grades TK-12
- 80% Unduplicated Count
- Schools range from 50% - 96%
- 36% English Learners
- 74% socio-Economically Disadvantaged
BACKGROUND - 2010

- Multi-year elementary PD
- Prescriptive instructional minutes/guidelines
- Teacher frustration
- Differences K/6 - 7/12
DISTRICT VISION

Culture

CCSS

Collaboration Structures
COLLABORATION STRUCTURES

- Education Services Committee
- Create CCSS Steering Committee
- Secondary Math Committee
CCSS STEERING COMMITTEE

• Make Up
  - Teachers from all grades/subjects
  - Principal Reps
  - Ed. Service Leadership

• Function

• Key Actions
  - Dove deep into the standards
  - Redwood
  - 2-day planning retreat
KEY ELEMENTS

- Clarity
- Structure - Framework
- Comprehensive
- Equity and access
- Time
- Training
Our Plan

Priority Standards

Professional Development

Implementation & Accountability

Units of Study
PRIORITY STANDARDS

Readiness
(for next level of learning)

High Stakes Assessments (SBAC)

Endurance
(concepts and skills that last over time)

Leverage
(crossover application to other areas)
PRIORITY STANDARDS KEY ACTION STEPS

- Establish committee
- Facilitated process
- Make initial selections
- Vertically align standards K-12
- Provide professional development
- Acquire feedback, revise, publish
A series of specific lessons, learning experiences, and related assessments — based on targeted Priority Standards & supporting standards — for an instructional focus that may last anywhere from two to six weeks.
UNITS OF STUDY COMMITTEE

- Make-up
- Selection
- Commitment
- Principals
- Process
Priority Standards are carefully placed, paced, taught, assessed, re-taught, re-assessed throughout the year.
### UNITS OF STUDY RESEARCH BASE
(EFFECT SIZE, HATTIE, VLFT, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative &amp; Frequency of Assessment</th>
<th>Teacher Clarity</th>
<th>Teacher and Student Feedback</th>
<th>Spaced/Distributed Practice</th>
<th>Meta-Cognition &amp; Self-Regulate</th>
<th>Mastery Learning</th>
<th>Teacher Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Studies</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**90 – 90 – 90 Study (Reeves, 2000)**
- Laser-like focus on achievement
- Curriculum choices
- Non-fiction writing
- Collaborative scoring
- Multiple opportunities for success
LCFF / LCAP DEVELOPMENT
A COMPREHENSIVE AND COHESIVE LEARNING BLUEPRINT
(STAKEHOLDER INPUT, SYSTEMATIC IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING OF EFFECTIVENESS, AND MODIFICATION BASED ON STUDENT OUTCOMES)

High-Quality Classroom Instruction and Curriculum

Parent, Student, and Community Engagement

Academic and Behavior Interventions

Safe and Orderly School Environment

Professional Learning

Assessment, Data Analysis, and Monitoring

Every Student Learning in Every Classroom Every Day
IMPLEMENTATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Roll out (May 2014)
- August PD for Teachers
- Monitoring
- UOS Development
- Feedback Processes
- Coaching
- Standards-Based Grading & Reporting
- Parent Communications
UOS FEEDBACK PROCESS
UOS DIGITAL PLATFORM

- ELA/Math Units
- Discussion Board
- Shared Resources & Rating
- Coaches’ Corner
- Feedback Forms
JUSD COACHING VISION

Develop meaningful partnerships with classroom teachers to improve teaching, learning, and leadership.
WHY COACHING?

Positively impacts...

Teacher Attitudes

Teacher Practices
   Knight, 2007; Showers et al., 1997.

Teacher Efficacy

Student Achievement
   Wenglinsky, 2000; Sanders, 1996.
QUESTIONS