The steps in this protocol are based on Larry Ainsworth (2010) and his work with building aligned and rigorous curriculum. Additionally, materials based on Benjamin Bloom, Norman Webb, Arthur Costa, and Robert Marzano are used in the learning portions of this protocol.

Step 1: Prioritize Standards

It is important to note at the outset that prioritizing standards does NOT imply some standards can be omitted. Prioritizing creates a subset of the standards and identifies supporting standards which can be taught within the context of the priority standard, thus allowing teachers to organize time for student learning accordingly.

- Learn definitions for "priority" and "supporting" standards
- Criteria for decision making:
    - Endurance
    - Leverage
    - Readiness to progress
    - External exams
- Share some examples from other districts/educational institutions
- Practice prioritizing with a set of common standards
    - Start with one section of the grade/content level (ex: Reading Literature -- Key Ideas and Details)
    - INDIVIDUALLY, identify priority and supporting standards using the criteria
    - As grade-alike groups, using a graphic organizer/poster, share each person's prioritization work and come to an agreement on those standards that are priority/supporting/perhaps neither. There will probably be discussion to reach an agreement.
    - All levels represented in the meeting post their work to see a vertical vision of priority and supporting standards for the section of standards used for this learning. **Discuss vertical articulation, what ifs, other ideas that are shared**.

At the end of this step / practice session the large group should have taken part in reaching agreement of the prioritized and supporting standards in a specific section of their standards. This practice session models how to prioritize all sets of standards, K-12.

Step 2: Unwrap Priority Standards

To practice unwrapping standards use a common standard across the group, or choose a vertical strand of standards that represents a progression of knowledge and skill; this would allow participants to use their grade level standard of that strand.

- Begin basic sentence diagramming: circle verbs (or implied verbs) and underline nouns.
- Engage group by asking why, in our past, we might have identified the nouns and verbs of a standard (possible ideas may include enduring understandings, essential questions, finding the knowledge and skills students need...it may or may not include deciding the level of cognitive complexity of the standard….this is where the next bullet leads).
- PAUSE to fill in any gaps in two areas:
    - Learn about categorizing cognitive complexity
        - Consulting three experts and their ideas: McTighe and Wiggins, Bloom, Webb, Costa, Marzano
        - Investigate similarities, differences, verb 'wheels', Iowa Core connections, etc.
    - Review the connection between learning target/task/experience and a general teacher stance (UbD reference).

- Eventually identify a framework such as Webb's DOK framework as one your district will move forward with. Webb's is used in Iowa's Literacy and Math standards and it will also relate to thinking about the level of cognitive complexity of learning targets, formative assessment and learning experiences in stage 3, as well as Stage 2 performance tasks and other summative type assessments. **AND** identifying if it is acquiring, meaning making, transferring to help determine teacher moves/stance….then back to the task at hand:
- INTRODUCE the graphic organizer to help in the unwrapping process…..provide practical meaning of the priority standards by describing what **learning and teaching looks** (and sounds) like in the classroom as a student reaches proficiency on a priority standard. When doing this, identify the supporting standards and look at what the priority standard requires students to know and be able to do, not how to assess it. Be vigilant in distinguishing between learning targets (statements of what students know and are able to do) and the manner in which we will teach or assess them (the tasks, assessments, and assignments we will give students to do).

  *At the end of this step and practice session the large group should have thought through, discussed, and came to an agreement on either one common standard used during this practice or on a strand of related standards across grade levels. The latter case would also allow participants to compare the complex level of thinking students will need to **DO** as they travel the grade span represented.*

Step 3: Apply step 1 and 2 to Understanding by Design planning
- Stage 1: Desired Results
  - Identifying verbs; nouns; and complexity of thinking level(s) assists writers in:
    - decision-making on mapping standards, bundling standards for a unit within a content and cross-curricular, etc.;
    - creating (or revising) EU, EQ, TG, K&S for a specific unit for which this standard is attached.
    - other ideas?
- Stage 2: Evidence of Learning
  - Identifying verbs; nouns; and complexity of thinking level(s) assists writers in selecting, revising or creating:
    - summative, benchmark, formative assessments and performance tasks aligning to stage 1;
    - rubrics with appropriate levels of complexity of thinking and doing.
    - other ideas?
- Stage 3: Learning Experiences (and teacher supports)
  - Identifying verbs; nouns; and complexity of thinking level(s) assists writers in selecting, revising or creating:
    - learning experiences;
    - modifications;
    - appropriate teacher supports/strategies and scaffolding.
    - other ideas?

Step 4: Next Steps? (this is dependent on which group is using this protocol)