12-31-2004

Teachers' perceptions and attitudes regarding curriculum mapping

Teresa Ann Truesdale
Eastern Illinois University
This research is a product of the graduate program in Elementary Education at Eastern Illinois University.
Find out more about the program.

Recommended Citation

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow these to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Teresa Truesdale   _8/14/05_

Author's Signature   Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University **NOT** allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

_____

_____

_____

Author's Signature   Date

Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding
Curriculum Mapping

By

Teresa Ann Truesdale

THESIS

SUMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Science in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2005

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITIED ABOVE

8/14/05
DATE

Linda M. Reven
THESIS DIRECTOR

8 - 14 - 05
DATE

Merribeth D. Bruning
DEPARTMENT HEAD

8/14/05
DATE

Mahmood Butt
THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

8 - 14 - 05
DATE

Richard G. NeSmith
THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

Abstract

Curriculum mapping is a technique that can be used to view the actual curriculum. Every aspect of what is being taught to students is recorded in detail. Through teacher collaboration the content, skills and assessments at each grade level are thoroughly examined and compared. Therefore, teachers can immediately recognize the potential improvements curriculum mapping can foster. Curriculum mapping reveals possible gaps and/or repetitions in learning. Curriculum mapping therefore represents the real curriculum, not what is perceived to be the curriculum. Survey data were collected to determine how teacher attitudes are affected by curriculum mapping. The subjects in this study were kindergarten through sixth grade elementary education teachers (n=54). The Truesdale Survey of Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping was mailed in early May/June 2005 and distributed to each teacher. Teachers responded to 28 items concerning their perceptions of the impact of curriculum mapping within their school district. Based on the data, teacher perceptions of curriculum mapping were shown to be affected by the size of the community in which the school was located.

Dedication

This research is dedicated to the two most significant individuals in my life.

Sherry Carr

My mom, Sherry Carr, has been my biggest cheerleader throughout my life. I am proud to be her daughter and could not have asked for more in a Mother. She is a wonderful listener, an unselfish giver, a Christian example and my friend. Her unfailing love, encouragement and prayers have been instrumental in the success of my research.

Jim Truesdale

My husband, Jim Truesdale, is the man I love and the individual with whom I have chosen to share my life. He has been my faithful and understanding supporter throughout my research. His humor, jokes, thoughtful kindness, and caring strength helped me accomplish my goals. Without him life would be incomplete.

I cannot thank either of them enough for all their prayers and support.

Thank you.

Acknowledgements

Dr. Linda Reven

I thankfully recognize the contributions of my thesis advisor, Dr. Linda Reven. Dr. Reven skillfully helped me through each chapter of my research. She gave of her time, knowledge and energies, expecting nothing in return. It was a pleasure to work in the company of Dr. Reven. Her loyal dedication to my research project was extremely touching.

Dr. Mahmood Butt and Dr. Richard NeSmith

I would also like to acknowledge and thank the additional members of my thesis committee, Dr. Mahmood Butt and Dr. Richard NeSmith. Their willingness to serve on my committee and spend countless hours deliberating over my research was truly a blessing.

Table of Contents

Chapter   **Page**

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

Importance of the Study

As the new school year approaches, imagine that every teacher knows exactly what his/her students were taught the previous year and precisely what they will be learning the following year. Teachers would immediately be able to start the year with material and lessons that adequately build on the students' prior knowledge, consequently sending students on to the next grade level well prepared and ready to learn. This kind of knowledge is attainable through the use of curriculum mapping. Curriculum mapping is a way to view the actual curriculum. Every aspect of what is taught to students is written down in detail. Through teacher collaboration the content, skills and assessments at each grade level are thoroughly examined and compared. Teachers can immediately recognize the potential improvements curriculum mapping can foster. For example, if every grade level does a unit on Space, curriculum mapping would reveal any overlap in student learning as well as any gaps in learning. Therefore, curriculum mapping represents the real curriculum that is implemented by teachers and not what is perceived to be the curriculum. District curriculum mapping ties schools into a total learning community where teachers in each building know exactly what is occurring in the other buildings of the district. By mapping a school district's curriculum, the teachers, administrators and parents are able to clearly see the cumulative impact of daily learning activities.

Since little research currently exists on this topic, the impact of curriculum mapping and teacher attitude in regard to its implementation will be addressed in this research study.

Statement of the Problem

How are teachers' perceptions and attitudes affected by the implementation of curriculum mapping in their school district?

Definitions of Terms

- Curriculum- refers to the courses of study offered by an educational institution.

- Curriculum Development- involves the process of gathering, sorting and synthesizing relevant information from many sources in order to design and enhance learning experiences.

- Curriculum Mapping- is a procedure for collecting data about the actual curriculum in a school district using the school calendar as an organizer. Data are gathered in a format that allows each teacher to present an overview of his/her students' actual learning experiences (Jacobs 1997).

- Elementary School- refers to an educational setting consisting of grade levels kindergarten through sixth.

- Large Community- refers to a community with more than one hundred thousand residents.

- Medium Community- refers to a community with more than thirty thousand residents, but less than sixty thousand residents.

- Small Community- refers to a community with less than one thousand residents.

- Standards- refer to what students enrolled in public schools should know and be able to do as a result of their schooling according to state and national guidelines.

- Teacher Collaboration- refers to a program model in which a team of teachers works together to assist students in the classroom or achieve professional goals.

- The Truesdale Survey of Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping - refers to the survey instrument developed by the author to obtain data regarding teacher perspectives and attitudes.

Assumptions

The following assumptions will underlie this study:

1. The effect of curriculum mapping on teacher attitude is a valuable topic worthy of research.

2. Teachers will conscientiously respond to the items on the survey.

3. Teachers will complete the survey to the best of their ability.

4. The subjects from whom data will be collected will be kindergarten through sixth grade elementary education teachers.

5. The Truesdale Survey of Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping will provide a representation of teacher attitudes. Although the validity and reliability of the survey instrument has not been established, it will provide a means for initial data collection regarding teacher attitudes.

6. Teachers participating in this survey will be familiar with the procedures involved in curriculum mapping as designed by Dr. Jacobs.

7. Teachers in the school districts will receive identical surveys.

8. There will be one distribution of the survey during the spring semester and a follow-up mailing to non-respondents.

Delimitations

The following delimitations underlie this study.

1. The study will be limited to kindergarten through sixth grade elementary education teachers.

2. The study will be limited to school districts currently using curriculum mapping.

3. Data obtained will be limited to teacher responses to the items on <u>The Truesdale Survey of Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping</u> .

4. The survey respondents will be limited to teachers with previous experience using curriculum mapping.

5. The survey is limited to one distribution in the spring semester and a follow-up mailing to non-respondents.

6. Data gathered will be limited to regular education classrooms.

Limitations

The following limitations of this study include.

1. The use of kindergarten through sixth grade elementary education teachers limits the generalizability of the results to other grade levels such as high school.

2. The use of school districts in the Midwest limits the generalizability to other geographical areas such as the South.

3. The use of regular education classrooms will limit the generalizability of the results to special education classrooms.

4. The focus on curriculum mapping limits the generalizability of the data to other forms of curriculum development.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

This chapter will review literature related to curriculum development and teacher attitudes as they relate to curriculum mapping. The information will be divided into three basic areas: the principles of curriculum mapping, the implementation of curriculum mapping in curriculum development, and the implementation of curriculum development on the attitudes of teachers.

Principles of Curriculum Mapping

In the 1970's and early 1980's Fenwick English was a strong advocate of curriculum mapping. He stated that "curriculum mapping breaks with traditional curriculum practices, by focusing on what is really being taught" (English, 1980, p.558). During the early days of curriculum mapping, data were obtained through interviews or surveys given to educators. The amount of time spent on various learning topics was the main focus of early attempts at curriculum mapping. Data collected by a curriculum coordinator/developer was analyzed to determine its correspondence with the recommended curriculum guide (English, 1983). Thus, a third party attempted to align the actual curriculum with the approved curriculum as the completed surveys and interviews were reviewed. According to English, the curriculum guide of the school district was not the exact curriculum, because he believed the curriculum of a school was ultimately designed and controlled by the classroom teacher.

Although the term curriculum mapping has been synonymous with education in various forms for the last few decades; its full potential was not recognized until its

recent evolution by Heidi Hayes Jacobs. Calendar-based curriculum mapping was developed and popularized by Jacobs in the late 1980's.

As an educator and consultant, Jacobs began to see the need for a calendar based curriculum plan. She had teachers of all subjects and grade levels write down in detail every aspect of what was actually taught in their classrooms on a yearly basis. These curriculum maps were then compared at the school and district level to provide a realistic picture of the authentic school curriculum. Curriculum mapping is defined by Jacobs (1997), "as a procedure for collecting data about the actual curriculum in a school district using the school calendar as an organizer. Data are gathered in a format that allows each teacher to present an overview of his/her students' actual learning experiences" (p. 61). In her book, *Mapping the Big Picture*, Jacobs (1997) states, "Our students need us to know their experiences over the course of time. They need us to know what's really going on in their daily classes as they move among teachers and subjects. They need us to know and give credence to their work from year to year. With that information, possibilities emerge" (p. 5). Curriculum mapping involves increased communication among teachers, principals and the superintendent in a school district. Jacobs has developed a sequence of procedures for implementing curriculum mapping in a school district. There are seven phases used in creating curriculum maps that are based on the school calendar year (Jacobs, 1997).

Phase 1:

Collecting data is phase one in curriculum mapping. Each teacher completes a broad calendar based content map about what he/she teaches during the academic year.

According to Jacobs (1997), compiling this portion of the map requires approximately one hour. During this phase she asks a teacher to explain three major elements of the classroom curriculum: processes and skills emphasized, concepts and topics taught, and assessments of learning conducted.

Phase 2:

Asking teachers to read through the compiled map of the school while assuming the role of an editor is phase two. This phase requires that educators read the maps individually and without bias to gain information about the entire school. Once teachers have familiarized themselves with the maps the editing process begins. In the editing process teachers are identifying areas of repetition or gaps in learning; checking for appropriate alignment with standards; documenting assessments; and noting potential areas for integration. If problems are detected they are not to be corrected during this phase, just identified (Jacobs, 1997).

Phase 3:

During this phase, small heterogeneous groups of six to eight teachers from different grades and departments share their individual findings about the map. Each group compiles a sheet of areas within the curriculum that need further attention (Jacobs, 1997).

Phase 4:

This phase requires a large group review with all faculty members in attendance. The small group findings from the previous phase are posted for the large group to view. The large group looks for patterns to emerge and makes comments (either specific or general). At this point no final judgments or revisions take place. The large group may break into

smaller groups or stay together as a large group if the number of faculty is small. Once

that decision is made, the faculty can begin moving from reviewing to revising the

curriculum maps (Jacobs, 1997).

Phase 5:

In this phase members of the faculty look for areas of the curriculum that can be revised

without delay. At this point sections of the curriculum that are repeated can be examined,

discussed, and resolved by members of different grade levels quite easily. Teachers can

also sort through the data collected to acknowledge items that will need more time and

effort to adequately revise. There may be parts of the curriculum that would require

assistance from the principal or other administrators in order for curriculum revision to

occur (Jacobs, 1997).

Phase 6:

Long-term revisions to the curriculum fall into phase six. These would involve areas that

must be discussed and researched in order for the best solutions to be found. According to

Jacobs (1997), this type of long range planning should replace the curriculum committee

meetings of the past. Educators can now view the actual curriculum map and no longer

speculate about what is perceived to be the curriculum. Therefore, meetings addressing

curricular change are more purposeful and efficient and result in a wide range of

possibilities and solutions being developed (Jacobs, 1997).

Phase 7:

The final phase of the process of curriculum mapping is ongoing. This phase gives

ownership of the map to the individual teachers as they constantly review, change, add,

and integrate maps. The world around the school is constantly changing and the curriculum of a school must change in order to meet the needs of its students (Jacobs, 1997).

Jacob addresses several specific ways in which curriculum mapping can be used in curriculum development. In an interview conducted by Brandt (1991), Jacobs shows the correlation between curriculum mapping and interdisciplinary curriculum. In order to effectively find areas in which to place interdisciplinary units within the curriculum, teachers must identify the timeline of what is taught in all subject areas. By mapping a school district's curriculum teachers are able to clearly see the natural overlaps that occur in learning. Therefore, areas of natural overlap become areas for authentic learning through interdisciplinary units of study.

In an interview by Perkins-Gough (2003), Jacobs discusses how the computer age has taken curriculum mapping to a new electronic level. Curriculum mapping has the potential to facilitate attempts to align the curriculum with content standards. With new and better electronic programs teachers can instantly add information about content and assessment directly to curriculum maps. A school that has access to computer integration can immediately view changes to maps in all subjects and grade levels within a district.

Implementation of Curriculum Mapping in Curriculum Development

This section will focus on the current literature relating to the use of curriculum mapping in curriculum development.

Miller-Whitehead (2002) conducted a study of instruction, objectives and curricular goals in grades K-12 pertaining to student use of computers and technology in science. This study employed survey data and student achievement scores from the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Data were obtained from school systems in six states (i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee). It was found that students who used computers more often in science received lower science achievement scores than those who did not. Through curriculum mapping educators found that computer usage in the science classroom was not an essential form of instruction in regard to meeting the science curriculum standards. In this study, curriculum mapping helped to reveal a lack of alignment between the mode of instruction used and the science standards. The curriculum maps developed in the target school systems were used to show that the use of computers did not align well with the science standards.

Andrews and Wheeler (1994) implemented a study to contrast teaching style and theoretical orientation in preservice and inservice teachers. The study used curriculum mapping as a tool to assist preservice and inservice teachers in understanding the curriculum. Participants were language arts methods teachers (n=107) in graduate and undergraduate classes. The study examined the difference between teachers' scores on the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (TORP) and scores on the Gregorc Style Delineator. The TORP measures viewpoints about reading strategy instruction from an extremely controlled approach to an undefined holistic approach. The Gregorc Style Delineator measures the quantity of structure and concreteness innate within individuals.

The analysis revealed that teachers need to create more individualized assignments based on a teacher/student personal style orientation.

In an article by Husted (2000), curriculum mapping was used as a device to improve theater education within the school's curriculum. The maps revealed areas of strength and weakness in the theater arts program. By revealing these areas revisions could be made to the existing curriculum, therefore improving the theater program and consequently enhancing student performance.

Implementation of Curriculum Development on the Attitudes of Teachers

The focal point of this section will be the current literature relating to the implementation of curriculum change and teacher attitudes.

Berlin (1996) conducted a longitudinal study of teachers to determine whether The Berlin-White Action Research Model (BWARM) enhanced teacher attitudes towards curriculum development. The BWARM is a program intended to prepare, support, and sustain teachers in the development, execution, and assessment of innovations in their daily curriculum and classrooms. The five-year-long study of elementary education teachers (n=92) suggested that the program did improve teacher attitudes in relation to educational innovations and educational research. In addition, the research showed that teachers were more willing to implement innovations into their own classrooms using this model, therefore creating a better learning environment. After implementing the BWARM, teachers began to include inquiry and reflection about the school day into their daily lesson plans.

A study to determine the effects of professional development on teacher attitudes was completed by Bainer and Wright (1998). The elementary teachers (n=59) participated in a constructivist professional development program. At the end of the year-long project a sampling of teachers was chosen and interviewed. Data focused on the long-range impact of the intervention, teacher attitudes, and barriers to implementation. The results suggested that teacher attitude was improved if teachers were given a voice in regard to their own professional development. The authors of the study concluded that teachers then develop programs which lead to changes in teaching due to their improved attitudes and ownership of the program.

Mills (2001) describes the initial implementation of curriculum mapping as a mandated statewide school improvement plan in Arkansas. As an essential part of the state plan, curriculum mapping was viewed as a long-term commitment, not a curriculum development fad. Curriculum mapping has the potential to save Arkansas school districts time, money and resources, while at the same time improving student learning. But Miller acknowledged that in order for the state proposal to succeed, new and veteran teachers must be knowledgeable about and committed to the process of curriculum mapping.

Summary of the Literature Review

Although limited research has been performed involving curriculum mapping, one research report indicated that teachers have used curriculum mapping as a tool to align the curriculum with the applicable standards. Furthermore, curriculum mapping has been used as a mechanism to assist teachers in fully understanding the existing curriculum and improving specific instructional programs.

Due to the extremely limited amount of available research, there was no indication of whether curriculum mapping positively or negatively affects teacher attitude. Therefore, the proposed research will address teacher perceptions and attitudes towards curriculum mapping.

Chapter III

Research Design

Procedures involved in this study are reviewed in this chapter which is organized in five sections. They are overall design; hypothesis, subjects; instrumentation; and procedure.

Overall Design

A survey was administered to determine teacher attitudes and perceptions regarding the implementation of curriculum mapping across schools/communities varying in size (small, medium, or large). The data were collected in May/June 2005. The teachers' responses were obtained through a mail survey. Teachers in the target schools responded to 28 items concerning their personal attitudes and perceptions regarding curriculum mapping.

Hypothesis

The implementation of curriculum mapping in a school district positively influences the attitudes of elementary education teachers regardless of the size of the community.

Subjects

The subjects in this study were kindergarten through sixth grade elementary education teachers (n= 54) in the state of Illinois. The teachers' responses were grouped according to the size of the community in which the school was located (i.e., small n=19; medium n=21; large n=14).

Instrumentation

Data were obtained from <u>The Truesdale Survey of Teachers' Perceptions and</u> <u>Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping</u> (Appendix A). This survey was developed by the researcher. The survey consisted of 28 questions concerning teachers' personal attitudes and perceptions regarding curriculum mapping. The survey was divided into six sections. In the first portion, there were four questions regarding teacher experience (e.g., number of years teaching, current grade level taught, involvement with curriculum mapping). The teachers responded to items one through four by marking the answer that best described their teaching experience and past involvement with curriculum mapping. In the second segment of the survey, there were four questions regarding the respondent's perceptions of the impact of curriculum mapping at his/ her grade level. Similarly, in the third section of the survey, there were seven questions regarding the respondent's perceptions of the impact of curriculum mapping across grade levels. The teachers responded to items five through fifteen using the following Likert Scale: substantial, moderate, little, none, and not applicable.

The fourth and fifth segments of the survey contained statements regarding the impact of the implementation of curriculum mapping within the teachers' school district (items 16-22) and their perceptions of the overall impact of curriculum mapping (items 23 and 24). The teachers responded to items 16 through 24 using the following Likert Scale: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and not applicable. The final section of the survey asked respondents to complete the following four short answer items regarding curriculum mapping.

1. List any other changes that you have made in response to the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district.

2. What are some of the obstacles encountered in implementing curriculum mapping in your school district?

3. What are some factors that have facilitated the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district?

4. Please mention below any further information or issues regarding the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district.

Procedure

Trial Administration

Prior to the survey being distributed to the participants, a trial administration was conducted to confirm that all directions and questions on the survey were clear and understandable. Individuals (n=15) participating in the trial were educators pursuing master's degrees at a university. After the trial, minor adjustments were made to the configuration of the survey instrument.

Selection of Subjects

Since the population being targeted was comprised of educators with prior experience/involvement in curriculum mapping, the researcher performed an internet search to identify elementary schools in Illinois that employ curriculum mapping. The schools invited to participate in the study were selected randomly from the internet generated list. The schools were all situated in Illinois and had implemented curriculum mapping. A total of 198 surveys were distributed.

Permission to Collect Data

The Institutional Review Board at the researcher's University mandated prior authorization be obtained from the school districts whose teachers were asked to participate in the study (Appendix B). The researcher sought and obtained permission to collect data from the superintendents in the individual school districts prior to the mailing of the surveys to the classroom teachers. Superintendents in the selected districts were mailed a letter describing the research in detail (Appendix C) and were asked to mail a letter of permission to the researcher indicating their willingness to have kindergarten through sixth grade teachers from their district participate in the study.

Survey Distribution

After letters of permission had been obtained from the superintendents of each district and filed with the Institutional Review Board, all regular elementary education teachers (n=198) within the target districts were mailed a written letter describing the study in detail (Appendix D), the survey instrument, two copies of the consent form (Appendix E) and a self-addressed stamped return envelope. The white copy of the consent form was to be signed and returned to the researcher while the green copy was to be retained for the teachers' personal records. The teachers were asked to complete and return the survey and the consent form within a two week time frame. The Truesdale Survey of Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping was mailed in May to teachers working in the target school districts.

Second Mailing to Non-respondents

Although the consent form and completed survey were separated upon receipt to maintain teacher confidentiality, the envelopes were coded to allow the researcher to

determine which surveys had not been returned. A second mailing to non-respondents was conducted after the initial deadline had passed. The second mailing contained an updated written letter describing the study in detail (Appendix F), the survey instrument, two copies of the consent form and a stamped return envelope. Teachers were asked to return the survey instrument and the consent form within a two week time period.

Data Analysis

Results were compiled into three different groups according to the size of the community in which the schools are located: small, medium or large. The responses of teachers were analyzed to examine teachers' perceptions of curriculum mapping and determine whether differences were evident when school/community size was used as a basis for comparison.

Chapter IV

Results

This chapter will review the results obtained through the administration of The Truesdale Survey of Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping. A total of 198 surveys were mailed to teachers in the target school districts. After the initial mailing, 54 surveys were returned to the researcher. Six of these surveys were discarded because two were missing consent forms, three indicated they were not involved in curriculum mapping efforts and one had not been completed. After the second mailing, an additional six surveys were received. Therefore, a 27.3% return rate was attained with a total of 54 completed surveys being returned to the researcher. The researcher believes the close proximity of the survey distribution to the conclusion of the school year influenced the survey return rate.

The completed surveys were divided into three categories according to community size for purposes of comparison: small community (i.e., less than 1000 residents living in the school district), medium community (i.e., 30,000 to 60,000 residents living in the school district) and large community (i.e., over 100,000 residents living in the school district). The total number of completed surveys (n=54) included responses from teachers in one small community school (n=19), four medium size community schools (n=21), and one large community school (n=14).

After compiling the data within these groups, the groups were compared in order to discover if school or community size has any bearing on teachers' perceptions of the implementation of curriculum mapping.

Questions 1-4 deal with teaching experience and involvement with curriculum mapping:

Table 1

Question 1: Total number of years in the teaching profession?

Years Teaching Experience

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	1 - 5 yrs	7	36.8	36.8	36.8
		6 - 10 yrs	5	26.3	26.3	63.2
		11 - 15 yrs	3	15.8	15.8	78.9
		16 - 20 yrs	3	15.8	15.8	94.7
		26 - 30 yrs	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	omit	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
		1 - 5 yrs	3	14.3	14.3	28.6
		6 - 10 yrs	3	14.3	14.3	42.9
		11 - 15 yrs	5	23.8	23.8	66.7
		16 - 20 yrs	2	9.5	9.5	76.2
		21 - 25 yrs	3	14.3	14.3	90.5
		26 - 30 yrs	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	omit	2	14.3	14.3	14.3
		6 - 10 yrs	4	28.6	28.6	42.9
		11 - 15 yrs	3	21.4	21.4	64.3
		16 - 20 yrs	2	14.3	14.3	78.6
		26 - 30 yrs	3	21.4	21.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Educators participating in this survey indicated their total number of years in the teaching profession. Overall, a majority of the respondents (61.1%) had taught for less than fifteen years. Teachers with more than sixteen years of experience (29.6%) are in the minority in this study (Table1).

Table 2

Question 2: Had curriculum mapping already been implemented in your district prior to you joining the staff?

Curriculum Mapping Implemented

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	yes	4	21.1	21.1	21.1
		no	15	78.9	78.9	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	yes	7	33.3	33.3	33.3
		no	14	66.7	66.7	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	yes	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		no	13	92.9	92.9	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

The majority of the respondents participating in the survey were already teaching in their school district prior to the implementation of curriculum mapping. Specifically, 77.8% of teachers indicated that curriculum mapping had been implemented after they were hired in the district (Table 2).

Table 3

Question 3: Are you involved in your school district's curriculum mapping efforts?

Curriculum Involvement

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	yes	19	100.0	100.0	100.0
Medium	Valid	yes	21	100.0	100.0	100.0
Large	Valid	yes	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Respondents were asked to confirm their involvement in the school district's curriculum mapping efforts. All of the teachers in the small, medium and large

communities indicated they were involved in curriculum mapping efforts within their school districts (Table 3).

Table 4

Question 4:What grade do you currently teach in your district?

Grade Level Taught

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	omit	4	21.1	21.1	21.1
		K	1	5.3	5.3	26.3
		1st grd	3	15.8	15.8	42.1
		2nd grd	3	15.8	15.8	57.9
		3rd grd	4	21.1	21.1	78.9
		4th grd	3	15.8	15.8	94.7
		5th grd	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	omit	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
		K	1	4.8	4.8	23.8
		1st grd	5	23.8	23.8	47.6
		2nd grd	4	19.0	19.0	66.7
		3rd grd	3	14.3	14.3	81.0
		4th grd	2	9.5	9.5	90.5
		5th grd	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	omit	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		K	3	21.4	21.4	28.6
		1st grd	2	14.3	14.3	42.9
		2nd grd	2	14.3	14.3	57.1
		3rd grd	3	21.4	21.4	78.6
		4th grd	2	14.3	14.3	92.9
		5th grd	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Teachers were asked to mark the grade level that they currently teach within their district. It is important to note that all grade levels except sixth grade were represented in the study and that no single grade level dominates the data pertaining to teachers' perceptions and attitudes regarding the implementation of curriculum mapping (Table 4).

Questions 5-8 deal with the impact of curriculum mapping at the teachers current grade level:

Table 5

Question 5: How much change has occurred (at your grade level) in regard to the processes and skills emphasized in the curriculum due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

Change in Processes/Skills at Grade Level

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Moderate	4	21.1	21.1	21.1
		Little	12	63.2	63.2	84.2
		None	2	10.5	10.5	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	omit	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
		Substantial	6	28.6	28.6	33.3
		Moderate	7	33.3	33.3	66.7
		Little	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Substantial	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Moderate	6	42.9	42.9	50.0
		Little	5	35.7	35.7	85.7
		None	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Among teachers from a small community school, 73.7% indicated that little or no change had occurred in regard to the processes and skills emphasized in the curriculum as a result of curriculum mapping. However, teachers from schools in both the medium (61.9%) and large (50%) communities reported moderate or substantial change in the processes and skills emphasized at their grade level since curriculum mapping had been implemented (Table 5).

Table 6

Question 6: How much change has occurred (at your grade level) in regard to the

content (i.e., essential concepts and topics) emphasized in the curriculum due to the

implementation of curriculum mapping?

Change in Content at Grade Level

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Substantial	1	5.3	5.3	5.3
		Moderate	4	21.1	21.1	26.3
		Little	13	68.4	68.4	94.7
		None	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Substantial	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
		Moderate	8	38.1	38.1	61.9
		Little	7	33.3	33.3	95.2
		None	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Substantial	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Moderate	7	50.0	50.0	57.1
		Little	4	28.6	28.6	85.7
		None	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Respondents (73.7%) from the small community district reported that curriculum mapping had little or no effect on the content taught at their current grade level, while teachers in both large and medium sized communities reported that curriculum mapping had affected the content taught at their grade level. Specifically, 61.9% of those in medium sized communities and 57.1% of those in the large community reported that curriculum mapping had a substantial or moderate effect on the content taught at their grade level (Table 6).

Table 7

Question 7: How much change has occurred (at your grade level) in regard to the

manner in which learning is assessed due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

Change in Assessment at Grade Level

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Moderate	3	15.8	15.8	15.8
		Little	12	63.2	63.2	78.9
		None	4	21.1	21.1	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Substantial	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
		Moderate	7	33.3	33.3	47.6
		Little	11	52.4	52.4	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Moderate	3	21.4	21.4	21.4
		Little	9	64.3	64.3	85.7
		None	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

When asked to report if curriculum mapping had changed the way teachers assess

students, 84.2% of small community and 78.6% of large community teachers felt

curriculum mapping had little or no effect. On the other hand, medium sized district

teachers were divided with 47.6% stating that curriculum mapping had substantially or

moderately affected the way they assessed students. However, 52.4% reported that

curriculum mapping had little effect on the assessments given to students (Table 7).

Table 8

Question 8: To what degree has curriculum mapping changed the way you teach in your classroom?

Change in Teaching at Grade Level

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Substantial	2	10.5	10.5	10.5
		Moderate	5	26.3	26.3	36.8
		Little	5	26.3	26.3	63.2
		None	6	31.6	31.6	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	omit	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
		Substantial	2	9.5	9.5	14.3
		Moderate	7	33.3	33.3	47.6
		Little	8	38.1	38.1	85.7
		None	2	9.5	9.5	95.2
		Not Applicable	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Moderate	7	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Little	4	28.6	28.6	78.6
		None	3	21.4	21.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

The majority of teachers in the small (57.9%) sized district indicated that curriculum mapping had not changed the way they taught in their classrooms. On the contrary the data from teachers in the medium sized communities were difficult to interpret with 42.9% reporting moderate or substantial change and 47.6% reporting little or no change. Likewise, teachers from the large community district were equally divided. Half of the respondents believed that curriculum mapping moderately changed the way they taught and the other half felt little or no change in instruction had occurred due to the implementation of curriculum mapping (Table 8).

Questions 9-15 deal with the impact of curriculum mapping across grade levels:

Table 9

Question 9: How much change has occurred (across grade levels) in regard to the

processes and skills emphasized in the curriculum due to the implementation of

curriculum mapping?

Change in Processes/Skills Across Grade Levels

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Moderate	7	36.8	36.8	36.8
		Little	9	47.4	47.4	84.2
		None	2	10.5	10.5	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	omit	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
		Substantial	2	9.5	9.5	14.3
		Moderate	11	52.4	52.4	66.7
		Little	6	28.6	28.6	95.2
		Not Applicable	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Moderate	4	28.6	28.6	28.6
		Little	6	42.9	42.9	71.4
		None	1	7.1	7.1	78.6
		Not Applicable	3	21.4	21.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Respondents were asked to consider whether curriculum mapping had changed

the processes and skills taught across grade levels. Teachers (61.9%) in the medium sized

communities felt curriculum mapping had moderately or substantially changed the

processes and skills taught across grade levels. Conversely, a majority of teachers

(57.9%) from the small community school responded that curriculum mapping had

produced little or no change in the processes and skills taught across the grade levels in

their district. Once again, responses of the teachers from the large community school

were hard to interrupt with 28.6% reporting moderate change, 50% reporting little or no

change and 21.4% indicating that the item was "not applicable" to their current situation

(Table 9).

Table 10

Question 10: How much change has occurred (across grade levels) in regard to the

content (i.e., essential concepts and topics) emphasized in the curriculum due to the

implementation of curriculum mapping?

Change in Content Across Grade Levels

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Substantial	1	5.3	5.3	5.3
		Moderate	7	36.8	36.8	42.1
		Little	9	47.4	47.4	89.5
		None	1	5.3	5.3	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Substantial	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
		Moderate	12	57.1	57.1	66.7
		Little	6	28.6	28.6	95.2
		None	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Moderate	3	21.4	21.4	21.4
		Little	7	50.0	50.0	71.4
		None	1	7.1	7.1	78.6
		Not Applicable	3	21.4	21.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

When survey participants were questioned regarding the amount of change in

content emphasized across the grade levels, results were varied. Teachers (66.7%) in the

medium sized districts revealed that curriculum mapping had moderately or substantially

changed the content across grade levels. The majority of teachers in the other community

sizes reported that curriculum mapping had little or no impact on the content emphasized

across grade levels. It should be noted that once again three respondents or 21.4% of the

teachers from the large community school indicated that this particular item did not apply to their current situation (Table 10).

Table 11

Question 11: How much change has occurred (across grade levels) in regard to the manner in which learning is assessed due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

Change in Assessment Across Grade Levels

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Moderate	4	21.1	21.1	21.1
		Little	11	57.9	57.9	78.9
		None	3	15.8	15.8	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Substantial	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
		Moderate	7	33.3	33.3	47.6
		Little	10	47.6	47.6	95.2
		Not Applicable	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Moderate	2	14.3	14.3	14.3
		Little	8	57.1	57.1	71.4
		None	1	7.1	7.1	78.6
		Not Applicable	3	21.4	21.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Both the small (73.7%) and large (64.3%) community sized districts revealed that there was little or no change in the manner in which learning was assessed after the implementation of curriculum mapping. However, the medium sized community results were unclear with 47.6% of the teachers reporting moderate or substantial change, 47.6% reporting little change in assessments and one respondent indicating the item was not applicable to his/her current situation. It should be noted that once again three respondents or 21.4% of the teachers from the large community school indicated that this particular item did not apply to their current situation (Table 11).

Table 12

Question 12: To what degree was redundancy within the curriculum reduced due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

Redundancy Reduced

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Substantial	2	10.5	10.5	10.5
		Moderate	7	36.8	36.8	47.4
		Little	9	47.4	47.4	94.7
		None	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Substantial	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
		Moderate	10	47.6	47.6	61.9
		Little	7	33.3	33.3	95.2
		None	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Moderate	4	28.6	28.6	28.6
		Little	9	64.3	64.3	92.9
		Not Applicable	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

A majority of teachers (61.9%) in medium sized communities reported that curriculum mapping had reduced redundancy within the curriculum. The majority of the teachers in the large community size school reported little reduction in redundancy (64.3%), while teachers from the small community school were evenly divided with 47.4% reporting substantial or moderate reduction and 52.6% reporting little or no reduction in redundancy (Table 12).

Table 13

Question 13: Overall, how much has the school curriculum been restructured due to curriculum mapping?

School Curriculum Restructured

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Substantial	1	5.3	5.3	5.3
		Moderate	2	10.5	10.5	15.8
		Little	15	78.9	78.9	94.7
		None	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Substantial	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
		Moderate	11	52.4	52.4	57.1
		Little	7	33.3	33.3	90.5
		None	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Moderate	7	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Little	5	35.7	35.7	85.7
		None	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

When survey participants were asked to report the amount of school curriculum restructuring that had taken place due to the implementation of curriculum mapping, 57.1% of medium sized community teachers and 50% of large sized community teachers reported moderate or substantial change. However, only 15.8% of the small district teachers reported that the curriculum had been moderately or substantially restructured due to the implementation of curriculum mapping (Table 13).

Table 14

Question 14: *To what degree do you perceive improvement in your school district's*

curriculum after the implementation of curriculum mapping?

Perceived Improvement

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Substantial	3	15.8	15.8	15.8
		Moderate	6	31.6	31.6	47.4
		Little	8	42.1	42.1	89.5
		None	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Substantial	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
		Moderate	10	47.6	47.6	66.7
		Little	5	23.8	23.8	90.5
		None	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Substantial	3	21.4	21.4	21.4
		Moderate	7	50.0	50.0	71.4
		Little	2	14.3	14.3	85.7
		None	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

A majority of teachers in the medium (66.7%) and large (71.4%) communities believed that curriculum mapping had substantially or moderately improved the school district's curriculum. On the other hand the teachers from the small community were divided in regard to what degree curriculum mapping had changed their school district's curriculum with 47.4% reporting a substantial or moderate degree of change and 52.6% reporting little or no change (Table 14).

Table 15

Question 15: To what degree has curriculum mapping impacted the way you work with other teachers in your building?

Impact on Working with Other Teachers

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Substantial	3	15.8	15.8	15.8
		Moderate	1	5.3	5.3	21.1
		Little	13	68.4	68.4	89.5
		None	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Substantial	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
		Moderate	5	23.8	23.8	47.6
		Little	7	33.3	33.3	81.0
		None	3	14.3	14.3	95.2
		Not Applicable	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Substantial	3	21.4	21.4	21.4
		Moderate	1	7.1	7.1	28.6
		Little	8	57.1	57.1	85.7
		None	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Teachers from schools in both small (78.9%) and large (71.4%) community sizes indicated that curriculum mapping had little or no bearing on the way the teachers in their buildings worked together. Surprisingly, the results from teachers in medium sized communities were difficult to interpret with 47.6% indicating moderate or substantial change and 47.6% of teachers indicating little or no change (Table 15).

Questions 16-22 deal with the impact of curriculum mapping in the teachers' school district:

Table 16

Question 16: The implementation of curriculum mapping has allowed me to gain a better understanding of my school district's curriculum goals.

Understanding of Curriculum Goals

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Strongly Agree	3	15.8	15.8	15.8
		Agree	14	73.7	73.7	89.5
		Disagree	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Strongly Agree	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
		Agree	13	61.9	61.9	85.7
		Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Strongly Agree	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Agree	10	71.4	71.4	78.6
		Disagree	3	21.4	21.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

When teachers were asked if curriculum mapping had helped them gain a better understanding of their school district's curriculum goals, an overwhelming majority from all districts agreed. Specifically, 89.5% of teachers from small, 85.7% of teachers from medium, and 78.6% of teachers from large communities agreed or strongly agreed that curriculum mapping helped them to better understand their district's curriculum goals (Table 16).

Table 17

Question 17: The implementation of curriculum mapping has permitted me to more

effectively align my daily lesson plans with the appropriate state/national standards.

Alignment of Daily Lesson Plans

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Strongly Agree	1	5.3	5.3	5.3
		Agree	8	42.1	42.1	47.4
		Disagree	8	42.1	42.1	89.5
		Strongly Disagree	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	omit	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
		Strongly Agree	4	19.0	19.0	28.6
		Agree	10	47.6	47.6	76.2
		Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	90.5
		Strongly Disagree	1	4.8	4.8	95.2
		Not Applicable	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Strongly Agree	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Agree	10	71.4	71.4	78.6
		Disagree	2	14.3	14.3	92.9
		Strongly Disagree	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Teachers in the medium sized communities (66.7%) and teachers in the large

community (78.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that curriculum mapping had allowed them

to more effectively align their daily lesson plans with state/national standards. Once

again, the small community teachers were somewhat divided in their responses to this

item. Of the teachers from the small community, 47.4% agreed or strongly agreed with

the statement, while 52.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 17).

Table 18

Question 18: The implementation of curriculum mapping has permitted the district to

more effectively align the curriculum with appropriate state/national standards.

Alignment of District Curriculum

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Agree	13	68.4	68.4	68.4
		Disagree	4	21.1	21.1	89.5
		Strongly Disagree	1	5.3	5.3	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Strongly Agree	8	38.1	38.1	38.1
		Agree	11	52.4	52.4	90.5
		Disagree	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Agree	11	78.6	78.6	78.6
		Disagree	3	21.4	21.4	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

When survey participants were questioned regarding whether the implementation of curriculum mapping had permitted the school district to more effectively align its curriculum with state/national goals, the majority of teachers from all community sizes agreed or strongly agreed with the statement (Table 18).

Table 19

Question 19: As a result of the implementation of curriculum mapping, areas of strength/

weakness have been identified and the school district's curriculum has been revised

based on this information.

Strengths/Weaknesses

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Strongly Agree	3	15.8	15.8	15.8
		Agree	9	47.4	47.4	63.2
		Disagree	6	31.6	31.6	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Strongly Agree	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
		Agree	11	52.4	52.4	71.4
		Disagree	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	omit	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Agree	5	35.7	35.7	42.9
		Disagree	7	50.0	50.0	92.9
		Strongly Disagree	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Teachers in the small (63.2%) and medium (71.4%) sized communities agreed or strongly agreed that curriculum mapping had helped identify areas of strength and weakness within the school district's curriculum. In contrast, a majority of teachers from the large district (57.1%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (Table19).

Table 20

Question 20: The implementation of curriculum mapping has encouraged teachers at my

grade level to find potential areas for integration (e.g., interdisplinary units).

Identify Areas for Integration

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Agree	6	31.6	31.6	31.6
		Disagree	9	47.4	47.4	78.9
		Strongly Disagree	3	15.8	15.8	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	omit	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
		Strongly Agree	4	19.0	19.0	23.8
		Agree	9	42.9	42.9	66.7
		Disagree	5	23.8	23.8	90.5
		Not Applicable	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Strongly Agree	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Agree	7	50.0	50.0	57.1
		Disagree	5	35.7	35.7	92.9
		Strongly Disagree	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

A majority of educators from medium (61.9%) and large (57.1%) communities indicated that the implementation of curriculum mapping had encouraged teachers to find areas for integration within the curriculum at their grade level. Surprisingly, 63.2% of the teachers from the small community disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (Table 20).

Table 21

Question 21: The implementation of curriculum mapping has had a positive impact on my

classroom teaching.

Positive Impact on Classroom Teaching

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Strongly Agree	2	10.5	10.5	10.5
		Agree	6	31.6	31.6	42.1
		Disagree	6	31.6	31.6	73.7
		Strongly Disagree	1	5.3	5.3	78.9
		Not Applicable	4	21.1	21.1	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	omit	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
		Strongly Agree	4	19.0	19.0	23.8
		Agree	10	47.6	47.6	71.4
		Disagree	4	19.0	19.0	90.5
		Not Applicable	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Strongly Agree	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Agree	7	50.0	50.0	57.1
		Disagree	3	21.4	21.4	78.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	14.3	14.3	92.9
		Not Applicable	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Likewise, 66.7% of the teachers from medium sized communities and 57.1% of the teachers from the large community agreed or strongly agreed that the implementation of curriculum mapping had a positive impact on their classroom teaching. However, only 42.1% of the teachers in the small community agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. It should be noted that a total of seven teachers surveyed felt this item was not applicable to their current situation (Table 21).

Table 22

Question 22: *The implementation of curriculum mapping has had a positive impact on*

the way I work with other teachers in my district.

Positive Impact on Working with Other Teachers

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Agree	8	42.1	42.1	42.1
		Disagree	6	31.6	31.6	73.7
		Strongly Disagree	1	5.3	5.3	78.9
		Not Applicable	4	21.1	21.1	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Strongly Agree	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
		Agree	10	47.6	47.6	71.4
		Disagree	5	23.8	23.8	95.2
		Not Applicable	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Strongly Agree	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Agree	5	35.7	35.7	42.9
		Disagree	6	42.9	42.9	85.7
		Strongly Disagree	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Teachers from medium sized communities reported that curriculum mapping had a positive impact on the way they worked with other teachers in their school district. Specifically, 71.4% of the teachers from medium sized communities agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

This was also true of the teachers from the small community, since a majority (42.1%) agreed that the implementation of curriculum mapping had a positive impact on the way they worked with other teachers in their district. However, 36.8% of the small community teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement and 21.1% indicated that item was not applicable.

In contrast, a majority of the teachers from the large community (57.1%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (Table 22).

Questions 23-24 deal with the impact of curriculum mapping overall:

Table 23

Question 23: Revisions to the school district's curriculum (as a result of curriculum mapping) have improved the overall quality of the program and enhanced student performance.

Overall Program Quality/Student Performance

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	Agree	11	57.9	57.9	57.9
		Disagree	6	31.6	31.6	89.5
		Strongly Disagree	1	5.3	5.3	94.7
		Not Applicable	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Strongly Agree	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
		Agree	12	57.1	57.1	66.7
		Disagree	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	omit	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Agree	1	7.1	7.1	14.3
		Disagree	5	35.7	35.7	50.0
		Not Applicable	7	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Respondents from both the small (57.9%) and medium (66.7%) size communities agreed or strongly agreed that curriculum mapping had improved the overall quality of the program and enhanced performance of students within their district. In contrast, 35.7% of the teachers from the large community disagreed with this statement and 50% reported that the item was not applicable to their current situation (Table 23).

Table 24

Question 24: Overall, the implementation of curriculum mapping has had a positive

impact on my attitude toward teaching.

Positive Impact on Teacher Attitude

School Community Size			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Small	Valid	omit	2	10.5	10.5	10.5
		Strongly Agree	1	5.3	5.3	15.8
		Agree	8	42.1	42.1	57.9
		Disagree	4	21.1	21.1	78.9
		Strongly Disagree	2	10.5	10.5	89.5
		Not Applicable	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
		Total	19	100.0	100.0	
Medium	Valid	Strongly Agree	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
		Agree	9	42.9	42.9	66.7
		Disagree	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	21	100.0	100.0	
Large	Valid	Strongly Agree	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
		Agree	5	35.7	35.7	42.9
		Disagree	5	35.7	35.7	78.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	14.3	14.3	92.9
		Not Applicable	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
		Total	14	100.0	100.0	

In regards to the general impact of curriculum mapping on teacher attitude, a

majority of teachers in the medium sized communities (66.7%) and small community

(47.4%) reported that curriculum mapping had a positive impact on their overall attitude

toward teaching. In contrast, only 42.9% of teachers from the large community agreed or

strongly agreed with the statement and 50% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 24).

Questions 25-28 were short answer, open ended questions dealing with the implementation of curriculum mapping:

Question 25: List any other changes that you have made in response to the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district.

When teachers were asked to focus on other changes made in the curriculum due to the implementation of curriculum mapping, only a few teachers reported changes other than those already addressed in the survey. Most teachers reiterated that curriculum mapping had given them a better understanding of their district's curriculum (i.e., at their own grade level, other grade levels and the district in general) and identified gaps or repetitions in the curriculum. The limited amount of teachers that indicated other types of change noted changes in assessments, increased use of technology, more inquiry based teaching, and changes in scheduling as a result of implementing curriculum mapping.

Question 26: What are some of the obstacles encountered in implementing curriculum mapping in your school district?

Many of the teachers surveyed reported encountering obstacles in the implementation of curriculum mapping. The overwhelming obstacle reported was the time factor required to fully implement curriculum mapping. A lack of teacher agreement was cited as a second major obstacle to effectively mapping the curriculum. Other obstacles teachers listed included changes in administration, a lack of communication, coordinating different textbook editions, finding appropriate assessments, and sharing supplies.

Question 27: What are some factors that have facilitated the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district?

The majority of teachers participating in the survey indicated that there were factors that helped facilitate the implementation of curriculum mapping. Three main responses (i.e., time to work on mapping, committee meetings, and strong administration/curriculum director) were noted by the teachers surveyed. Other less common responses given by the teachers included test score data, the need for curriculum alignment and state/national standards.

Question 28: Please mention below any further information or issues regarding the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district.

More than half of the respondents chose to mention further details about the implementation of curriculum mapping in their school districts. The answers varied widely due to the broad scope of the question. Overall the teachers liked the concept of curriculum mapping and could recognize the benefits, but many participants in the survey reiterated the time consuming nature of the task.

All of the schools surveyed were in the initial phases of curriculum mapping and most of the teachers described the initial phase as the hardest portion of the mapping process. Likewise, many teachers referred to curriculum mapping as a work in progress that is often frustrating, but worthwhile in the end for the students, parents, teachers and school administration.

Some of the teachers indicated that the curriculum maps serve as a professional development tool to help new teachers better understand the district's curriculum and

newer teachers were grateful for the maps that had already been completed prior to their employment in the district.

Chapter V

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine teachers' perceptions and attitudes in regard to the implementation of curriculum mapping. Specifically, this study collected data from kindergarten through sixth grade educators in the state of Illinois with prior involvement in the implementation of curriculum mapping.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping at Grade level

During the initial phase of curriculum mapping three major elements of the classroom curriculum are investigated. They are processes and skills emphasized, concepts and topics taught, and assessments of learning conducted. This section will consider teachers' perceptions of the impact of curriculum mapping within a grade level concerning these three elements for schools in small, medium and large communities.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in Small Communities at Grade Level

A majority of small community teachers indicated that little or no change occurred in regard to the processes and skills emphasized in the curriculum (Table 5), the content taught at their current grade level (Table 6), or the manner in which students were assessed (Table 7). Furthermore, the majority of teachers in the small sized district revealed that curriculum mapping had not changed the way they taught in their classrooms (Table 8). The overall consensus among teachers from the small community revealed that curriculum mapping had little or no perceived impact at the teachers' current grade level.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in Medium Sized Communities at Grade Level

Teachers in medium sized communities reported that curriculum mapping had affected the content taught and the processes/skills emphasized at their grade level. In particular, 61.9% of teachers reported a moderate or substantial impact at grade level in response to both these questions in the survey (Tables 5 & 6). Medium sized district teachers were divided over the perceived impact of curriculum mapping on student assessment. Forty-seven and six tenths percent reported that curriculum mapping had substantially or moderately affected assessment, but 52.4% reported that curriculum mapping had little effect on the assessments given to students (Table 7). Similarly, the data from teachers in medium sized communities regarding changes in the way the teachers taught in their classrooms was difficult to interpret with 42.9% reporting moderate or substantial change and 47.6% reporting little or no change (Table 8).

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in Large Communities at Grade Level

In regard to content taught and processes or skills emphasized at their grade level, a majority of teachers in the large community district reported that curriculum mapping had moderately or substantially changed these elements of the curriculum (Tables 5 & 6). When asked if curriculum mapping had changed the way students were assessed, 78.6% of large community teachers reported that curriculum mapping had little or no effect (Table 7). Data from these teachers regarding perceived changes in the way the teachers taught in their classrooms were difficult to interpret with half the respondents reporting moderate change and the other half reporting little or no change (Table 8).

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in All Communities at Grade Level

Overall, the survey results reveal that the implementation of curriculum mapping appears to have a greater perceived impact on the processes/skills emphasized and content taught at grade level for teachers in schools in medium or large communities as compared to schools in small communities. In contrast there was no clear evidence that the implementation of curriculum mapping had an impact on student assessment at grade level.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping Across Grade Levels

Curriculum mapping is a way to view the actual curriculum across grade levels. After curriculum maps are completed teachers at every grade level can view the processes and skills emphasized, concepts and topics taught, and assessments of learning conducted across the grade levels. This enables every teacher to know exactly what his/her students were taught the previous year and precisely what they will be learning the following year.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in Small Communities Across Grade Levels

A majority of teachers from the small community responded that curriculum mapping had not changed the processes and skills emphasized (Table 9), the content taught (Table 10), or assessments given (Table 11) across the grade levels in their districts.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in Medium Communities Across Grade Levels

A majority of teachers in the medium sized communities felt curriculum mapping had changed the processes/skills emphasized (Table 9) and content taught (Table 10) across grade levels. However, the teachers from medium sized communities were divided

in regard to the perceived impact of curriculum mapping on the assessments used across grade levels. Overall, teachers reported that curriculum mapping had a significant impact across grade levels in schools located in medium sized communities.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in Large Communities Across Grade Levels

Teachers from large community schools indicated that curriculum mapping had not significantly changed the processes and skills, content, or assessments employed across grade levels in their districts (Tables 9, 10 & 11). Unfortunately, 21.4% of the teachers from the large community indicated that Items 9, 10 & 11 were not applicable. This is puzzling to the researcher and caution should be used in drawing conclusions from this data.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in All Communities Across Grade Levels

Based upon the data, only teachers in medium sized communities perceived noteworthy change in the school district's curriculum across grade levels after the implementation of curriculum mapping. In contrast, the teachers in the small community school reported little change in curriculum across grade levels. Perhaps, close-knit communities are more apt to work in close proximity across grade levels because of the smaller number of faculty members. Thus, curriculum mapping would not impact smaller communities across grade levels to a large degree. However, medium sized communities involve a larger number of teachers and would be impacted more across grade levels due to the implementation of curriculum mapping.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping in the District

The implementation of district curriculum mapping ties schools into a total learning community where teachers across the district know exactly what is occurring in

all areas of the district. Curriculum mapping also has the ability to align the district curriculum with state/national standards.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping on Small Community Districts

Teachers in the small community school were divided in regard to what degree curriculum mapping had improved the school district's curriculum (Table 14), but reported that the process had helped them to identify areas of strength/weakness (Table 19) within the curriculum.

Impact of Curriculum Mapping on Medium Community Districts

Teachers in the medium sized community schools reported that the school curriculum had been restructured due to the implementation of curriculum mapping (Table 13). A majority of these teachers perceived moderate or substantial improvement in the school district's curriculum due to the restructuring (Table 14) including identifying areas of strength/weakness (Table 19), reducing redundancy (Table 12) and highlighting potential areas for integration (Table 20).

Impact of Curriculum Mapping on Large Community Districts

Individuals teaching in the large community school also perceived improvement in the school district's curriculum after the implementation of curriculum mapping (Table 14). A majority of these teachers reported that curriculum mapping had encouraged them to identify potential areas for integration (Table 20).

Impact of Curriculum Mapping on Districts for All Communities

In comparison, the medium sized districts were the most positively impacted by the implementation of curriculum mapping at the district level with the majority of teachers responding with agree or strongly agree to all questions in that section of the

survey. Similarly, responses of teachers in the large district were also more positive than those of teachers in the small community school. The possibility exists that the teachers in the medium and large communities were more positively impacted at the district level, because these schools were larger in comparison to those in the smaller community. The larger districts have more sections per grade level, many teachers and separate buildings. Curriculum mapping would help tie the different areas of the district together through curriculum maps and could help explain the significant impact of curriculum mapping at the district level for schools in medium and large communities.

Overall, a majority of all the teachers surveyed reported that curriculum mapping had permitted them to gain a better understanding of the school district's curriculum goals (Table 16), more effectively align daily lesson plans with the appropriate state/national standards (Table 17), and assisted the district in more effectively aligning the curriculum with state/national standards (Table 18).

Impact of Curriculum Mapping Overall

Impact of Curriculum Mapping Overall in Small Communities

A majority of respondents from the small community school revealed that curriculum mapping had indeed improved the overall quality and performance of students within their district (Table 23) and had a positive impact on their overall attitude regarding teaching (Table 24).

Impact of Curriculum Mapping Overall in Medium Communities

Data from teachers in the schools located in medium sized communities were the most positive in regard to the overall impact of curriculum mapping. A majority of those individuals indicated that curriculum mapping had a positive impact on their classroom

teaching (Table 21), the way they work with other teachers in the district (Table 22), and their attitude toward teaching (Table 24). Revisions to the school district's curriculum were viewed as having improved the overall quality of the program and enhanced student performance (Table 23).

Impact of Curriculum Mapping Overall in Large Communities

Respondents from the large community school reported that curriculum mapping had not improved the overall quality and performance of students within their district (Table 23). Once again, caution should be used in drawing conclusions from the data collected from teachers in the large community school, because 50% of these individuals indicated that the preceding item (Question 23) did not apply to their current situation.

Overall Conclusions Regarding the Implementation of Curriculum Mapping

Based on the data collected, the perceived impact of curriculum mapping does appear to be affected by the size of the community/school district. Findings indicated that curriculum mapping had the greatest perceived benefits in schools located in communities of medium size (30,000>60,000 residents).

Recommendations

Recommendation for Further Research

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1. A longitudinal study should be conducted to determine the effects of curriculum mapping on the attitudes of elementary education teachers during the various phases of its implementation.

2. Further research should be conducted to determine the effects of curriculum mapping based on school size.

3. It is suggested that in further research concerning the topic of curriculum mapping, the size of the school or community be considered an important independent variable.

4. It is suggested that further research be conducted concerning curriculum mapping and its effect on the attitudes of middle level teachers.

5. A study of high school teachers should be conducted to determine the effects of curriculum mapping on teacher attitude at that level.

6. A survey of administrators should be conducted to determine the perceived impact of curriculum mapping on student achievement.

7. A study should be conducted to compare student achievement in schools employing curriculum mapping and schools without a curriculum development program.

Recommendations for Further Practice

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for future practice are suggested:

1. It is suggested that school districts designate funds for teachers who attend professional development workshops on curriculum mapping.

2. It is suggested that districts provide release time on a monthly basis for teachers at the same grade level to share and collaborate in creating/maintaining curriculum maps.

3. It is suggested that districts create a mentoring program for new teachers to become acquainted with curriculum mapping and existing curriculum maps.

4. It is suggested that school districts hire an individual with experience in curriculum mapping to serve as a facilitator in collaborating and sharing information with teachers.

5. It is suggested that school districts schedule teacher planning days into the school calendar for teachers across the district to meet and discuss curriculum maps.

6. It is suggested that a grant be written to obtain funds to provide curriculum mapping computer software for the district.

7. It is suggested that school districts provide a budget for the purchase of professional resources dealing with curriculum mapping.

8. It is suggested that release time be allocated for teachers to visit schools that employ curriculum mapping as a form of professional development in preparing for its implementation.

9. It is suggested that teachers, principals and administrators schedule regular meetings to discuss the current status and progress of implementing curriculum mapping in a school district.

References

Andrews, S. & Wheeler, P. (1994, April). *Personalizing instructional supervision: Differentiating support structures for teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (Eric Document Reproduction Service ED375081)

Bainer, D. & Wright, D. (1998, April). *Teachers choices about their own professional development in science teaching and learning*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. (Eric Document Reproduction Service ED420517)

Berlin, D. (1996, April). *Teacher action research: The impact of inquiry on curriculum improvement and professional development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. (Eric Document Reproduction Service ED397029)

Brandt, R. (1991). On interdisciplinary curriculum: A conversation with Heidi Hayes Jacobs. *Educational Leadership, 49*(2), 24-26.

English, F. W. (1980). Curriculum mapping. *Educational Leadership, 37*(7), 558-559.

English, F.W. (1983). *Fundamental Curriculum Decisions. ASCD 1983 Yearbook*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Husted, K. (2000). Curriculum mapping: A tool to help you track what you teach. *Teaching Theatre, 11*(2), 10-12.

Jacobs, H. (1989). *Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jacobs, H. (1997). *Mapping the big picture: Integrating curriculum & assessment K-12.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mills, M.S. (2001). *Ensuring the viability of curriculum mapping in a school improvement plan.* Little Rock, AR: University of Arkansas at Little Rock. (Eric Document Reproduction Service ED460141)

Miller-Whitehead, M. (2002, June). *Computer use and science achievement: Linking science standards and the assessments. Monograph series.* (TVEE Monitor, Vol.1, No. 1). Muscle Shoals, AL: Tennessee Valley Educators for Excellence. (Eric Document Reproduction Service ED468462)

Perkins-Gough, D. (2003). Creating a timely curriculum: A conversation with Heidi Hayes Jacobs. *Educational Leadership*, 61(4), 12-17.

Appendix A

<u>Truesdale Survey of Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping</u>

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

CODES								
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

IMPORTANT DIRECTIONS FOR MARKING ANSWERS

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY

- Do **NOT** USE PENS.
- Make heavy black marks that completely fill circle.
- Erase clearly any answer you change.
- Make no stray marks.

The Truesdale Survey of Teacher Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping

Mark the answer that best applies to your teaching position and school district on the following Likert Scale. Please answer honestly; all responses will be kept confidential.

Thank you for completing this survey!

The following items deal with your teaching experience:

Total number of years in the teaching profession:

1 = 1 - 5 years;   2 = 6 - 10 years;   3 = 11 - 15 years;   4 = 16 - 20 years;
5 = 21 - 25 years;   6 = 26 - 30 years;   7 = 31 and above

`1 2 3 4 5 6 7`

Had curriculum mapping already been implemented in your district prior to you joining the staff?
1 = Yes; 2 = No

`1 2 X X X X X`

Are you involved in your school district's curriculum mapping efforts?
1 = Yes; 2 = No

`1 2 X X X X X`

What grade do you currently teach in your district?
1 = K;   2 = 1st;   3 = 2nd;   4 = 3rd;   5 = 4th;   6 = 5th;   7 = 6th

`1 2 3 4 5 6 7`

The following items deal with the impact of curriculum mapping at your current grade level:

Please use the following scale:
S = Substantial;   M = Moderate;   L = Little;   N = None;   NA = Not Applicable

`S M L N NA X X`

How much change has occurred (at your grade level) in regard to the processes and skills emphasized in the curriculum due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

How much change has occurred (at your grade level) in regard to the content (i.e. essential concepts and topics) emphasized in the curriculum due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

How much change has occurred (at your grade level) in regard to the manner in which learning is assessed due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

To what degree has curriculum mapping changed the way you teach in your classroom?

The following items deal with the impact of curriculum mapping across grade levels:

9. How much change has occurred (across grade levels) in regard to the processes and skills emphasized in the curriculum due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

`S M L N NA X X`

10. How much change has occurred (across grade levels) in regard to the content (i.e. essential concepts and topics) emphasized in the curriculum due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

11. How much change has occurred (across grade levels) in regard to the manner in which learning is assessed due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

12. To what degree was redundancy within the curriculum reduced due to the implementation of curriculum mapping?

13. Overall, how much has the school curriculum been restructured due to curriculum mapping?

14. To what degree do you perceive improvement in your school district's curriculum after the implementation of curriculum mapping?

15. To what degree has curriculum mapping impacted the way you work with other teachers in the building?

Please continue on reverse side

CONTINUED ON REVERSE SIDE

The following items deal with the impact of curriculum mapping in your district:
  Please use the following scale:
    SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree; NA = Not Applicable

	SA	A	D	SD	NA	X	X
16. The implementation of curriculum mapping has allowed me to gain a better understanding of my school district's curriculum goals.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
17. The implementation of curriculum mapping has permitted me to more effectively align my daily lesson plans with the appropriate state/national standards.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
18. The implementation of curriculum mapping has permitted the district to more effectively align the curriculum with appropriate state/national standards.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
19. As a result of the implementation of curriculum mapping, areas of strength/weakness have been identified and the school district's curriculum has been revised based on this information.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
20. The implementation of curriculum mapping has encouraged teachers at my grade level to find potential areas for integration (e.g, interdisciplinary units).	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
21. The implementation of curriculum mapping has had a positive impact on my classroom teaching.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
22. The implementation of curriculum mapping has had a positive impact on the way I work with other teachers in my district.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

The following items deal with the impact of curriculum mapping overall:

	SA	A	D	SD	NA	X	X
23. Revisions to the school district's curriculum (as a result of curriculum mapping) have improved the overall quality of the program and enhanced student performance.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
24. Overall, the implementation of curriculum mapping has had a positive impact on my attitude toward teaching.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please continue the short answer portion of this survey on the enclosed questionnaire.

Thank you!

Please answer the following questions in your own words. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

25. List any other changes that you have made in response to the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district.

26. What are some of the obstacles encountered in implementing curriculum mapping in your school district?

27. What are some factors that have facilitated the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district?

28. Please mention below any further information or issues regarding the implementation of curriculum mapping in your school district.

Thank you for completing this survey!

Appendix B

<u>Institutional Review Board</u>

Instructions
for Submitting Materials for Review by the
Institutional Review Board

New Application—Checklist of materials required for review
Submit 1 copy to the IRB administrator, care of the Office of Grants and Research (OGR), of the following:

_____ Form A, including answers to all research description items
  • If you are submitting your proposal for funding or your project has been
    funded, submit a copy of your grant proposal
  • Students: do not submit dissertation or thesis proposals
_____ Questionnaires, surveys, tests, or other materials that will be administered to subjects
_____ Form B or C, if applicable
_____ Written permission from other institutions or agencies involved in the research (e.g., school
    board, hospital, agency, prison)
_____ Informed consent form or written request for waiver of an informed consent form
_____ HIPAA Authorization or waiver of Authorization if your proposed study involves protected
    health information
_____ Advertisements, letters, or flyers that will be used, if any

**Reminder: All PI's, Co-PI's and sponsors must complete the "On-line Training Tutorial for Certification"
    prior to IRB approval.**

Modification Request—Checklist of materials required for review
Submit 1 copy of the following:
_____ Form D and documentation requested on the form

Continuation Request—Checklist of materials required for review
Submit 1 copy of the following:
_____ Form E and required documentation requested on the form
_____ Protocol summary, including approved modifications since last review and/or proposed changes
_____ Informed consent forms, permission forms, and assent forms, if applicable

Adverse Incident Report—Checklist of materials required for review
Call or e-mail the IRB Chairperson immediately and complete and submit Form F and documentation requested
on the form to OGR within 20 working days
Submit 1 copy of the following:
_____ Form F

Completion of Research Activities—Checklist of materials required
Submit 1 copy of the following:
_____ Form G

Form C

Expedited Review Research Categories
(63 FR 60364; November 9, 1998)

Principal Investigator: _Teresa A. Truesdale_

Title of Project: _Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping_

Applicability

A. Research activities that (1) present no more than minimal risk to human subjects, and (2) involve only procedures in one or more of the following categories, may be reviewed by the IRB through the expedited review procedure authorized by 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110. The activities listed should not be deemed to be of minimal risk simply because they are included on this list. Inclusion on this list merely means that the activity is eligible for review through the expedited review procedure when the specific circumstances of the proposed research involve no more than minimal risk to human subjects.

B. The categories in this list apply regardless of the age of the subjects, except as noted.

C. The expedited review procedure may not be used where identification of the subjects and/or their responses would reasonably place them at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, insurability, reputation, or be stigmatizing, unless reasonable and appropriate protections will be implemented so that risk related to invasion of privacy and breach of confidentiality are no greater than minimal.

D. The expedited review procedure may not be used for classified research involving human subjects.

E. The standard requirements for informed consent (or its waiver, alteration, or exception) apply regardless of the type of review—expedited or convened—utilized by the IRB.

F. Categories one (1) through seven (7) pertain to both initial and continuing IRB review.

Research Categories

Research projects may receive expedited review when the involvement of human subjects falls within one or more of the categories below. Check the appropriate categories that apply to your research project.

_____ 1. Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices only when condition (a) or (b) is met.
_____ (a) Research on drugs for which an investigational new drug application (21CFR Part 312) is not required (Note: Research on marketed drugs that significantly increases the risks or decreases the acceptability of the risks associated with the use of the product is not eligible for expedited review).
_____ (b) Research on medical devices for which (i) an investigational device exemption application(21CFR Part 812) is not required; or (ii) the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its cleared/approved labeling.

_____ 2. Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows:
_____ (a) from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these subjects, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8-week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; OR
_____ (b) from other adults and children[1], considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8-week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.

---

[1] Children are defined in the HSS regulations as "persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted." 45 CFR 46.402(a).

1

_____ 3. Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by noninvasive means. Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a nondisfiguring manner; (b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (d) excreta and external secretions (including sweat); (e) uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulation by chewing gumbase or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue; (f) placenta removed at delivery; (g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time or rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor; (h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques; (i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washing; (j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization.

_____ 4. Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.)

Examples: (a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subjects' privacy; (b) weighing or testing sensory acuity; (c) magnetic resonance imaging; (d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, doppler blood flow, and echocardiography; (e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.

_____ 5. Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for nonresearch purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (Note: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

_____ 6. Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

__X__ 7. Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (Note: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

_____ 8. Continuing review of research previously approved by the convened IRB as follows:
_____ (a) where (i) the research is permanently closed to the enrollment of new subjects; (ii) all subjects have completed all research-related interventions; and (iii) the research remains active only for long-term follow-up of subjects; OR
_____ (b) where no subjects have been enrolled and no additional risks have been identified; OR
_____ (c) where the remaining research activities are limited to data analysis.

_____ 9. Continuing review of research, not conducted under an investigational new drug application or investigational device exemption where categories two (2) through eight (8) do not apply but the IRB has determined and documented at a convened meeting that the research involves no greater than minimal risk and no additional risks have been identified.

Appendix C

Superintendent's Letter

Superintendent's Letter

Dear_____,

I am conducting research on the topic of curriculum mapping. Specifically, I am interested in collecting data regarding the perceptions and attitudes of teachers after the implementation of curriculum mapping in a school district. In reviewing the extremely limited amount of research involving curriculum mapping there was no indication of whether curriculum mapping positively or negatively affects teacher attitude. Therefore, I believe further study examining the benefits of curriculum mapping and its impact on teacher attitude is needed. Guided by my thesis director, (advisor's name), I would like permission to administer an attitudinal survey regarding teacher attitudes towards curriculum mapping in your district.

I plan to distribute the surveys to kindergarten through sixth grade teachers. The teachers will respond to approximately 28 questions based on a Likert Scale concerning their personal attitudes regarding the impact of curriculum mapping. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete and will then be mailed back in the stamped self-addressed envelope provided.

I am not interested in responses given by individual teachers, but in the district results collectively. The results will be analyzed according to grade level and school district, but the school district and teachers' names will remain confidential. I am eager to begin conducting my research and would be happy to share the findings at the conclusion of the study. The Institutional Review Board at Eastern Illinois University has requested that prior authorization be obtained from the school districts participating in the study. Please remit a letter of permission indicating your willingness to have your teachers participate in the study.

Sincerely,

(Researcher's name)

Appendix D

Teacher Letter

Teacher Letter

Dear Educator,

I am conducting research on the topic of curriculum mapping. Specifically, I am interested in collecting data regarding the perceptions and attitudes of teachers after the implementation of curriculum mapping in a school district. In reviewing the extremely limited amount of research involving curriculum mapping, there was no indication of whether curriculum mapping positively or negatively affects teacher attitude. Guided by my thesis director, (advisors name), I am requesting that you respond to the enclosed attitudinal survey regarding the implementation of curriculum mapping in your district.

Before contacting you, I have obtained permission from your superintendent to distribute the survey within your district. Please respond to the 28 survey questions concerning curriculum mapping. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Upon completion, please mail the survey back within two weeks in the stamped self-addressed envelope provided. Although all information supplied by you in this survey will be kept confidential, the envelopes have been coded to allow the researcher to determine which surveys have not been returned.

The Institutional Review Board at Eastern Illinois University has mandated that written consent be obtained from each individual participating in the study. Therefore, two copies of a consent form have been included with the survey instrument (i.e., a white copy to be signed and returned to the researcher; and a green copy that is to be retained for your personal records). The consent form and completed survey will be separated upon receipt to maintain participant confidentiality. The results will be compiled into collective grade level and district responses. Thank you for your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely,

(Researcher's name)

Appendix E

Consent Form

Consent Form

Title of Investigation: **Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding Curriculum Mapping**

Name of Principal Investigator: **Teresa Truesdale**

IRB File Number: **05-049**

This document is to certify that I,_____, hereby freely agree to participate as a volunteer in a study as an authorized part of the educational and research program of the Eastern Illinois University under the supervision of Teresa Truesdale.

The research project and my role in the research project have been fully explained to me in writing by Teresa Truesdale, and I understand her explanation as well as what will be expected of me by virtue of my participation in this research project.

I understand that all data will remain confidential with regard to my identity.

I understand that participation in this research project is voluntary and not a requirement or a condition for being the recipient of benefits or services from Eastern Illinois University or any other organization sponsoring the research project.

I understand that the approximate length of time required for participation in this research project is 15 minutes.

I understand that if I have any questions or concerns about the treatment of human subjects in this study, I may call or write:

Institutional Review Board
Eastern Illinois University
600 Lincoln Avenue
Charleston, IL 61920
Telephone: (217) 581-8576

Although this person will ask my name, I understand that all inquiries will be kept in the strictest confidence.

Furthermore, I understand that if I have any questions concerning the purposes or the procedures associated with this research project, I may call or write:

(Researcher's name, address, phone number)

I also understand that it will not be necessary to reveal my name in order to obtain additional information about this research project from the principal investigator.

I FURTHER UNDERSTAND THAT I AM FREE TO WITHDRAW MY CONSENT AND DISCONTINUE MY PARTICIPATION AT ANY TIME.

_____   _____
Date   Signature of Subject

    I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained in writing the study to the above subject.

_____   _____
Date   Signature of Investigator

Appendix F

Second Mailing to Non-respondents (Letter)

<u>Second Mailing to Non-respondents (Letter)</u>

Dear Educator,

A curriculum mapping survey was mailed to you a few weeks ago. I have not received your survey and would like to extend a second opportunity to complete the survey. I truly value your time and responses to this project.

I am conducting research on the topic of curriculum mapping. Specifically, I am interested in collecting data regarding the perceptions and attitudes of teachers after the implementation of curriculum mapping in a school district. In reviewing the extremely limited amount of research involving curriculum mapping, there was no indication of whether curriculum mapping positively or negatively affects teacher attitude. Guided by my thesis director, (advisor's name), I am requesting that you respond to the enclosed attitudinal survey regarding the implementation of curriculum mapping in your district.

Before contacting you, I have obtained permission from your superintendent to distribute the survey within your district. Please respond to the 28 survey questions concerning curriculum mapping. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Upon completion, please mail the survey within two weeks in the stamped self-addressed envelope provided.

The Institutional Review Board at Eastern Illinois University has mandated that written consent be obtained from each individual participating in the study. Therefore, two copies of a consent form have been included with the survey instrument (i.e., a white copy to be signed and returned to the researcher; and a green copy that is to be retained for your personal records). The consent form and completed survey will be separated upon receipt to maintain participant confidentiality. The results will be compiled into collective grade level and district responses. Thank you for your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely,

(Researcher's name)