

Is This True About Common Core? You Decide.

Is Common Core really a set of “State Led Standards” or is it the foundation of a “federal curriculum” reinforced through aligned assessments, resulting in loss of local control?

When funding and teacher/school evaluations are tied directly to Common Core Assessment results, Curriculum and Teacher Practices will be closely aligned to those national standards, allowing very little flexibility in both curriculum and teaching practices. That begins to look like a National Curriculum.

Dr. Sandra Stotsky a member of the Common Core Validation Committee who refused to sign off on standards:

“Based on the analyses cited above, **Common Core’s standards are an unsound basis for the development of common assessments. Moreover, in order for test developers to develop “curriculum-based” assessments, they will essentially remove control of curriculum from the local level if not the state level.**” Sandra Stotsky

<http://www.freedomkentucky.org/images/2/29/Stotsky> -

[Reasons for not signing off on Common Core’s final standards-1.pdf](#)

Are Common Core Standards “Rigorous” and “Benchmarked against International Standards?”

English: Read Dr. Sandra Stotsky’s Full Report in the link above. Excerpts below:

“In my judgment, Common Core’s standards for grades 6-12 do not reflect the core knowledge needed for authentic college-level work and do not frame the literary and cultural knowledge one would expect of graduates from an American high school.”

“Many standards are paraphrases of the “anchor” “college and career readiness standards.” Many others are unclear in meaning, not easily interpretable, or unteachable. The “college and career readiness standards” that govern all grade-level standards have no discernible academic level; for the most part, they are simply a set of poorly written, confusing, content-empty, and culture-free generic skills with no internally valid organization of their own. They cannot serve the function academic standards are intended to serve—to frame a curriculum with common intellectual goals that build coherently from grade to grade.”

“**Comparable to the expectations of other leading nations.**” The two English-speaking areas for which I could find assessment material (British Columbia and Ireland) have far more demanding requirements for college readiness. The

British Commonwealth examinations I have seen in the past were far more demanding in reading and literature in terms of the knowledge base students needed for taking and passing them. **No material was ever provided to the Validation Committee or to the public on the specific college readiness expectations of other leading nations in mathematics or language and literature.**”

“Informed by available research or evidence” No evidence was ever provided to the Validation Committee supporting the specific “college and career readiness standards” as a group and their use as an organizing scheme for generating grade-level standards. In fact, the evidence that can be located is either counter-evidence or misinterpreted evidence (see Stotsky and Wurman, 2010). Nor is there clear evidence that career readiness is similar to college readiness.”

“The result of processes that reflect best practices for standards development.” I am unaware of any study providing information on “best practices” for standards development aside from my own published work in a Brookings Institution publication (Stotsky, 2004) and a Peter Lang collection of essays (Stotsky, 2000) and my own recommendations to Senate and House Committees on Education in the Ohio and New Jersey legislature (Stotsky, 2009a; Stotsky 2009b). Based on my experience in the Massachusetts Department of Education from 1999-2003, where I was in charge of the development or revision of Massachusetts K-12 standards in all major subjects, and on my extensive experience in local government on a variety of committees for different boards, **my judgment is that almost every aspect of the process in which Common Core’s standards were developed profoundly violated almost all civically appropriate procedures for the development of what would become a major public document** (see Wurman and Stotsky, 2010, for details, as well as the model procedures used by the National Mathematics Advisory Panel on which I served from 2006-2008, outlined from p. 79 on in its final report of March 2008).

Math: Read Dr. Jim Milgram’s report below:

http://www.freedomkentucky.org/images/e/e9/Milgram%27s_Full_Letter_comments-final-draft-short-versiont.pdf

Jim Milgram, Stanford Math Professor, member of the Common Core Validation Committee, one of 5 of the 29 members who refused to validate the standards.

Geometry:

It is also worth noting that a similar approach was taken in Russia about 30 years back, but was quickly rejected. It wasn't that the teachers were not capable of teaching, though this may well be a problem for most middle school and many

high school math teachers here. The problem was that it was way too non-standard, and basic geometric facts and theorems had to be handled in entirely new, untested, and ultimately unsuccessful ways. However, to my knowledge, there is no solid research that justifies this approach at the K-12 level currently.

Final Remarks:

. . . In any case there are now actual errors in the sixth and seventh grade discussions of ratios and rates. They had been clear and mathematically correct presentations of material that is typically very badly done in most state standards in this country. Now they are neither mathematically correct nor especially clear.

. . . In any case, in spite of all these issues, only the very best state mathematics standards, those of California, Massachusetts, Indiana and Minnesota are stronger than these standards. Most states would be far better off adopting the Core Math Standards than keeping their current standards. **However, California, and the other states with top standards would almost certainly be better off keeping their current standards.** But overall, I would not take this as an endorsement of the final version of Core Standards, rather I would regard it as a strong critique of the really poor quality of 90% of the state standards as of 2010.

How Do Common Core Math Standards Compare to Current CA Math Standards?

http://www.scoe.net/castandards/multimedia/k-12_math_crosswalks.pdf

Who Developed Common Core Standards? Teachers and Professors from many states or something else? Note, “only 2 of the 29 members are not affiliated with an education company.” <http://joeforamerica.com/2013/09/bill-gates-buying-childrens-brain/> <http://deutsch29.wordpress.com/2013/09/03/gates-money-and-common-core-part-ii/>

Data Mining—What’s Different with Common Core?

FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) was changed in December of 2011 making it easier for “**personally identifiable information**,” including biometric records to be accessed beyond state agencies.

Read the FERPA law below. See excerpts below from page 4, 14, and 16.

<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/pdf/2012-final-regs.pdf>

See page 4, 14, and 16 of the FREPA. (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act)

P. 4. “Biometric record,” as used in the definition of “personally identifiable information,” means a record of one or more measurable biological or behavioral characteristics that can be used for automated recognition of an individual. Examples include fingerprints;

retina and iris patterns; voiceprints; DNA sequence; facial characteristics; and handwriting.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1232g)

P.14 § 99.31 Under what conditions is prior consent not required to disclose information?

(a) An educational agency or institution may disclose personally identifiable information from an education record of a student without the consent required by § 99.30 if the disclosure meets one or more of the following conditions:

(B) A contractor, consultant, volunteer, or other party to whom an agency or institution has outsourced institutional services or functions may be considered a school official under this paragraph provided that the outside party—

P. 16 (ii) Nothing in the Act or this part prevents a State or local educational authority or agency headed by an official listed in paragraph (a)(3) of this section from entering into agreements with organizations conducting studies under paragraph (a)(6)(i) of this section and re-disclosing personally identifiable information from education records on behalf of educational agencies and institutions that disclosed the information to the State or local educational authority or agency headed by an official listed in paragraph (a)(3) of this section in accordance with the requirements of § 99.33(b).

Note: There is concern that private companies/consortiums associated with Common Core Assessments, Computers, and Curriculum materials may have or gain access to “personally identifiable information” of students. That information has the potential to be misused and or hacked, especially if it is stored in a digital “cloud.” Do we believe that schools will be doing retina scans on our students next year, no, but this program will be in place for a long time, technology moves quickly, and data is highly valuable to multiple stakeholders. **Nine States have already agreed to adopt a data mining process.** <http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/student-data-compiling-system-outrages-article-1.1287990#ixzz2PXFjzkV>

National Center for Education Statistics. SLDS Technical Brief Guidance for Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems See Page 4
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011602.pdf>

Page 4. “The PPRA requires written parental consent before a minor student can be required to participate in any survey, analysis, or evaluation funded by the U.S. Department of Education that includes information concerning the following:3

- 1. Political affiliations or beliefs of the student or parent;**
- 2. Mental and psychological problems of the student or the student’s family;**
- 3. Sex behavior or attitudes;**
- 4. Illegal, anti-social, self-incriminating, and demeaning behavior;**

5. **Critical appraisals of other individuals with whom respondents have close family relationships;**
6. **Legally recognized privileged or analogous relationships, such as those of lawyers, physicians, and ministers;**
7. **Religious practices, affiliations, or beliefs of the student or the student's parent; or**
8. **Income (other than that required by law to determine eligibility for participation in a program or for receiving financial assistance under such program).**

In the event any data elements under consideration for inclusion in a student record system involve any of these eight topics, those data elements should be included on the inventory of PII and should be identified on the list as PPRA-related variables. A number of data systems include data on students' instructors. A teacher identification number, a student-teacher link, and information on the teacher's education, certification, teaching assignments, and scores on teacher assessments are examples of the types of teacher data elements that may be included at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. A faculty identification number, a student-faculty link, and information on the faculty member's field, education, tenure status, credit hours taught in the relevant academic period, and amount of funded research may be included at the postsecondary level. Although FERPA and the definitions given refer specifically to students, PII on teachers and any other staff that are maintained as part of the electronic record system should be included in the inventory of PII and protected in the same way as the student data. Apart from the fact that protecting any PII is a best practice, when faculty and staff data are linked to the student's record, they become indirect identifiers for the student record and can be used to identify individual students.

3 Under PPRA (20 U.S.C. § 1232h; 34 CFR Part 98), school districts receiving funds from the U.S. Department of Education are required to provide annual parental notification of their policies concerning students' rights and of the specific or approximate dates during the school year of any survey that is scheduled to be administered to students if the survey includes any of the eight restricted topics, regardless of survey funding."

Twenty of the 45 States that originally signed on to Common Core have pending legislation to withdraw from the Common Core Standards and or Assessments.
<http://fightcommoncore.com/>

Find out more from the Experts at the Common Core Town Hall Panel Discussion on Wednesday, September 25th, Ulatis Community Center, 1000 Ulatis Dr., Vacaville CA. Doors open at 6:30 pm. Panel Discussion from 7:00-9:00 pm

Ask yourself, "Is Common Core really best for our children, or am I just going along?"

Stand Up for Our Children! <http://www.cacommoncoreconcerns.webs.com>