This instructional blueprint describes an approach a team of educators might take to progress through the curriculum and review previously-learned material while still offering opportunities for personalized learning.

What does this look like in action?

This blueprint proposes a way to move students through three different thematically-related learning experiences over the course of a block period (about 90-120 minutes):
- A lesson cycle (e.g., inquiry lesson, writer's workshop, lab),
- Cumulative review facilitated by community educators and
- Technology-supported personalized learning.

The order in which students engage in the learning experiences will vary, so success in one learning experience should not be contingent upon success in another.

Consider, for example, that students might be engaging in a multi-disciplinary problem-based learning unit on biodiversity:
- The lesson cycle might prompt students to write a persuasive letter convincing local business owners to turn their green spaces into certified wildlife habitats.
- Community educators might facilitate cumulative review of science content about plant life and animal habitats.
- Students might be reading on-level non-fiction texts about conservation with the support of a virtual tutor during technology-supported personalized learning time.

What guidance and considerations might maximize student learning?

- Facilitation of cumulative review should not require content area expertise. Trivia-style activities, review games and problem-sets with answer keys might be appropriate activities in this context.
- If space permits, consider combining students and educators from learning spaces 3 and 4 for some portion of the lesson cycle. This would allow educators to better distribute their expertise and would also increase the level of personalization for students.
- Later in the school year, the lead teacher might co-teach in learning spaces 3 or 4 in lieu of supporting and coaching in spaces 1 and 2.
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### Rotation schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 25 min.</td>
<td>Small-group cumulative review</td>
<td>Technology-supported PL</td>
<td>Lesson cycle</td>
<td>Lesson cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 50 min.</td>
<td>Technology-supported PL</td>
<td>Small-group cumulative review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 75 min.</td>
<td>Lesson cycle</td>
<td>Lesson cycle</td>
<td>Small-group cumulative review</td>
<td>Technology-supported PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 100 min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology-supported PL</td>
<td>Small-group cumulative review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student learning activities and educator roles

Imagine four learning spaces with 100 total students, a core team of 6 educators and 5 community educators.

**Learning space 1**  
Small-group cumulative review

**Learning space 2**  
Technology-supported personalized learning

**Learning space 3**  
Lesson cycle

**Learning space 4**  
Lesson cycle