

Exploring IB-Thought through Text – Course Map

(Module 2) Course Foundation Components

Learner Profile Summary	Course Description
<p>The organizational context revolves around a public, IB high school with the identified learners being 15-16 year old sophomores taking IB MYP English courses. The students have varying literacy levels, ZPD's, socioeconomic backgrounds, disabilities, and ELL statuses. All of these students are required to take IBDP English next year, but they're not all familiar with what IBDP means and the higher-level thinking accompanied with it. Students voice interest in kinesthetic learning opportunities and have a goal of being prepared for their future rigorous coursework. They share struggles with lack of structure and higher-order thinking. To remedy this, students will explore IB-style thinking seen in the English IBDP program through literary and non-literary analysis. NOTE: Objectives in IB require an ATL skill that is seen in the objectives. For the sake of real-life application, I have provided supplemental ATL skills for each objective below</p>	<p>Language is fundamental to learning, thinking, and communicating. In this course, students will be encouraged to recognize that proficiency in language is an essential component of IBDP learning and a powerful tool for communication in all societies. This Language and literature course incorporates creative processes and encourages the development of imagination and creativity through self-expression. To that end, students will analyze both literary and non-literary texts with IB-style thinking. Students will incorporate the IB Learner Profile attributes in their daily routine and will develop their cognitive, metacognitive, and affective skills as they accomplish course objectives through IB Approaches to Learning (ATL) skills. Ultimately, the course goal is to enhance IB-style thinking skills through literary analysis in preparation for more challenging reading and writing assignments in the IB Diploma Program.</p>
Course Objectives	
CO1 Understand how IB-style thinking influences interpretations of texts ATL Skill: Interpret	
CO2 Analyze the meaning of texts through author choice and IB concepts. ATL Skill: Critical Thinking	
CO3 Apply the IB-style thinking framework when analyzing literary and non-literary texts. ATL Skill: Research	
CO4 Evaluate interpretations of texts using higher order IB-style thinking criteria. ATL Skill: Reflection	
CO5 Create a product communicating understanding of author choice in literature using IB-style thinking ATL Skill: Communication	
Summative Assessment Idea	
<p>Students create a concept map, demonstrating IB style thinking about a literary and non-literary text discussed within the course. When students are asked to create a concept map, they need to show how an IB style of thought works within a variety of texts with author's choices. This assesses both the first and second objectives, with students not only identifying IB levels of thought, but the way authors use</p>	

Learner Profile Summary	Course Description
language to show the identified IB related themes. The summative focusing on creation forces students to apply their understanding (objectives 3 and 5). They must evaluate various texts discussed in the course which is seen with the texts they choose and furthered by how they discuss and compare author choice in said texts.	

(Module 3)

Learning Design - Exploring IB-Thought through Text

	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3
Module Title	Foundations of IB Thinking	Applying IB Thought through Interpreting Author Choice in Text	Synthesis of IB Thought through Text
Course Objective Alignments	<p>CO#1 Understand how IB-style thinking influences interpretations of texts ATL Skill: Interpret</p> <p>CO#2 Analyze the meaning of texts through author choice and IB concepts. ATL Skill: Critical Thinking</p>	<p>CO#2 Analyze the meaning of texts through author choice and IB concepts. ATL Skill: Critical Thinking</p> <p>CO#3 Apply the IB-style thinking framework when analyzing literary and non-literary texts. ATL Skill: Research</p>	<p>CO#4 Evaluate interpretations of texts using higher order IB-style thinking criteria. ATL Skill: Reflection</p> <p>CO#5 Create a product communicating understanding of language using IB higher order thinking ATL Skill: Communication</p>
Module Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identify the 7 IB Lang and Lit IB concepts -Describe how each concept can influence interpretations of a literary text differently -Analyze a literary and non-lit text using unfamiliar concepts -Explore the impact of author choice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develop understanding of author choice in both literary and non-literary texts -Explain the impact of author choice in a variety of texts through different lenses -Discuss with peers how author choice is seen in conjunction with IB concepts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Interpret a literary and non-literary text using an IB concept -Justify understanding of interpretations through citing and comparing authorial choices -Create a concept map detailing how different IB concepts shape student understanding of a text

	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3
Module Title	Foundations of IB Thinking	Applying IB Thought through Interpreting Author Choice in Text	Synthesis of IB Thought through Text
Topics/Skills to Teach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) IB Lang and Lit Concept Introduction (creativity, communication, perspective, representation, identity, culture, and transformation). b) Relevance of author choice in IB style thinking c) Author choice (literary device) identification and development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Compare author-choice in literary and non-literary texts b) Explain impact of author choice (literary devices) in a variety of texts through different concept lenses c) Discuss interpretations of text through varied concepts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Synthesis of author choice in literary v non-literary texts b) Compare concept lens interpretation of texts and peer interpretation of texts, similarities and differences. c) Concept Map Creation
Learning Resource	<p>IBDP Lang and Lit Expectations</p> <p>International Baccalaureate. (2025, March 06). <i>Literature and performance updates</i>. Retrieved November 29, 2025, from https://www.ibo.org/university-admission/latest-curriculum-updates/literature-and-performance/</p> <p>Kami Annotation Platform (cited below)</p> <p>Kami. (n.d.). <i>Kami: Elevate instruction. Reach every learner</i>. Retrieved November 29, 2025, from https://www.kamiapp.com/</p> <p>IB Style Thinking Concept Map (cited below)</p>	<p>Student exemplar of two non lit analysis using IB concepts and authorial choice</p> <p>Clastify. (n.d.). Clastify. Retrieved November 29, 2025, from https://www.clastify.com/notes/english-a-lang-lit/60fc0e6b81ca7600127067c3</p> <p>Student exemplar of non lit and lit analysis</p> <p>Clastify. (n.d.). <i>IB English A (Lang & Lit) notes</i>. Clastify. Retrieved November 29, 2025, from https://www.clastify.com/notes/english-a-lang-lit/5fbd8a395657b471ba0a1c9b</p>	<p>IBDP Style Rubric with Criterion (Bands 1-8)</p> <p>Paper 1 Assessment Criteria First Exams 2021 – HL/SL. (n.d.). <i>IB English A Language and Literature – Paper 1 Assessment Criteria</i>. Scribd. Retrieved November 29, 2025, from https://www.scribd.com/document/486893474/paper-1-assessment-criteria-first-exams-2021-hl-sl</p> <p>-Concept Map Example of Literary Device</p> <p>Thinkmap Visual Thesaurus. (2013, February 26). <i>Introducing Students to Literary Nonfiction</i> [Infographic]. Thinkmap Visual Thesaurus. https://www.visualthesaurus.com/cm/le</p>

	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3
Module Title	Foundations of IB Thinking	Applying IB Thought through Interpreting Author Choice in Text	Synthesis of IB Thought through Text
	<p>LitLearn. (n.d.). <i>[Infographic on IB English Paper 1] [Infographic]</i>. In <i>IB English Paper 1 explained</i>. Retrieved November 29, 2025, from https://litlearn.com/ib-english-paper-1-explained/</p>	<p>Literary Example of Text</p> <p>Fitzgerald, F. S. (1925). <i>The Great Gatsby</i>. In <i>Owl Eyes</i>. Retrieved November 29, 2025, from https://www.owleyes.org/text/the-great-gatsby/read/chapter-iii#root-266</p> <p>Non-Literary Example of Texts below</p> <p>Great Gatsby by Baz Luhrman</p> <p>JohnMaverick (2022, March 10). <i>The Great Gatsby (2013) Scene: "...I'm Gatsby!"</i> [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Efx_yD8xAXM</p> <p>Moulin Rouge by Baz Luhrman</p> <p>Wincy Studios. (2023, July 23). <i>Moulin Rouge (2001) Scene: Smells Like Teen Spirit</i> [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cwN1N07_0eQ&list=RDcwN1N07_0eQ&start_radio=1</p>	<p>ssons/introducing-students-to-literary-nonfiction/</p>

	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3
Module Title	Foundations of IB Thinking	Applying IB Thought through Interpreting Author Choice in Text	Synthesis of IB Thought through Text
Assessment Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Learners identify purpose of author choice in annotation synthesis -Learners define 7 IB concepts using A word bank -Learners share examples of non-literary texts in entry tickets 	<p>-Learners create a Venn Diagram comparing an author choice in a non-literary v literary text.</p> <p>For example, how is tone seen in an advertisement vs a speech?</p> <p>-Learners create a graphic to show how two concepts changes an interpretation of the same text</p> <p>-Students could have a second, discussion based /ATL skill-based assessment where they share with peers who chose the same concepts or same texts how they see interpretations change.</p> <p>For example: A student explains how interpretations of Celeste Ng's Little Fires Everywhere change when analyzing the text from a lens of culture vs a lens of communication. They can work with someone else who chose that text but different concepts, or the same concepts in a different text. This way they get experience seeing different interpretations regardless of their choice.</p>	<p>-Learners create a concept map, demonstrating how an IB concept shapes understanding of a literary and non-literary text discussed within the course. Students must justify each concept interpretation with author choices (literary device) seen in text.</p>

(Module 5)

Alignment Analysis & Reflection

Alignment – Key Terms

Key Terms (3–5)				
IB Thinking / IB-style Thought	Author Choice	Texts (literary and non-lit)	IB Concept(s)	Interpretation
17	20	40	28	15

Alignment Analysis

The main goal of the highlighting activity is to ensure alignment throughout the course. From the foundational components to the course map, there should be a clear through-line with these terms and how they are used to align student needs and course goals with the course objectives, activities, and summative assessment.

Analysis of Findings

The findings from this activity show a clear focus on IB thought, author choice, and text types. This focus relates directly to the learner needs of developing textual analysis used within the IB diploma programme. The terms text and IB thought/IB Concept appeared the most, with author choice trending right behind. Interpretation was seen often but not as much as the other terms. A lot of IB language consists of similar concepts explained with different terms. For example, **IB-style thinking** is an analysis of **author choice** in **texts** through the lens of varying **IB concepts**. When **texts** are analyzed through different **IB concepts** (lenses), they're considered different **interpretations** of the **text**. Seeing that these terms are all connected, the slight differences in term appearance makes sense. If an objective expects the learner to use IB-thought or analyze a text, using IB concepts and author choice is inherent to that task because doing those things is what makes up IB-thought.

The IB concepts appeared on average 8.3 times in each module, but that term is not expressed in any of the three module titles. However, the term IB thought is the focus of each module title. While this may read as a misalignment, it actually shows strong alignment of IB concepts. IB thought is the culmination of the literary analysis process done through IB concept lenses using author choice. Using the terms that make up IB thought in the objectives and activities helps make the intangible “IB-thought” a more tangible skill for learners. Solving a math equation requires a learner to show their work. Just stating a problem and the answer isn’t helping the learner solve the problem. The learner needs to learn the process to solve the equation themselves. IB thought is the problem, analyzing author choice in texts through IB concepts is the process, and an accurate interpretation of the text is the answer. Interpreting texts could be mentioned more given that it is the synthesis of the course. However, when applying the previous logic, it could be argued that the process of interpreting texts is already emphasized in each module with the other terms.

Reflection on Curriculum Design

This curriculum design process was very insightful and provided a refreshing look on course design. Beginning by identifying an actual, data-based need within my organization for the course increased my intention when communicating with my SME and designing the course as whole. I'm used to using the backwards design process for creating curriculum but I was always given the IB based standards that needed to be met. When creating the assessment for this course, it was a little difficult to create the objectives myself and then go into creating the summative. Once I got over the objective uncertainty, it became a fulfilling experience to work through the course module by module. It enhanced my understanding of what I should and should not include, and I used my objectives as an anchor I knew were addressing true needs.

Another aspect of the design process was my constant reflection on my initial plans for the course. I wanted multimodality to play a role because it's a material that every teacher has the option of using and an easier accommodation for the wide demographic of students to access. However, after further reflection with my SME, we realized that we could open the course up to UDL without requiring multimodality as a core part of the curriculum. Students also voiced interest in kinesthetic learning opportunities and multimodality directly opposes this. As seen in Cammy Beans 2023 text, *The Accidental Instructional Designer*, she explains how the three main types of data (performance, user experience, and customer experience) can all work together to develop a course (Bean 2023). When reflecting on the design process, I never realized that by going back to the needs assessment I was ignoring the user experience data and substituting it for demographic data. In the alignment activity, I was able to see where the terms did and did not match up when it came to the objectives, needs, and assessment. It provided a great deal of clarity for how I could shift terminology to better align wording to intended outcome.

The learners wanted kinesthetics, and I wanted accommodations for learners to be easier. I didn't really meet either of those goals by including multimodality. Just having students make a multimodal product doesn't constitute as kinesthetic or accessible. It also watered down the entire goal of the course. By going back to user experience data and performance data, it was obvious that I needed to make curriculum changes. That's where I broadened the "what" (multiple means of representation) of the course. This helps make the content more accessible and provided structure with more intangible tasks like the why and how of learning. With the help of the SME, I was able to create a course that directly translates to an IBDP environment and independently further this through reviewing the learner and performance data as we made content modifications.

The course development was a cyclical process and that repetitive nature is seen in the alignment of the course objectives, tasks, and assessment. Effective curriculum design requires confronting your own bias, SME bias, and revisiting multiple types of data to enhance the course effectively. In American College of Education's Module 5 presentation *Using Your Course Map*, Sarah Alstyne explains that building curriculum is like putting the pieces of a puzzle together (American College of Education 2023). You start with a bunch of pieces and begin assembling by identifying the "ends". These ends are the learner data, objectives, and assessments. When you make part of a puzzle, you have to go back to those ends to complete the rest of the picture. That's exactly how I designed the modules for the course. Finished one module, went back to the summative, finished the second module, went back to the summative to check for alignment. Effective courses and alignment sit on the shoulders of a strong objective-summative connection.

The strength of my curriculum is the strong critical theory-based content that's made tangible. In Ionia Stoica's 2021 article, *Curriculum Theory*, she explains critical theory backed curriculum aims "to appreciate individual differences and the dynamics between people and within groups, and recommend methods...to foster communication, integrative and embodied learning, and holistic understandings" (Stoica 2021). The design of the

course is based on practicing thinking as a product; making a non-concrete style of thinking, concrete. IB-thought is inherently critical, with the goal being various interpretations of text based on the IB concepts of identity, culture, creativity, communication, perspective, representation, and transformation. With students partaking in kinesthetic, discussion-based activities to meet this goal, they navigate this style of thought hands-on. It's difficult but it's essential to the IB cause of creating students with international mindedness. The course and its contents follow a critical framework, embracing the importance of knowing.

The main weakness is the weaker verb connection in part of the summative assessment with the other objectives. Strong, specific verbs are essential to strong objectives that align with the summative. In the course, I use the term "interpret" loosely in the objectives while it is the focus of the summative. This is in part due to the objectives following Bloom's taxonomy hierarchy and building a course within 3 modules. Before students can get to the interpretation/evaluation level, they need to get through the apply and analyze levels. The process of interpreting is done throughout all of module 2, but it's described as analysis in the objective. In John Loeser's 2021 article *Understanding by Design*, he explains how "facts and concepts are not easy to retain if students are unable to relate them to a larger picture of understanding" (Loeser 2021). This is where I struggle with terminology in objectives and summatives. I know the order and building blocks to get students to the point they need to be at, but I want the final goal to be digestible and retained. By using differing terms for the summative and objective, I may be doing a disservice when they get to the final product.

Recommendations for Improvement

There are a few recommendations to improve my course. The main recommendation is to include more term specific objectives that relate to interpreting text. While the process of IB thinking requires students to interpret text, the module titles and objectives do not include the term interpret. As stated before, the term analysis is used often when in reality, students are practicing interpretation in their texts along with analysis. . Their practice analyzing texts through different concept lenses leads to them interpreting texts differently based on the IB concept they're using. I would make sure to be clear with the objective language and include more assignments that focus on just analysis and just interpretation before making them synthesize their knowledge of both in the summative.

References

American College of Education. (2025). *TECH5213 Curriculum alignment and planning: Module 5 [Part 1 presentation]. Canvas*. https://ace.instructure.com/courses/2143135/external_tools/118428

Bean, C. (2023). *The accidental instructional designer: Learning design for the digital age* (2nd ed.). American Society for Training & Development. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/AmerCollofEduc/detail.action?docID=7251112>

Loeser, J. (2021). *Understanding by Design*. In *Salem Press Encyclopedia*. Salem Press.

Stoica, I. (2021). *Curriculum theory*. In *Salem Press Encyclopedia*. Salem Press. Retrieved from