



Courtesy of Deborah Lamehill

## **GUIDING QUESTIONS**

---

1. What is a curriculum?
2. What is a standards-based curriculum?
3. How does a standards-based curriculum differ from a traditional curriculum?
4. Why have we gone to using a standards-based curriculum?
5. How has educational reform impacted schools and the way they do business?
6. What other factors have influenced curriculum development?
7. How does planning differ with traditional and standards-based curricula?
8. What role does assessment play in a standards-based curriculum?
9. How are activities selected in a standards-based curriculum?

# Introduction to Standards-Based Curriculum Development

*Jacalyn Lund, Georgia State University*  
*Deborah Tannehill, University of Limerick*

---

What makes a good program good? What are its main characteristics? . . . First, it is clear that a good program accomplishes something . . . physical education must accomplish tangible outcomes to gain acceptance by students, faculty, administrators, and parents.<sup>1</sup>

---

What does your physical education program stand for? Can you articulate clearly what your program is attempting to accomplish? Can you communicate this to students, parents, and administrators? Could you produce tangible evidence that this is happening? Physical education programs today are repeatedly being required to answer these and other questions. Educational reform and the move to standards-based education are changing the way educators do business.

Picture the graduate of your physical education program—how would you want this person to act? What would you want them to know and be able to do? Many physical educators would reply that they want their graduates to choose to participate in physical activity, have sufficient skill and knowledge to do so successfully, and lead an active lifestyle. Others may be more concerned with their students gaining social responsibility as they participate in a physically active lifestyle, and still others may focus on young people becoming physically active citizens who are

---

<sup>1</sup>Reproduced from Siedentop, D., Mand, C., & Taggart, A. (1986). *Physical education: teaching and curriculum strategies for grades 5–12*, p. 311, The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

conscious of the inequalities that exist for physical activity participation in some social contexts and work as change agents to remedy this situation. Though there is not just one correct answer, most likely all physical educators would want graduates to recognize that an active lifestyle contributes to physical health, as well as social and mental well-being. Participation can manifest itself in a wide variety of forms—from square dancing with a local group, to playing softball with a recreational team, to hiking in state or national parks.

Although certainly a goal of most physical education teachers, having graduates participate in physical activity on a regular basis is not an automatic outcome of a physical education program, as our national health statistics confirm (Burgeson, Wechsler, Brener, Young, & Spain, 2003). Choosing to be physically active is the result of experiencing a solid curriculum that allows students to develop the skills and knowledge necessary for success, along with making them aware of activity venues within the community in which to participate (Rink, 2000). People tend to participate in activities during which they experience success. The challenge for physical educators is twofold: first, to give students the skills and knowledge they need to be successful, and second, to introduce them to activity venues where they can participate in these activities long after they graduate from high school.

As stated previously, educational reform is changing the way schools operate. The move toward standards-based education is an attempt to clarify what schools and teachers are trying to accomplish. This book is designed to help you during the journey of developing a standards-based physical education program. Because knowing where to start is often the most difficult part, this chapter is designed to help you begin by defining what a curriculum includes, describing how the standards-based movement began, and explaining the significance of this movement so that you will know the important components of developing a quality, standards-based physical education program.

## What Is Curriculum?

**Curriculum** includes all knowledge, skills, and learning experiences provided to students within the school program. This encompasses even those activities that are typically offered beyond the school day such as band, student clubs, intramurals, and after school sports teams. From our perspective, curriculum includes the planned and sequenced learning experiences that allow students to reach significant goals deemed worthwhile for students to achieve. Ultimately, a curriculum represents the plan that guides delivery of learning experiences and instruction. Although it is difficult to separate instruction from the curriculum and assessment, we will attempt to do so to better clarify the latter pieces of the triad. In this text, we will narrow our description of curriculum development to include only those experiences that are delivered within the physical education class typically offered within the school day, although we recognize that the curriculum actually includes much more than that.

**curriculum** Includes all knowledge, skills, and learning experiences that are provided to students within the school program.

*Curriculum writing* is the process of developing a sequence of activities and/or selecting an appropriate curriculum model that will enable students to meet

desired goals at the conclusion of their school experience. The curriculum outlines the big picture for this process; develops assessments that are given at various points, allowing students to demonstrate success toward meeting these goals; and identifies activities that allow graduates to meet curricular goals. In the past, curricular goals were determined largely by the school district developing the curriculum. Most school districts relied on teachers within the system to write the curricular goals. Educational reform has now provided external guidelines that schools are required to follow. States and nations have developed **standards**, which are statements describing what students should know and be able to do. Instead of developing their own goals, most teachers are now required to have their students meet standards at the state, district, or national level. How the standards are unpacked will result in programs looking quite different depending on the decisions made about the content and the activities used to meet the standards.

**standards** Curriculum goals established at the national, state, or district level that identify the skills, knowledge, and dispositions that students should demonstrate.

## What Is a Standards-Based Curriculum?

A **standards-based curriculum** represents a huge paradigm shift for many teachers currently in the field (Doolittle, 2003). In the past, choice of activity led the design of the curriculum. Curricula were written to include a variety of activities traditionally included in a physical education program. The focus was on developing skill competence for students in these sports or activities. In other words, teachers taught students the skills necessary to play volleyball, soccer, or tennis; dance; or swim, for example, and the only goal was for students to be able to play or perform the activity. Activities were selected because they were typically played by one gender or the other (e.g., boys wrestled and girls danced), were commonly played in a certain region (e.g., ice hockey was common in Minnesota physical education programs), teachers were competent performers in the sport or activity and/or they enjoyed teaching the unit, or that was tradition—certain sports have always been included in physical education and not including them would almost be an act of heresy (e.g., basketball). As new sports or activities emerged they might be included in the curriculum if facilities, equipment, and personnel were available (e.g., inline skating, ultimate, team handball, etc.). Other activities might be eliminated for a variety of reasons (e.g., trampoline units were eliminated largely for liability reasons).

**standards-based curriculum** A curriculum that is developed by looking at the standards (district, state, or national); identifying the skills, knowledge, and dispositions that students should demonstrate to meet these standards; and identifying activities that will allow students to reach the goals stated in the standards.

Developing a standards-based curriculum begins by looking at the standards; recognizing the skills, knowledge, and dispositions that students should demonstrate to meet these standards; and selecting a curriculum model and/or activities that will allow students to reach the outcomes

stated in the standards. In other words, curriculum design now begins with the standards and when they are unpacked, the activities to reach them emerge. Time is limited, so teachers must carefully choose content and activities that will allow students to reach the standards. Some activities may be eliminated from a program because of their minimal contribution to meeting standards.

Curricular assessments are also necessary in standards-based curricula so that students will be able to track their success, and teachers can determine whether the curriculum will enable students to meet the standards. If students are falling short of meeting the standards, the reason(s) why must be determined. In some cases, new approaches to teaching or different activities must be included in the program. In other instances, additional time is needed for students to achieve the standards. For example, 30 minutes per week in elementary school is not sufficient for children to learn and become competent in all the standards. When physical education is offered for only 1 year at the high school level, there is no opportunity for most youth, especially the slow developers, to gain the skills necessary to achieve all the standards. In these instances, schools need to identify additional ways to give students the opportunity to reach the standards, or teachers must make choices about which standards their students will meet. If physical education is not part of the state testing mandate, and school districts do not take responsibility for ensuring that the standards are met, it is unlikely that all students will reach the standards.

Due to a misunderstanding of what it is, some teachers object to a standards-based curriculum because they feel it infringes on their right to choose what students should learn. Other teachers, who run recreational programs where little instruction and, consequently, little student learning occurs, dislike standards-based curricula because their programs do not allow students to meet the standards. Some teachers are so concerned that students enjoy physical activity that they sacrifice skill competency so that students can engage in game play for the majority of their class time without considering the role that skill competency has in the level of student enjoyment. Other teachers who object to standards-based curricula have traditionally taught only team sports, and tend to repeat them at every grade level and sometimes within the same year. Some teachers have come to appreciate the standards for the guidance they provide, how they have contributed to improving what is done in the name of physical education, and how they have improved the status of our profession (Petersen, Cruz, & Amundson, 2002).

In actuality, most movement forms and physical activities can be included in the curriculum to assist students in meeting the standards if instruction is focused on student learning. Although we are proponents of sport when it is taught well, we also recognize that not all standards can be achieved through sport alone . . . or dance alone, climbing walls alone, or fitness alone. Dance, outdoor pursuits, body control activities (e.g., gymnastics, martial arts), individual sports, fitness activities, and racquet sports have much to contribute to the development of a physically educated person. Omitting them from a curriculum does the student a serious injustice and eliminates primary options for students achieving the standards. The key is to provide meaningful options through variety. To help achieve this variety, many school districts have adopted main theme curriculum models.

## Why Have We Gone to a Standards-Based Curriculum?

Have you ever stopped to consider what a high school diploma represents? Prior to the standards movement, for too many schools, a diploma had come to represent “seat time” (Guskey, 1996). In other words, a student attended school for a given number of years, sat at a desk for a required number of days, and thus earned a diploma. Although some students achieved competence in several subjects, this could not be said for all students. The standards movement sought to bring an end to this by stating what a graduate of a program should *minimally* know and be able to do.

## What Is Educational Reform?

In 2001, federal legislation was passed in the United States that required states and their respective school districts to report student progress on reaching academic performance goals established by the state. Schools were required to report results publicly as to whether students are making adequate yearly progress toward these state mandates. Recently, however, this provision has been relaxed as states are moving toward holding teachers accountable for student learning as part of merit pay increases. The original legislation, referred to as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, resulted in schools spending many precious resources (time and money) to meet these goals. The intent of NCLB is for every child to achieve a minimal level of competence in several academic areas. To date, physical education is excluded as a core subject from this legislation and in some ways has become the forgotten subject as schools struggle to meet the expectations outlined in NCLB. This legislation is really part of a reform effort that began in the mid-1980s as the United States sought to catch up to the performance levels exhibited by many other countries around the world. The following section will briefly discuss some of the important events that led to the call for educational reform.



Courtesy of Rachel Gurvitch

## What Triggered Educational Reform?

In many respects a school is a reflection of society. Early educational systems were based on classical European models, designed for the upper class (Siedentop, 1998). As the United States became less of an agricultural society and more industrial, schools assumed more of a vocational role rather than providing a liberal arts education for a few.

Compulsory education laws caused students with less scholastic ability to stay in school. This trend, coupled with the population boost from the baby boomer generation (those born between 1946 and 1964), put increased demands on the structure of schools. As class sizes increased, students were less likely to receive individual attention. At the same time that schools were dealing with a more diverse population of students with a wide variation in ability, as well as larger class sizes, knowledge increased exponentially. Teachers tried to cover what they had traditionally taught along with this new information. The net result was that not all students were learning necessary skills and knowledge by the time they graduated from high school.

A similar metamorphosis impacted physical education. Physical education classes in the early 1900s found students engaged in physical training that consisted largely of calisthenics and fitness activities. Today's physical education classes may cover a variety of team and individual sports and recreational activities, along with aerobics, hiking, disc games, dance, swimming, and fitness activities. Teachers have more to teach, less time to teach it, larger classes, and greater variation in physical ability, ethnic background, and culture.

The standards movement actually originated from the world of business as leaders began calling for educational reform. Business leaders wanted to ensure that their future workers were capable of performing the tasks necessary for success. Employers who hired graduates wanted to make sure that those holding a high school diploma had mastered at least a minimum set of skills and acquired a basic level of knowledge. Educators were called upon to identify what students should know and be able to do. This set of skills and knowledge was referred to as standards.

Because states have control of their own educational system, each state is responsible for developing its own standards. The standards movement required people to look at the graduate to define the desired knowledge base or exit skills. From there, educators could go through a

**backward design** Intentional planning in which the teacher begins with the exit goals and designs the curriculum toward those goals, from high school down to elementary school.

process referred to as **backward design** (Jacobs, 1997), which means to identify the ultimate goal/end and then determine what students needed to know at each grade level to enable them to successfully achieve the exit outcomes.

Many cognate areas began developing subject area standards to assist states and provide guidance. The National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) released physical education content standards in 1995. The NASPE standards (1995, 2004) were based on the document *Outcomes of Quality Physical Education Programs* (NASPE, 1992), which defined a physically educated person (see **Figure 1.1**). Although each state is responsible for developing its own content standards, many states have adopted the NASPE National Physical Education Content Standards (1995, 2004), as did the International Council for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport, and Dance (ICHPERSD), an international physical education organization. Some countries followed suit, adapting their standards to those developed by NASPE.

Although some people look at educational reform and the standards movement as being problematic, in some respects it can be looked upon as an opportunity for educational renewal. Because of the expansion of knowledge, the emphasis has changed from knowing minute facts



*To pursue a lifetime of healthful physical activity, a physically educated person:*

- has learned skills necessary to perform a variety of physical activities
- knows the implications of and the benefits from involvement in physical activities
- participates regularly in physical activity
- is physically fit
- values physical activity and its contributions to a healthful lifestyle

**Figure 1.1** Outcomes of quality physical education programs, which define a physically educated person.

*Source:* Reproduced from the National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (1992). *Outcomes of quality physical education programs*. [www.aahperd.org](http://www.aahperd.org).

and details to a more conceptual approach to learning (Erickson, 2002). In many instances the standards provide a lens through which to focus learning. Philosophical conversations about how to address these standards can be challenging for those willing to engage in the debate while clarifying and sharpening program goals. In physical education, a standards-based approach to curriculum development forces teachers to select activities based on their contribution to meeting the standards rather than based on teacher preference, tradition, or just as a place to start. Research (Peterson et al., 2002; Veal, Campbell, Johnson, & McKethan, 2002) has indicated positive results while moving to a standards-based approach to designing and implementing units.

The National Standards (2014) are the basis for the model of curriculum development proposed in this text. These standards are:

- *Standard 1:* Demonstrates competency in a variety of motor skills and movement patterns
- *Standard 2:* Applies knowledge of concepts, principles, strategies, and tactics related to movement and performance
- *Standard 3:* Demonstrates the knowledge and skills to achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of physical activity and fitness
- *Standard 4:* Exhibits responsible personal and social behavior that respects self and others
- *Standard 5:* Recognizes the value of physical activity for health, enjoyment, challenge, self-expression, and/or social interaction

National Standards might best be thought of as a way to define our subject matter. A new, recently approved framework will provide grade-level outcomes for each grade, K–8, and two levels of outcomes for high school. Many states have adopted the National Standards other states have modified them and developed their own standards and frameworks.

It is important to recognize that, unlike other disciplines, physical education does not have a national curriculum. Instead, we have a set of competencies that define the skills and knowledge that students are expected to learn through physical education (Society of Health and Physical Educators 2014). These competencies have been labeled *content standards* and specify what a student should know and be able to do as a result of participating in a quality physical education program. Although these content standards describe what students are expected to know and be



able to do, they do not define what is considered an acceptable level of performance. That is the role of *performance standards*. The Society of Health and Physical Educators (2014) suggests that a performance standard describes the levels of achievement that students are expected to attain to meet the content standards. Although the new standards provide a framework for physical education, they are not considered performance standards because performance expectations will depend on the number of days per week a child has physical education, class size, and resources (space and equipment) availability. NASPE's PE Metrics provides assessments to measure student performance for each of the National Standards (Fisette et al., 2009). These can be helpful for programs as they develop performance standards for their students.

## What Other Factors Have Influenced Curriculum Development?

Although educational reform has changed the focus of curriculum development, other factors have led to the changes in physical education curriculum content. These factors are a direct result of our changing society and, more importantly, changes in the way that education is considered. This section will discuss the impact that societal interests, mobility, accessibility, choice, educational accountability, and time have on curriculum development.

### Societal Interests

Several games and activities that, in the past, were the focus of after school and weekend play in local parks are now popular additions to physical education programs. Physical activity trends have appropriately become curricular choices. Ultimate, inline skating, and pickleball are three examples of popular activities that have been added to physical education programs starting in the 1970s. When students master the basic skills of physical activities, they can learn new activities as adults. If young people develop a sidearm throw, balance, and striking skills while in school, then the previously mentioned activities are relatively easy to learn as adults, even though they had not previously experienced them. Physical education curricula must provide a variety of activities and skills to allow success while learning new activities as adults, even if these activities are not directly taught in physical education.

### Mobility

Society today is much more mobile than in the past. Instead of living in a single community for one's entire life, people today are much more likely to work in a variety of geographical settings because of job and personal changes. An individual growing up in Florida taking part in body surfing and snorkeling might end up working in Colorado, where skiing, hiking, and mountain climbing abound. Someone from North Dakota, having spent time mountain biking and skiing, might settle in southern California and have access to beaches, beach volleyball, and surfing. Curricula need to be diverse enough to allow for the changes in the living environment that adulthood may bring.

## Accessibility

Sports and physical activity are popular outlets for enjoying one's free time. As a result, many facilities have made new activities more accessible. Someone living in a major city might never visit a mountain, yet can enjoy wall climbing at a local YMCA or sport center. Some homes include exercise rooms so that busy owners can work out when it fits into their schedules. For these individuals it is important to understand training principles so they can develop their own exercise regimens. The needs of youth are varied in a physical education program. Curricula that align with the standards will identify conceptual learning and provide youth with ways to stay physically active throughout a lifespan.

## Choice

Despite what we know about the importance of physical activity and leading a physically active lifestyle, we live in a sedentary society. Too many people select sedentary activities because they have greater appeal than more physical ones. Physical education programs must have a major focus on helping children and youth choose to be physically active and provide them with the skills and knowledge to design their own physical activity and fitness plans to carry them through adulthood. Success and enjoyment of our programs as they move through school are one way to facilitate this effort, because we tend to choose to take part in the things we enjoy.

## Accountability

As stated earlier, one of the biggest components of educational reform has been the idea of accountability. In 1983, Placek found that many physical education teachers planned lessons primarily to keep students busy, happy, and “good.” Although these are factors of a strong program, they are not enough alone—learning and achievement must also be an outcome. In some schools, physical education was marginalized and administrators did not care about what students learned in physical education, as long as the classes were under control. In these schools, physical education often turned into recreation programs, with large numbers of students engaged in game play rather than instruction. In other schools, physical education became a setting where students could choose to just sit and watch others participate. In still other schools, a few days were devoted to instruction but the majority of time was spent in game play. Because learning didn't need to be documented, some administrators didn't pay much attention to what was happening in physical education. Times have changed, and the accountability movement is as important for physical education as it is for reading or mathematics.

## Time

Time is a precious commodity in schools. Teachers in subjects that are tested in state-wide assessment programs are under pressure to document student learning. Physical education must become part of this accountability system if we are to keep our programs and make them viable. In states where physical education is not part of the accountability formula, some administrators have cut time available for physical education so that students can spend additional time

on subjects that are tested, despite there being no documented evidence that this practice improves test scores on a long-term basis (Wechsler, 2008). If physical education is going to continue to be part of the school curriculum, teachers must find a way to connect with the educational goals of a school and document their contribution to meeting these goals. Schools are being held accountable for student learning, and physical education is not exempt from this accountability.

## **How Does Planning Change When Moving from a Traditional to a Standards-Based Curriculum?**

---

The process of curriculum development with a standards-based format is different from the process used in planning traditional curricula. Whereas traditional curriculum development begins with identifying activities for students, a standards-based curriculum does not. The major difference between the two is that a standards-based curriculum requires those developing the curriculum to look first at what they are trying to accomplish before identifying activities that will help students attain those standards. In states where there is strong accountability (i.e., rewards and sanctions based on whether students meet standards), schools pay closer attention to whether their students are able to meet the standards.

In a standards-based curriculum, once teachers have decided what students should know and be able to do, they must decide on the level of performance. National Standards talk about competency in motor skills and movement patterns to perform a variety of physical activities. What number does “a variety” represent? What level of performance does “competency” represent? Identifying performance levels for standards helps define the standards. This process also can be part of educational renewal as teachers discuss their expectations about how good is “good enough” to satisfy the intent of the standards. These and other discussions occur as curriculum writers unpack the standards.

## **What Is the Role of Assessment in a Standards-Based Curriculum?**

---

The second part of the paradigm shift with standards-based curricula involves the use of assessment. Assessments are a key part of the standards-based curriculum process because those developing curricula must decide what they are going to accept as evidence that students have met the standards. Additionally, they must decide at what point(s) students are going to demonstrate competence. Because exit outcomes are assessed when students have taken their last physical education class, in some districts, this may be as early as 9th grade. Teachers and schools will also usually assess students prior to this final evaluation to see whether they are making adequate progress toward the exit outcomes. Some states have mandated when students will be assessed. In states where there are no state mandates, school districts make these decisions.

The types of assessments used for a standards-based curriculum must be aligned with the standards. Although this might seem like a simplistic statement, in some cases there is a disconnect between the standards and the assessments. For example, if the state adopted standards similar to the National Standards a paper and pencil test would not be an adequate measure for Standard 1 (Demonstrates competency in a variety of motor skills and movement patterns). Many states have been reluctant to implement *performance-based assessments* because they are costly to administer and evaluate. It is also difficult to hire evaluators who can visit a site and administer the assessments. Some states have directed school districts to develop assessment systems that measure student learning and achievement of standards; others are trying to develop assessments at the state level. The challenge of assessing physical education performance is an issue that will need to be resolved when using student learning to determine teacher merit raises. Recent legislation associated with Race to the Top funding will require states to determine how to award merit in those subjects that are not tested with current assessment programs.

## Selecting Activities in a Standards-Based Curriculum

---

A standards-based curriculum calls for a careful selection of activities with adequate time provided for students to strive toward and master them. When viewing an entire standards-based program, it would appear that fewer sports and activities are offered, and instructional units tend to be extended for longer periods of time. This reflects the “less is more” principle and is built on students gaining competency in a few activities. It is also intended that as students become knowledgeable with one activity they will be able to transfer that knowledge to other activities with similar characteristics. The “exposure curriculum” of the more traditional multiactivity programs simply does not allow this depth of knowledge and transfer.

Teachers often feel they are on a teeter-totter when they plan for and deliver a curriculum in physical education. On one hand, a primary function of education is to provide students with the skills and information that they will need to be active as adults. Participation patterns for adults are very different from those of youth. Physical education programs need to take these differences into consideration as they prepare students to be active adults. On the other hand, we know that if students are going to choose to be physically active as adults, they must enjoy physical activity as youth. A wonderful article in *Educational Leadership*, “Lessons from Skateboarders” (Sagor, 2002), highlights the time, energy, sweat, and injury many youth will go through just to master a skateboarding skill, yet when they get to school they are unmotivated and lack interest in learning. Although what we teach should not be dictated by what the students want, we must find ways to pull them in, motivate them to persevere, and provide them with what is important, relevant, and worth their time and energy to master. This also might mean that our programs offer activities that are taking place in the community after school and on weekends and encourage students to participate in them beyond the physical education class.

Although providing options is a key to meeting the standards, activities included in the curriculum must be evaluated in terms of their contribution and linked to the standard to which they align. For instance, golf is a great lifetime sport, but its contribution to fitness is minimal. Gymnastics contributes to the aesthetics as well as the flexibility component of fitness, but it is not something in which older adults usually participate. Activities must be selected not only for their individual contribution, but also for their impact on the overall education of the child. Just as a jigsaw puzzle needs all the pieces to show the correct picture, a curriculum needs to have all the pieces (activities) necessary for a child to be physically educated. The curriculum must have a balance between activities for the present and those for the future.

Teachers also must remember that students have different activity preferences. All students are not alike—some enjoy backpacking, whereas others prefer the aesthetics that dance and gymnastics provide. Additionally, different activities are popular in different regions. Imagine trying to teach ice hockey in Alabama, and trying not to teach it in upstate New York! Clogging is a very important dance form in North Carolina, but few (if any) people in New Mexico go clogging on a regular basis. When deciding how to meet the intent of the National Standards each of the previously mentioned activities has its place and contribution. Teachers must select a variety of activities that will allow students to meet the standards, while respecting the participation preferences regarding physical activity in their region of the country.

One alternative is to have a main theme as the organizing center or central thrust of a program around which content is developed to meet specific goals or standards (Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000; Tannehill, van der Mars, & MacPhail, 2015). A variety of activities presented through main theme models (e.g., net, invasion, and target games in sport education; hiking, fishing, and camping in outdoor education; trust, cooperative games, and low-level initiatives in adventure education; and basic motor skills in developmental education) will increase opportunities for students to reach these goals or standards to their fullest extent. The standards reform initiative has forced schools and school districts to think differently about what is taught and why it is included in the curriculum.

## Summary

---

A standards-based curriculum is complex and requires a great deal of thought to develop and implement. Writing clear goals and purposes for a physical education curriculum, and then developing assessments to measure these goals, are the first steps when creating a standards-based curriculum. A variety of curricular models may be adopted that provide interesting lenses through which to create a program. Physical education programs can be exciting and provide challenging learning opportunities for students. Additionally, they make a positive contribution to the health and well-being of those who participate in and complete the program. Although some individuals are resistant to the standards movement, we see it as an opportunity to redesign the way we think about physical education. Developing a standards-based curriculum is seen as a vehicle for educational renewal, as well as the first step toward building a quality physical education program.

## Key Terms

curriculum  
standards

standards-based curriculum  
backward design

## References

- Burgeson, C., Wechsler, H., Brener, N., Young, J., & Spain, C. (2003). Physical education and activity: Results from the school health policies and programs study 2000. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 74(1), 20–36.
- Doolittle, S. (2003, April). *Assessment programs in New York State: A whole village's effort*. Paper presented at the National Conference for the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Philadelphia, PA.
- Erickson, H. L. (2002). *Concept-based curriculum and instruction: Teaching beyond the facts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fisette, J., Placek, J., Avery, M., Dyson, B., Fox, C., Franck, M., & Zhu, W. (2009). Developing quality physical education through student assessments. *Strategies*, 22(3), 33–34.
- Guskey, T. (1996). *Alternative ways to document and communicate student learning*. Read by author. Cassette recording no. 296211. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jacobs, H. H. (1997). *Mapping the big picture*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (1992). *Outcomes of quality physical education programs*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (1995). *Moving into the future: National standards for physical education*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Society of Health and Physical Educators. (2014). *National standards & grade-level outcomes for k–12 physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Peterson, S., Cruz, L., & Amundson, R. (2002). The standards' impact on physical education in New York State. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 73(4), 15–18, 23.
- Placek, J. (1983). Concepts of success in teaching: Busy, happy and good? In T. Templin & J. Olson (Eds.), *Teaching in physical education* (pp. 46–56). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Rink, J. (2000, July). *Linking physical activity and fitness*. Presented at the National Conference sponsored by the National Association of Sport and Physical Education on Content Standards 3 and 4. Baltimore, MD.
- Sagor, R. (2002). Lessons from skateboarders. *Educational Leadership*, 60(1), 34–38.
- Siedentop, D. (1998). *Introduction to physical education, fitness, and sport* (3rd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Siedentop, D., Mand, C., & Taggart, A. (1986). *Physical education: Teaching and curriculum strategies for grades 5–12*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Siedentop, D., & Tannehill, D. (2000). *Developing teaching skills in physical education* (4th ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Tannehill, D., van der Mars, H., & MacPhail, A. (2015). *Building effective physical education programs*. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Veal, M. L., Campbell, M., Johnson, D., & McKethan, R. (2002). The North Carolina PEPSE project. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 73(4), 19–23.
- Wechsler, H. (2008). *Physical education in the United States: A status report from the CDC's 2006 school health policies and programs study*. Presentation made at NASPE's general session at the 2008 AAHPERD national convention in Ft. Worth, TX.



## Additional Resources

- Bulger, S., Housner, L., & Lee, A. (2008). Curriculum alignment: A view from physical education teacher education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 79(7), 44–49.
- Carr, J., & Harris, D. (2001). *Succeeding with standards: Linking curriculum, assessment, and action planning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Castelli, D., & Beighle, A. (2007). The physical education teacher as school activity director. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 78(5), 25–28.
- Cooper Institute. (2002). *FITNESSGRAM test administration manual* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Corbin, C., & McKenzie, T. (2008). Physical activity promotion: A responsibility for both K–12 physical education and kinesiology. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 79(6), 47–50.
- Eisner, E. (1995). Standards for American schools: Help or hindrance? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 758–764.
- Hirsch, S., & Killion, J. (2009). When educators learn, students learn: Eight principles of professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90, 465–469.
- Kirk, D., Penney, D., Burgess-Limerick, R., Gorley, T., & Maynard, C. (2002). *A-level physical education: The reflective performer*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Lambert, L. (2000). The new physical education. *Educational Leadership*, 57(6), 34–38.
- Landers, D., & Kretchmar, S. (2008). Focus and folk knowledge. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 79(6), 51–56.
- Lawson, H. (2007). Renewing the core curriculum. *Quest*, 59, 219–243.
- Lee, A., & Solmon, M. (2007). School programs to increase physical activity. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 78(5), 22–24, 28.
- Lewis, A. (1995). An overview of the standards movement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 744–750.
- Locke, L. (1990). Why motor learning is ignored: A case of ducks, naughty theories, and unrequited love. *Quest*, 59, 346–357.
- Locke, L. (2008). Three examples of kinesiology in physical education: Why, how, and for whom? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 79(7), 50–54.
- Lynn, S. (2007). The case for daily physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 78(5), 18–21.
- McCullick, B., & Chen, A. (2008). Introduction. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 79(6), 46, 55–56.
- Napper-Owen, G., Marston, R., Volkinburg, P., Afeman, H., & Brewer, J. (2003). What constitutes a highly qualified physical education teacher? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 79(8), 26–30.
- National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity. (n.d.). Model school wellness policies. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolwellnesspolicies.org>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Pub.L. No. 107-110, 20 U.S.C. section 6301 (2001).
- President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports. (2002). *The president's challenge*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Thomas, J., Thomas, K., & Williams, K. (2008). Motor development and elementary physical education are partners. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 79(7), 40–43.
- Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Welk, G., Wood, K., & Morss, G. (2003). Parental influences on physical activity in children: An exploration of potential mechanisms. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 15, 19–33.
- Wiegand, R., Bulger, S., & Mohr, D. (2004). Curricular issues in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 75(8), 47–55.
- Woods, A. M., & Graber, K. (2007). Stepping up to the plate: Physical educators as advocates for wellness policies—part 1. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 78(5), 17, 21.



