

Sample Curriculum Construction Process

Generic Community Schools Physical Education Core Curriculum

Generic Community Schools initiated a curriculum review during the 1998-1999 school year. Superintendent Richardson, the building principals and the physical education staff met with Dr. Ray Allen, an Assistant Professor of Kinesiology from Michigan State University to consider the possibility of a curriculum revision during the summer of 1998. As a result of that meeting, Generic's Physical Education program met at regular intervals from August of 1998 through April of 1999 to construct a curriculum that met the following criteria (see Appendix A, Claims that Can be Made as a Result of the Curriculum Revision Process):

- The resultant core curriculum was consistent with Michigan's Department of Education Physical Education Core Curriculum document (Appendix B);
- The curriculum was consistent with the latest research in physical education curriculum;
- The curriculum focused on content deemed of highest priority for students to learn by community representatives;
- The document was written in terms that are interpretable by all stakeholders;
- The document clearly communicated expected achievement within and across grades;
- The curriculum communicated intended learning in measurable terms;
- The curriculum plan allocated sufficient instructional time for students to achieve the core content, given effective instruction and a concerted effort on the part of students.

The basic procedures the committee used are consistent with those described in Vogel and Seefeldt's, *Program Design in Physical Education: A Guide To The Development Of Exemplary Programs*. (1988). The committee used the following procedure in determining the core curriculum content:

1. A team of community stakeholders met to establish relative priorities on content they desired students to learn in physical education.
 - The team of 24 stakeholders are listed in the Acknowledgments, on page two of this document.
 - The team used procedures described in Allen's, *Content Priorities among Representative Stakeholder Groups for Physical Education Programs in Michigan: a Delphi Study* (1998) to reach consensus on the relative importance of potential program content.
 - The team considered all program objectives appropriate for physical education programs, and determined their order of importance for students of the community.
 - The data were aggregated to represent district-wide priorities. Resultant rankings of lifelong activities and program objectives appear in Appendix C.
2. The Physical Education staff reviewed and revised the program and building mission statements to reflect the intent of the program relative to the school's mission.
3. Benchmarks were established across grades, and estimates of instructional time necessary to achieve the intended benchmarks were made.
 - The physical Education staff reviewed program objectives and teaching/learning progressions for each program objective, and revised them to meet local needs, values and conditions. The objectives and progressions were developed by Dr. Allen or created by the physical education staff and are consistent with NASPE standards and criteria.

- The staff used these to decide: 1) at what grade instruction should be initiated on each program objective, 2) at what grade, through effective instruction, most students should be expected to achieve the program objective, 3) what would be appropriate benchmarks for students to meet at each grade as they progress towards achieving the program objective, and 4) how much instructional time would be necessary under conditions existing in Generic Community Schools for most students to achieve the benchmark.
4. The amount of instructional time available for the core curriculum was determined in the following manner:
- Ten percent of the physical education instructional time scheduled was reduced to account for lost instruction due to uncontrollable circumstances (e.g., snow days, assemblies, elections);
 - Seventy-five percent of the remaining instructional time was allocated for instruction on the core curriculum. This provided some flexibility in planning to account for special events, teaching/learning moments specific to a class or grade, etc.. The remaining 25 percent of the instructional time is left to the discretion of the instructor to meet the unique needs of each class or school.
5. The core curriculum content was selected
- The core curriculum was defined as the skills, knowledge, fitness capacities and affective traits that all students in the Generic Community Schools should acquire through the physical education program, given the amount of time and resources available.
 - Content deemed of highest importance to local stakeholders was inserted into the curriculum as available instructional time permitted.
 - Content was systematically added to the core curriculum according to relative importance, until available instructional time in each grade was fully consumed.
 - The core curriculum document includes as many of the most important program objectives as the physical education staff can accommodate effectively, within the existing instructional time frames. Program inclusions with time estimates across grades appear in the Content Matrix in Appendix D.