

Great Lakes East & Great Lakes West

Comprehensive Centers



Building a Collaborative Work Plan for Implementation of the Common Core State Standards

Innovation Configuration Map

Many districts and schools have begun adopting and aligning the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics. Unfortunately, adoption and alignment does not translate into high-quality implementation. There is not a common way for districts and schools to identify how to systematically move forward with implementation. LEAs need a tool that can help them identify the research-based best practices for standards implementation. Innovation configuration maps, introduced by Hord, Hirsch, and Roy (2005), can help create common language and begin to assist states in moving toward a more systemic approach to implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

The purpose of an innovation configuration map is to help set and assess implementation goals. An innovation configuration map identifies research-based key attributes of the work, the highest levels of desired outcomes, and the incremental variables that lead to those levels. Innovation configurations can add clarity by providing descriptive actions as practiced by different role groups. It is a way to define quality and measure fidelity. An innovation configuration map creates a descriptive vision of what implementation looks like in action. It can be used to:

- Analyze the current status.
- Create precise plans and access sufficient resources for implementation.
- Assess implementation.

This innovation configuration map can enhance a LEAs' ability to assess improvement needs and develop solutions to address those needs. In addition, LEAs can use this tool to build and sustain continuous systemic supports for standards implementation. It also will allow LEAs to better assist with developing and assessing clear standards implementation goals that focus on aligning assessments and development of instructional materials.

Key Components

An innovation configuration can include the following components:

- Key Attributes—the research-based factors that ensure high-level implementation
- Desired Outcomes—the most ideal way of implementing per constituent group
- Ideal Descriptors—identifies the highest quality of implementation and describes what the constituent will be doing at the highest level of implementation (identified on the left side of the map)
- Continuum of Behaviors—levels of implementation
- Constituents—groups involved in implementation

Constituency: Local Education Agency

KEY ATTRIBUTE: <i>Curriculum</i>			
DESIRED OUTCOME: <i>Creates model curricula that articulates and clarifies the expectations of the Common Core State Standards.</i>			
4 (Innovating)	3 (Implementing)	2 (Progressing)	1 (Beginning)
Creates model curricula that articulate high expectations, based on rigorous content and practices that link to student learning and clearly define the intended learner results and demonstrates connections to effective learning strategies.	Creates a framework to develop model curricula that link to effective learning strategies.	Share resources to assist LEAS in creating curricula that link to and demonstrates connections to effective learning strategies.	Does not create model curricula to clarify the standards.

Ideal Descriptors

Continuum of Behaviors

The following innovation configuration map was adapted from Hord, Hirsh, and Roy (2005).

Curriculum

Successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards that increases levels of student learning requires a <i>curriculum</i> to be a well-defined set of research-based experiences in which students and instructors are engaged to attain understanding and achievement of outcomes and expectations aligned to the standards.			
4 (Innovating)	3 (Implementing)	2 (Progressing)	1 (Beginning)
Desired Outcome: <i>Translate the standards to support implementation.</i>			
Collaborates with practitioners, content organizations, and postsecondary institutions to identify gaps and translate the standards to help ensure a clear and common understanding and to determine the underlying skills in the standards. Shares tools and specific examples that clearly articulate the characteristics of successful academic performance and that can be used to align and improve curricula.			
Desired Outcome: <i>Develop tools and evaluations to help identify and select appropriate resources and materials.</i>			
Engages a wide variety of stakeholders in the adaptation of existing tools or the development and dissemination of new tools and evaluations to help identify and select appropriate materials based on rigorous research-based practices that link to student learning, clearly define the intended learner results, and demonstrate connections to effective learning strategies.			
Desired Outcome: <i>Create elaborations of the standards to help educators envision how they play out in classrooms.</i>			
Engages with partners (including postsecondary institutions, businesses and community organizations) to develop rigorous instructional units and curricular tools that identify real world applications of the standards, including cross curricular connections, cognitive expectations and sequencing to assist classroom teachers in creating opportunities for moving all			

students to higher levels of academic growth as required by the standards.			
--	--	--	--

Resources:

Binkley, M., Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., & Ripley, M. (with Rumble, M.). (2010). *Defining 21st century skills* (Draft White Paper 1). Melbourne, Australia: Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills. Retrieved December 15, 2010, from <http://cms.education.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/19B97225-84B1-4259-B423-4698E1E8171A/115804/defining21stcenturyskills.pdf>

Learning Point Associates. (2010). *Curriculum alignment* [Website]. Naperville, IL: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from <http://www.learningpt.org/expertise/schoolimprovement/curriculumAlignment.php>

New Technology High School. (2007). *New Technology High School* [Website]. Napa, CA: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from <http://www.newtechhigh.org>

Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2009). *Framework for 21st century learning*. Tucson, AZ: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from http://www.p21.org/documents/P21_Framework.pdf

Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2009). *The MILE guide: Milestones for improving learning and education*. Tucson, AZ: Author. Retrieved December 16, 2010, from http://www.p21.org/documents/MILE_Guide_091101.pdf

Wallingford Public Schools. (2007). *Social studies: K–12 enduring understandings and essential questions*. Wallingford, CT: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from http://www.wallingford.k12.ct.us/uploaded/Curriculum/SOCIAL_STUDIES_K-12/SS_K-12_EUs_&EQs.pdf

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2001). *Understanding by design*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Instructional Leadership

Successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards that increases levels of student learning requires <i>instructional leadership</i> that creates a vision for teaching and learning portraying a clear commitment to learning for understanding.			
4 (Innovating)	3 (Implementing)	2 (Progressing)	1 (Beginning)
<i>. Desired Outcome: Create a clear vision for teaching and learning.</i>			
Creates a vision for teaching and learning in collaboration with students, staff, parents, postsecondary institutions, business leaders, and community members that shows a commitment to the expectation that all students can achieve success and outlines a set of explicit principles of learning and instructional design principles based on research that ensures meaningful learning opportunities for each individual student.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Disseminate and promote research-based instructional practices that are aligned with the vision of the standards</i>			
Collaborates with practitioners, postsecondary institutions and professional associations to identify studies and reports of research-based instructional practices that are linked to student achievement and creates clear definitions and examples of instructional practices classroom teachers can use to create opportunities for moving all students to higher levels of academic growth as required by the standards.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Develop instructional models to help teachers envision what the high-quality, standards-based instruction looks like in practice.</i>			
Collaboratively develops and collects descriptions of the strategies with sample lessons and videos using a wide array of research-based instructional strategies connected to standards-based instruction to help teachers envision what high-quality, standards-based instruction looks like in			

practice.			
<i>Desired Outcome:</i> <i>Develop the instructional leadership of school, district, and community leaders.</i>			
Develops instructional leaders by collaboratively creating training programs for district and school instructional leaders based on the standards; includes a “how-to guide” focusing on high quality, responsive, and engaging instruction.			

Resources:

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (n.d.). *Inside teaching: A living archive of practice* [Website]. San Francisco, CA: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from <http://gallery.carnegiefoundation.org/insideteaching/>

Coalition of Essential Schools Northwest/Small Schools Project. (2004). *Instructional framework: Rigor, relevance, relationship*. Seattle, WA: Author. Retrieved December 16, 2010, from http://www.wsascd.org/downloads/annual_conf_archives_2007/instfrmwk.pdf

Costa, Arthur L., and Robert J. Garmston. (2002) *Cognitive coaching: a foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Lewis, C. (2002). *Lesson study: A handbook of teacher-led instructional change*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. (n.d.). *PreK–12 standards: Keys to learning*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from <http://www.mcrel.org/keystolearning/Default.aspx>

Pellegrino, J. W. (2006). *Rethinking and redesigning curriculum, instruction and assessment: What contemporary research and theory suggests*. Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy. Retrieved December 16, 2010, from <http://www.skillscommission.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/Rethinking-and-Redesigning.pdf>

Stepanek, Jennifer, et al. (2007) *Leading lesson study: a practical guide for teachers and facilitators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Professional Development

Successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards that increases levels of student learning requires <i>professional development</i> that is a “comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to improving teachers’ and principals’ effectiveness” in improving student learning (National Staff Development Council, 2010).			
4 (Innovating)	3 (Implementing)	2 (Progressing)	1 (Beginning)
<i>Desired Outcome: Develop a systemic approach that sustains and supports communities of practice, including professional learning communities.</i>			
Creates a systemic plan that outlines expectations and best practices and offers tools that facilitate an atmosphere of support and collaboration for internal <i>and</i> external groups to continuously work together regarding implementation issues.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Create a clearinghouse of research-based best practices.</i>			
Collaborates with postsecondary institutions to create a digital clearinghouse based on research-based instructional models, by documenting and leveraging the strengths of exemplars through the identification, digital documentation, and replication of best practices so that all stakeholders know what is required and how to do it.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Build the capacity of multiple stakeholders to support the continued development of the knowledge and skills needed by educators to teach the standards.</i>			
Collaboratively creates professional development modules to build the capacity of school and district leaders to support the development of educators’ knowledge and skills related to the standards; includes a how-to guide on implementing and monitoring curriculum, assessments, and instruction (identification of high-quality instruction), including the ability to give feedback and use data to respond to personalized student learning goals, classroom instruction, and intervention strategies.			

Desired Outcome: *Allocates adequate resources to support implementation of the standards.*

Involves policymakers at the local level throughout the implementation process so that they can see firsthand the time and structures school and district staff require to support standards implementation and that individuals require time to learn and change in order to implement new standards.

Resources:

CCSSO (2010). *Edsteps*. Washington, DC: CCSSO. Retrieved <http://www.edsteps.org/CCSSO/Home.aspx>

The College Board. (2010). *Pre-AP: Preparing every student for college* [Website]. New York: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from <http://professionals.collegeboard.com/k-12/prepare/pre-ap>

Croft, A., Cogshall, J., Dolan, M., & Powers, E. (with Killion, J.). (2010). *Job-embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it done well*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/JEPD%20Issue%20Brief.pdf>

Hord, S. M., Hirsh, S., & Roy, P. (2005). *Moving NSDC's staff development standards into practice innovation configurations, Volume II*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Mitchell, R. (n.d.). *Standards in practice: Standards and looking at student work*. Bloomington, IN: National School Reform Faculty. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from http://www.nsrffharmony.org/protocol/doc/standards_lasw.pdf

Newmann, F. M., King, B. M., & Carmichael, D. L. (2009). *Teaching for authentic intellectual work*. Minneapolis, MN: Tascia Books.

Newmann, F. M., Secada, W. G., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). *A guide to authentic instruction and assessment: Vision, standards and scoring*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Assessment

<p>Successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards that increases levels of student learning requires <i>assessments</i> that include the processes used to measure student mastery of the standards and the delivery of curriculum experiences through both formal and informal methods (Pellegrino, 2006).</p>			
<p><i>Desired Outcome: Develop training programs to help educators build summative, benchmark, interim, and formative assessments aligned to the standards.</i></p>			
4 (Innovating)	3 (Implementing)	2 (Progressing)	1 (Beginning)
<p>Creates training programs in collaboration with postsecondary institutions and other stakeholders to develop the capacity of school and district leaders to assess the impact of the standards on student learning and develop more complex assessments to measure student learning through higher order thinking. Addresses systemic capacity by including the topics of innovative assessment practices, multiple strategies, and models of the assessment of the standards and how to recognize positive results and refine programs as needed.</p>			
<p><i>Desired Outcome: Develop the capacity of school and district leaders to use assessment data that identify the impact of the standards.</i></p>			
<p>Makes investments in flexible, ongoing, and innovative training for teachers and other education leaders to increase their assessment literacy skills focusing on using data to inform and improve teaching and learning.</p>			

<i>Desired Outcome: Participate, implement, and support the work of the statewide assessment system.</i>			
Provides ongoing, long-term, multiple stakeholder communication, training, and support in the critical elements of the statewide assessment system. All stakeholders receive timely information on the research, design, security, management, reporting, implementation, administration, scoring, and new technology and accountability requirements of this system and are trained on how to use the new systems that support it. Partnerships with other schools and districts are leveraged to save money, time, and resources.			

Resources:

Ainsworth, Larry, and Donald Viegut. (2006). *Common formative assessments: How to connect standards-based instruction and assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Beatty, A. (2010). *Best practices for state assessment systems, part I: Summary of a workshop*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved December 16, 2010, from http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12906

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139–144.

Darling-Hammond, L. (n.d.). *Performance counts: Assessment systems that support high-quality learning*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved December 13, 2010, http://flareassessment.org/resources/Paper_Assessment_DarlingHammond.pdf

Darling-Hammond, L., & Adamson, F. (2010). *Beyond basic skills: The role of performance assessments in achieving 21st century standards of learning*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Retrieved December 16, 2010, from http://edpolicy.stanford.edu/pages/pubs/pub_docs/assessment/scope_pa_overview.pdf

Florida Department of Education. (2010). *Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC): Application for Race to the Top Comprehensive Assessment Systems Competition*. Tallahassee, FL: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from <http://www.fldoe.org/parcc/pdf/apprtcasc.pdf>

Guskey, Thomas R. (2000). Grading Policies that work against standards...and how to fix them. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(620), 20-29.

Heritage, Margaret. (2010). *Formative assessment: Making it happen in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Herman, J. L., Osmundson, E., & Dietel, R. (2010). *Benchmark assessment for improved learning* (AACC Report). Los Angeles: University of California. Retrieved December 16, 2010, from http://www.aacompcenter.org/pdf/R2_benchmark_report_Herman.indd.pdf

Marzano, Robert (2010). *Formative Assessment and Standards Based Grading*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Library.

O'Connor, Kenneth (2007). The Last Frontier: Tackling the Grading Dilemma. *Ahead of the Curve: The Power of Assessment to transform Teaching and Learning*. p. 127-145.

Perie, M., Marion, S., Gong, B., & Wurtzel, J. (2007). *The role of interim assessments in a comprehensive assessment system: A Policy Brief*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute. Retrieved December 16, 2010, from <http://www.nciea.org/publications/PolicyBriefFINAL.pdf>

Reeves, Douglas (2004). Putting It All Together: Standards, Assessment, and Accountability. *Accountability for Learning: How Teachers and School Leaders can take Charge*. p. 106-116.

State of Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2010). *SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium*. Olympia, WA: Author. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from <http://www.k12.wa.us/smarter/>

Stiggins, Rick (2007). Assessment FOR Learning: An Essential Foundation of Productive Instruction. *Ahead of the Curve: The Power of Assessment to transform Teaching and Learning*. p. 59-76.

Wormeli, Rick (2006). *Fair Isn't Always Equal: Assessing & Grading in the Differentiated Classroom*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

—DRAFT—

Policy

Successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards that increases levels of student learning requires a focus on <i>policies</i>, formal and informal guidelines that define the parameters for action through which an organization carries out its priorities to influence systemic decisions.			
4 (Innovating)	3 (Implementing)	2 (Progressing)	1 (Beginning)
<i>Desired Outcome: Create a feedback system that supports local implementation.</i>			
Develops a continuum of evaluation for implementation based on goals rooted in how well students demonstrate academic growth toward learning meaningful standards; creates a comprehensive feedback system that is ongoing and timely with a focus on identifying and replicating exemplary practices.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Align evaluation systems for principals and teachers to the expectations of the standards.</i>			
Connects evaluation systems to the rigorous expectations of the standards so that all educators and administrators are prepared to impart to students the ambitious cognitive skills expected by the standards.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Align all policies to systematically support implementation of the standards.</i>			
Creates an alignment of all educational policies to support and connect to implementation of the standards, ensuring that the policies that are implemented are congruent with other policy initiatives and support implementation of the standards.			

Desired Outcome: Ensure allocation of adequate resources for implementation.

Considers how to more effectively align education funding programs to meet the needs of the goals with respect to instructional and curricular practices demanded by adoption of the standards. Includes policymakers in the discussions regarding standards implementation. Conducts research with the best available data to evaluate the level at which students are currently performing, allowing policymakers to allocate current resources most appropriately.

Internal and External Alignment of Policies and Practices

Successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards that increases levels of student learning requires a focus on <i>internal and external alignment</i> , connection and configuration of various systemic elements including people, practices, policies, and structures.			
4 (Innovating)	3 (Implementing)	2 (Progressing)	1 (Beginning)
<i>Desired Outcome: Articulate and create tools and methods to assist educators in creating an aligned system for learning.</i>			
Articulates a vision of success, describing in detail various levels of alignment and implementation success, identifying best practices for aligning and implementing the standards; creates tools and methods to help schools design an aligned system for learning, incorporating points of view from a broad cross-section of stakeholders.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Clearly articulate the many stages of implementation.</i>			
Invests significant efforts in mapping the transition from current state standards to the new standards in collaboration with various stakeholders (e.g., postsecondary institutions and the business community) and creates an aligned framework for strengthening curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development models.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Create a clear internal mission and vision to which all policies, structures, and practices are aligned.</i>			
Internally aligns department programs, policies, and activities so that there is a consistent vision, mission, and message.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Create structures that support and empower implementation of the standards.</i>			
Assigns responsibility within the district and school, identifying entities responsible for each part of the implementation process (e.g., creation of content area implementation advisory committees) and a process for continuous input and reflection.			

Resources:

Conley, David T. (2010) *College and career ready: Helping all students succeed beyond high school*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Waters, Louise Bay, and Kiley Walsh O'Meara. (2008). *Defining a comprehensive aligned instructional system to ensure powerful teaching and learning for every student in every classroom*. Mill Valley, CA: Stupski Foundation.

http://www.stupski.org/documents/Defining%20CAIS_01-08.pdf .

Walsh, Kiley (2006). *Aligning an instructional system to close the gap. Illinois school district U-46*. Mill Valley, CA: Stupski Foundation.

http://www.stupski.org/documents/U-46_report_11_1_06.pdf

Communication

Successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards that increases levels of student learning requires a focus on <i>communication</i> , a process of collective thinking, inquiry, and sharing that leads to a clearer, common understanding.			
4 (Innovating)	3 (Implementing)	2 (Progressing)	1 (Beginning)
<i>Desired Outcome: Translates the standards to support broader understanding of intent and implications.</i>			
Communicates the intent and implications using school board meetings, inservice time, informal meetings, and print publications to focus attention on standards so that all stakeholders become aware of the value for students, schools, districts, and the community.			
<i>Desired Outcome: Communicate the levels of expectations of the standards to all stakeholders.</i>			
Creates a clear, consistent message, outlining the processes, purposes, characteristics, resource requirements, and real-life expectations and examples of the standards, used to continuously communicate to the school board; students; parents; and other school, district, and community leaders to better prepare stakeholders to understand what “college and career ready” means, why the standards are essential, and how these expectations may affect achievement reporting.			

Resources:

National PTA. (2010). *Parents’ Guide to Student Success*. Alexandria, VA: National PTA.

CCSSO (2010). *Common Core state standards communications toolkit*. Washington, DC: CCSSO. Retrieved http://programs.ccsso.org/link/CCSSO_Standards_Toolkit.pdf

CCSSO (2010). *Messaging toolkit*. Washington, DC: CCSSO. Retrieved <http://programs.ccsso.org/link/CCSSI%20Toolkit%20Sept%202010.pdf>

References

Hord, S. M., Hirsh, S., & Roy, P. (2005). *Moving NSDC's staff development standards into practice innovation configurations*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

National Staff Development Council. (2010). *Definition of professional development*. Dallas, TX: Author. Retrieved January 14, 2011, from <http://www.nsd.org/standfor/definition.cfm>

Pellegrino, J. W. (2006). *Rethinking and redesigning curriculum, instruction and assessment: What contemporary research and theory suggests*. Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy. Retrieved January 14, 2011, from <http://www.tc.umn.edu/~cliao/Pellegrino-Rethinking-and-Redesigning.pdf>