|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Background SUPPORTIVE of the CCSS\*** \*It should be noted that CCSS support comes from both ends of the political spectrum. | **SUPPORT** **the CCSS****What do supporters say are the benefits of implementing the CCSS?\*** | **AGAINST** **the CCSS****What do the detractors say are the detriments to implementing the CCSS?** | **Similar Comments AGAINST the CCSS\***\*It should be noted that the activist’s pushing back against the CCSS come from opposite ends of the political spectrum. |
| * English language arts and math were the subjects chosen for the Common Core State Standards because they are areas upon which students build skill sets which are used in other subjects. They are also the subjects most frequently assessed for accountability purposes. The *Standards* are designed to build upon the most advanced current thinking about preparing all students for success in college and their careers. This will result in moving even the best state standards to the next level. In fact, since this work began, there has been an explicit agreement that no state would lower its standards. The *Standards* were informed by the best in the country, the highest international standards, and evidence and expertise about educational outcomes. We need college and career ready standards because even in high‐performing states – students are graduating and passing all the required tests and still require remediation in their postsecondary work.
* International benchmarking played a significant role in both sets of standards. In fact, the college and career ready standards include an appendix listing the evidence that was consulted in drafting the standards and the international data consulted in the benchmarking process is included in this appendix and at this link-<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/0812BENCHMARKING.pdf>
* The Standards recognize that both content and skills are important. In English‐language arts, the Standards require certain critical content for all students, including: classic myths and stories from around the world, America’s Founding Documents, foundational American literature, and Shakespeare. Appropriately, the remaining crucial decisions about what content should be taught are left to state and local determination. In addition to content coverage, the Standards require that students systematically acquire knowledge in literature and other disciplines through reading, writing, speaking, and listening.
* The Standards recognize that both content and skills are important. In Mathematics, the Standards lay a solid foundation in whole numbers, addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, fractions, and decimals. Taken together, these elements support a student’s ability to learn and apply more demanding math concepts and procedures. The middle school and high school standards call on students to practice applying mathematical ways of thinking to real world issues and challenges; they prepare students to think and reason mathematically. The Standards set a rigorous definition of college and career readiness, not by piling topic upon topic, but by demanding that students develop a depth of understanding and ability to apply mathematics to novel situations, as college students and employees regularly do.
* Unfortunately, young people – even in high-performing states – are graduating and passing all the required tests, and *still* require remediation in their postsecondary work. The CCSS were specifically designed to prepare young people for college and career success. It may take a few years, but students with a high school diploma from participating states will be ready for work-force training programs and to take entry-level, credit-bearing college courses. The development, adoption, and implementation of the CCSS have shown an unprecedented level of coordination between K-12 and higher education systems. Students will know, while still in high school, whether or not they have the skills required to take entry-level general education college courses without needing remediation. According to a 2006 report, almost one-third of entering freshman at four-year and community colleges enroll in at least one remedial course. Every year, approximately $1.4 billion is spent providing remedial education.5 For students, there are cost savings achieved with respect to “opportunity costs”– school loans for years spent in remedial coursework while not building college credit, dropping out of college due to frustration, time lost, and more. When the need for remedial course work is reduced, higher education institutions will yield a cost savings (course and faculty costs) while also providing a shorter path to completion for students.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* The CCSS leads to development of higher level thinking skills.
* States with poor standards adopted the stronger CCSS standards because they were stronger than what they had.
* Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D, Massachusetts Commissioner of Ed. speaking on why MA selected to go with the CCSS even though the Fordham Institute had ranked them as one of the top three in content and skill standards: *We received three types of reports. The first was a summary of an online public survey on the Common Core standards conducted by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; the second was a side-by-side comparison of Massachusetts working draft standards to the Common Core; and a third was an independent analysis of two groups of Massachusetts educators, one in PK-12 and the other in higher education. All three sets of input reached the same conclusion: that for the English language arts standards, the Common Core was a better choice than the Massachusetts working draft, and for math, that both the Common Core and the Massachusetts draft were excellent options. We concluded, therefore, that while Massachusetts standards were very strong, the advantages of adopting the Common Core standards outweighed the disadvantages. And there would be opportunities to customize the Common Core in areas where we feel our standards are stronger.*

<http://opportunityequation.org/standards-and-assessments/common-core-standards-why-did-states>* Now more than ever, the economic climate demands innovative thinking, collaboration, high expectations, and a willingness to learn from the past and move purposefully forward. We must support educators at all levels – teachers, principals, superintendents – as they work to implement their states’ new academic standards.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* Canada either is statistically the same or lower than the USA on the latest TIMMS.

<http://www.eqao.com/pdf_e/08/TIMSS_Ontario_Report_2007.pdf>* The *Standards* do accommodate and prepare students for Algebra 1 in 8th grade, by including the prerequisites for this course in grades K‐7. Students who master the K‐7 material will be able to take Algebra 1 in 8th grade. At the same time, grade 8 standards are also included; these include rigorous algebra and will transition students effectively into a full Algebra 1 course.
* The mathematical progressions presented in the common core are coherent and based on evidence.
* Part of the problem with having 50 different sets of state standards is that today, different states cover different topics at different grade levels. Coming to consensus guarantees that from the viewpoint of any given state, topics will move up or down in the grade level sequence. This is unavoidable. What is important to keep in mind is that the progression in the Common Core State Standards is mathematically coherent and leads to college and career readiness at an internationally competitive level.
* With the Common Core ELA *Standards*, English teachers will still teach their students literature as well as literary non‐fiction. However, because college and career readiness overwhelming focuses on complex texts outside of literature, these standards also ensure students are being prepared to read, write, and research across the curriculum, including in history and science. These goals can be achieved by ensuring that teachers in other disciplines are also focusing on reading and writing to build knowledge within their subject areas.

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf>* The high school Math Standards identify the knowledge and skills students need to be prepared for postsecondary education programs including those leading to a technical credential or specialized certificate. The Math Standards are purposely *not* delineated by courses or grade-level to leave to state and/or local determination how to craft high school courses using either a traditional high school math course sequence or a series of integrated math courses. Appendix A was developed and is provided specifically to assist states and/or local districts in how to use the Math Standards to accommodate their curricular models.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* The Math Standards do accommodate and prepare students for algebra 1 in 8th grade, by including the prerequisites for this course in grades K-7. Students who master the K-7 material can move to algebra 1 in 8th grade. At the same time, grade 8 standards are also included which allow students to further develop pre-algebra skills and prepare for rigorous algebra. Both paths are available and allow states and local districts to determine course projections.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* *A solid foundation in whole numbers, addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, fractions, and decimals*. Taken together, these elements support a student’s ability to learn and apply more demanding math concepts and procedures that follow in the upper grades. The Math Standards devote attention to these building blocks, aligning with practices of high performing countries and the recommendations of our own National Research Council’s Early Math Panel report. For example, kindergarten expectations are focused on the *number core*: learning how numbers correspond to quantities, and learning how to put numbers together and take them apart, which lays the foundation for the addition and subtraction skills found in the first grade Math Standards. This logical progression of concepts and skills continues through 8th grade.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* The K-5 Math Standards provide *detailed guidance to teachers* on how to navigate their way through knotty topics such as fractions, negative numbers, and geometry, and do so by maintaining a continuous progression from grade to grade. These grade-by-grade progressions were informed by current best state standards, as well as by international models, education research, and the insights of professional mathematicians.
* By drawing on the best lessons from high performing countries, the Math Standards provide a *foundation for redesigning and refocusing the math curriculum* – and moving sharply away from the "mile wide and inch deep" approach.
* The Math Standards ensure that students spend sufficient time mastering the building blocks of mathematical thinking in K-5, and allow middle and high school teachers to engage students in hands-on learning and real world applications in geometry, algebra, probability, and statistics.
* An extensive appendix has also been created to demonstrate optional pathways through either a traditional high school math course sequence or an integrated math course progression.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* The ELA Standards include a balance between fiction/literature and non-fiction/biography/informational texts. This balance is intended to ensure that students develop literacy skills in other content areas. In the elementary grades, teachers can utilize science and social studies lessons to develop literacy skills and build students’ background knowledge, which research shows improves their success in later years. In secondary classrooms, this means teachers in subjects other than ELA address these skills within their content areas and the responsibility for literacy skill development is shared among all teachers. High school English teachers will continue to teach literature and non-fiction in accordance with the demand for increasing text complexity. Examples of appropriate texts for each grade level and categories of fiction/literature and non-fiction/informational texts are found in Appendix B to the ELA Standards.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* For example, most of today's high school students master narrative writing, which includes expressing opinions, beliefs, and personal experiences. That's a form of writing rarely required in the workplace or at college.
* Because of the type of writing needed in the workplace and college, the English Language Arts Standards put a greater emphasis on writing arguments. And because college and career readiness overwhelming focuses on complex texts outside of literature, the CCSS also ensure students are reading, writing, and researching in history and science, in addition to literature.
* Evidence shows that the complexity of texts students are required to read today does not match what is demanded in college and the workplace, creating a gap between what high school students can do and what they need to be able to do. The CCSS create a staircase of increasing text complexity so that students are expected to develop their skills and apply them to more and more complex texts.
* In mathematics, the teaching practices of high-performing countries and the National Research Council’s Early Math Panel report indicate that it is important to focus on arithmetic in early grades – in part, because it takes time to master.
* The Mathematics Standards require a level of mastery in mathematics unlike any current system of standards. For example, nine laws of arithmetic underlie algebra. Previous state standards did not even describe these laws, but the CCSS use the laws as building blocks, laying the foundation that students will need to successfully master algebra.
* In addition, the CCSS commit to teaching mathematics in a real world context – presenting examples that apply the approach/reasoning to problems that aren’t presented as math problems.
* The CCSS address a problem identified by the National Mathematics Panel and international benchmarking studies: today’s math textbooks are overloaded, fragmented, sometimes incoherent, and lack effective presentation of concepts.
* In the CCSS, the mathematical progressions are careful and coherent – making it easier to develop better textbooks. Textbooks in high-performing school systems such as those used in the city-state of Singapore are not only more focused than U.S. textbooks, they also present the concepts that underlie the skills.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf> * The Common Core standards in reading restore freedom, the freedom of students to be able to read and comprehend a text on their own upon leaving the classroom because they have gained the skills to do so without the mediation of a teacher-facilitator. The Common Core standards in reading are designed empower students to read, and to read well, the very foundation of success for college, career, and life.<http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2013/04/why-i-support-the-common-core-reading-standards/27526/>
 | **Standards**: The CCSS are rigorous standards.The rigorous CCSS define the knowledge and skills students should have within their K-12 education experience so that they will graduate high school fully prepared for post-secondary success. The standards are:* Aligned with college and work expectations;
* Clear, understandable and consistent;
* Include rigorous content and application of knowledge through high-order thinking skills;
* Build upon strengths and lessons of current state standards;
* Informed in a benchmarking study of other top performing countries, so that all students are prepared to succeed in our global economy and society; and
* Evidence- and research-based.

<http://www.corestandards.org/articles/8-national-governors-association-and-state-education-chiefs-launch-common-state-academic-standards><http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf><http://www.corestandards.org/assets/0812BENCHMARKING.pdf><http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts>  | **Standards:** The CCSS are not rigorous standards. | * The CCSS are no more rigorous than some state standards and actually lower than three states.
* The Standards are not research based but guess work.
* The standards are not internationally benchmarked but are influenced.
* The core focuses more on the higher-order thinking skill than emphasizing the basics from which this thinking pattern grows.
* The CCSS does not have enough content in the standards.
* It moves Algebra from 8th to 9th grade and weakens math education
* The CCSS weakens both English and math education
* The math standards are two years less rigorous than the old state standards.
* Canada does not have CCCS and as a nation does well.

<http://www.parents4publicschools.org/Documents/Common_core_chart_final.pdf><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eHUMgxEKszk><http://www.cwfa.org/images/content/StopCommonCoreIA.pdf><http://www.ncregister.com/daily-news/common-core-education-standards-generate-catholic-concerns/> <http://excelined.org/2013/05/myth-v-fact-taking-on-the-tallest-tales-about-common-core-state-standards/><http://truthinamericaneducation.com/common-core-state-standards/ccss-content-issues-reviews/common-cores-serious-flaws/><http://www.wiscnews.com/portagedailyregister/news/opinion/mailbag/article_d6cba016-aec3-11e2-8ee8-0019bb2963f4.html><http://iowansforlocalcontrol.com/2012/12/nine-common-core-myths-vs-facts/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/03/debunking-nine-common-core-myths/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/04/ben-swann-gives-ohioans-against-common-core-a-shout-out/><http://www.teapartyperspective.com/2013/05/02/an-open-letter-to-republican-state-officials-on-common-core-state-standards/><http://www.beaufortobserver.net/Articles-NEWS-and-COMMENTARY-c-2013-05-13-266807.112112-COMMON-CORE-Common-Core-or-Rotten-to-the-Core-You-Decide.html><http://www.uaedreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2000/01/Stotsky-Invited-Testimony-for-Missouri-on-Common-Core.pdf><http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/05/why-national-standards-won-t-fix-american-education-misalignment-of-power-and-incentives><http://heinemann.com/shared/onlineresources%5CE02123%5CNewkirk_Speaking_Back_to_the_Common_Core.pdf> |
| * The CCSS incorporate critical content and skills. For example in ELA the CCSS require certain content for all, including a) classic myths and stories from around the world, b) America’s founding documents, c) foundational American literature, and d) Shakespeare. Most content decisions about what content should be taught are left to state and local determination. In addition to the CCSS ELA require that students systemically acquire knowledge in literature and other disciplines though reading, writing, speaking and listening. The CCSS includes sample texts that demonstrate text complexity. Teachers are best prepared to determine actual text selections that are aligned to learning targets.
* The mathematical progressions presented in the Common Core State Standards are coherent and based on evidence. Part of the problem with having 50 different sets of state standards is that different states cover different topics at different grade levels. Coming to consensus guarantees that from the viewpoint of any given state, topics will move up or down in the grade level sequence. This is unavoidable. What is important to keep in mind is that the progression in the Common Core State Standards is mathematically coherent and leads to college and career readiness at an internationally competitive level.

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf>* The Stanford ELL Understanding Language project describes opportunities for supporting ELL students in reaching the intent of the CCSS ELA.

<http://ell.stanford.edu/publication/realizing-opportunities-ells-common-core-english-language-arts-and-disciplinary-literacy> * Like the CCSS previous state standards were intended for all students. To expect different outcomes for different students would not live up to the promise of an education.
* Ramping instruction for student success is crucial to implementing the CCSS. Doug Fisher and Nancy Frey are providing some of the best PD materials for PLC’s focused on RTI.
 | **Standards**: The CCSS are based upon wide evidence.The Standards made careful use of a large and growing body of evidence, including:* Scholarly research;
* Surveys on what skills are required of students entering college and workforce training programs;
* Assessment data identifying college- and career-ready performance;
* Comparisons to standards from high-performing states and nations …
* National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) frameworks in reading and writing for English language arts; and
* Findings from Trends in International Mathematics and Science (TIMSS) and other studies concluding that the traditional US mathematics curriculum must become substantially more coherent and focused in order to improve student achievement.

In particular, the following criteria guided the development of the standards: * Alignment with expectations for college and career success;
* Clarity;
* Consistency across all states;
* Inclusion of content and the application of knowledge through high-order skills;
* Improvement upon current state standards and standards of top-performing nations;
* Reality-based, for effective use in the classroom; and
* Evidence and research-based

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf><http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts> | **Standards**: The CCSS are not based on known outcomes and represent unproven ideas and concepts. | * It is an untried experiment that lacks empirical study that will waste billions of dollars, multiple years of educational efforts, and the learning potential of all schoolchildren.
* They hurts ECE with drill and grill techniques.
* The stress on skill acquisition in reading and math at the [expense of content understanding](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alan-singer/what-we-lose-with-common-_b_1601152.html) in other subject areas has the potential to eviscerate instruction in history, social studies, science, health, literature, the arts, and language.
* The core limits individualized instruction.
* The CCSS cannot be tailored to all of the diverse populations of our nation. States have a firmer grasp than the federal government on the population being taught.

<http://www.parents4publicschools.org/Documents/Common_core_chart_final.pdf><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eHUMgxEKszk><http://www.ncregister.com/daily-news/common-core-education-standards-generate-catholic-concerns/><http://truthinamericaneducation.com/common-core-state-standards/ccss-content-issues-reviews/common-cores-serious-flaws/><http://www.wiscnews.com/portagedailyregister/news/opinion/mailbag/article_d6cba016-aec3-11e2-8ee8-0019bb2963f4.html><http://www.rightsidenews.com/2013052632596/life-and-science/health-and-education/push-against-common-core-gains-momentum.html> <http://www.teapartyperspective.com/2013/05/02/an-open-letter-to-republican-state-officials-on-common-core-state-standards/><http://www.beaufortobserver.net/Articles-NEWS-and-COMMENTARY-c-2013-05-13-266807.112112-COMMON-CORE-Common-Core-or-Rotten-to-the-Core-You-Decide.html><http://www.uaedreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2000/01/Stotsky-Invited-Testimony-for-Missouri-on-Common-Core.pdf><http://heinemann.com/shared/onlineresources%5CE02123%5CNewkirk_Speaking_Back_to_the_Common_Core.pdf> |
| * In addition to ensuring young people graduate with the skills and knowledge they need today, consistent English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards shared by states offer an unprecedented opportunity to pool expertise and resources. Every state currently spends time and money creating, revising, and implementing standards on its own. By working together, states won’t have to duplicate efforts, which will be more efficient. States that have adopted the CCSS will benefit from shared tools and practices, including professional development designed to support teaching of the CCSS, and formative/interim assessments that can immediately inform instructional decision-making. In addition, aligned instructional materials (vendor developed and open-source) will be available. While states, districts, and schools will unquestionably benefit from the sharing of costs, teachers, parents, and students will finally have clear, consistent guidelines of what students are expected to learn whether they live in Maine, California, or states in-between.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* In addition to ensuring young people graduate with the skills and knowledge they need today, consistent English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards shared by states offer an unprecedented opportunity to pool expertise and resources. Every state currently spends time and money creating, revising, and implementing standards on its own. By working together, states won’t have to duplicate efforts, which will be more efficient. States that have adopted the CCSS will benefit from shared tools and practices, including professional development designed to support teaching of the CCSS, and formative/interim assessments that can immediately inform instructional decision-making. In addition, aligned instructional materials (vendor developed and open-source) will be available. While states, districts, and schools will unquestionably benefit from the sharing of costs, teachers, parents, and students will finally have clear, consistent guidelines of what students are expected to learn whether they live in Maine, California, or states in-between.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* School districts were using professional learning communities and frequent PD long before the CCSS was envisioned. And with success.
* By themselves textbooks, technology, and assessments do not change achievement. But they do when are used to make informed instructional decisions by skillful teachers as they plan, implement, and reflect upon the dynamic world of teaching children and youth.
* Iowa will continue to use the Iowa Assessments through at least 2015-16. States are beginning to amend the original timelines for CCSS implementation.
 | **Budgets:** There is a cost for implementing any new standards. States had costs anytime over the last twenty years that they updated their state standards. But in this situation the synergy of states working together has drawn down the cost of implementing the new standards.* States will cut costs because they will not need to develop their own public accountability tests.
* States will cut PD development costs with sharing across states and organizations.
* Districts will follow their instructional replacement schedules and will adopt new materials as the replacement cycle permits.
* Increasing the number of students who are post-secondary ready saves public dollars.

<http://grantwiggins.wordpress.com/2013/05/01/the-common-core-standards-a-defense/><http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts> | **Cost**: The high cost of CCSS implementation is impractical in the current economy. | * The core implementation is a cash cow for publishers (especially Pearson and McGraw-Hill), test developers and hardware companies.
* Too much class time will be lost to teacher PD.
* New textbooks, tech, tests do not equate to enhanced performance.
* States and districts lack the necessary resources to meet the core’s 2014-2015 assessment timeline.

<http://www.parents4publicschools.org/Documents/Common_core_chart_final.pdf><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eHUMgxEKszk><http://www.cwfa.org/images/content/StopCommonCoreIA.pdf><http://www.lodinews.com/opinion/article_ba9f24ff-5984-5883-84fe-d9384528c13f.html><http://www.wiscnews.com/portagedailyregister/news/opinion/mailbag/article_d6cba016-aec3-11e2-8ee8-0019bb2963f4.html><http://www.teapartyperspective.com/2013/05/02/an-open-letter-to-republican-state-officials-on-common-core-state-standards/> |
| The CCSS are *not a curriculum.* Standards are *statements of the knowledge and skills* that students need to master in order to be prepared for college and/or the workforce. Curriculum is *the roadmap* that teachers use to help young people acquire and master those skills. Depending upon the individual needs and learning styles of their students, teachers then develop instructional strategies and techniques to navigate the roadmap. <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* The U. S Department of Education was *not* involved in the development of the CCSS*.* Instead, the state membership organizations coordinating the development of the CCSS – the Council of the Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices – led the Standards development and writing process, which included the release of several drafts of the Standards, as well as multiple rounds of feedback from states, educators, and the public.
* The state membership organizations coordinating the development of the CCSS – the Council of the Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices – conducted a robust public comment period that yielded more than 10,000 comments. A summary of the public feedback can be found at CoreStandards.org.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pd>* The standards provide clarity and consistency in what is expected of student learning across the country. This initiative helps provide all students with an equal opportunity for an education, regardless of where they live. The Common Core State Standards will not prevent different levels of achievement among students, but they will ensure more consistent exposure to materials and learning experiences through curriculum, instruction, and teacher preparation among other supports for student learning.

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf>The CCSS will enhance teacher collaboration and professional development because of the synergistic sharing of materials across 45 states and multiple organizations.* The CCSS Initiative is a state-led effort. Recognizing the strength of having high standards for all students, the federal government only required that states demonstrate that they had adopted college- and career-ready standards for all students. Race to the Top does not name the CCSS or any other specific standards.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* The Standards are not a curriculum. They are a clear set of shared goals and expectations for what knowledge and skills will help our students succeed. Local teachers, principals, superintendents and others will decide how the standards are to be met. Teachers will continue to devise lesson plans and tailor instruction to the individual needs of the students in their classrooms.
* Teachers have been a critical voice in the development of the standards. The Common Core State Standards drafting process relied on teachers and standards experts from across the country. The National Education Association (NEA), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), among other organizations were instrumental in bringing together teachers to provide specific, constructive feedback on the standards.
* The Common Core State Standards enable collaboration between states on a range of tools and policies, including:
* the development of textbooks, digital media, and other teaching materials aligned to the standards;
* and the development and implementation of common comprehensive assessment systems to measure student performance annually that will replace existing state testing systems; and
* changes needed to help support educators and schools in teaching to the new standards.

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf> | **Local:** Regardless of state or federal legislation it has been and will be local school boards in collaboration with local educators that develop the instructional units and curriculum. Implementation of any standards aligned curriculum is still a local responsibility and right.<http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts> | **Federal**: The CCSS opens the door wider for over-involvement of the federal government in education. | * Implementation standardizes learning and federal testing.
* It centralizes education.
* National education standards are unconstitutional according to the 10th amendment.
* This is a United Nations plot to take over America.
* This is just “Obamacore.” It is a federal take-over like “ObamaCare.”
* The core is a loss of local control.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eHUMgxEKszk><http://www.cwfa.org/content.asp?ID=22293><http://www.cwfa.org/images/content/StopCommonCoreIA.pdf><http://www.lodinews.com/opinion/article_ba9f24ff-5984-5883-84fe-d9384528c13f.html><http://excelined.org/2013/05/myth-v-fact-taking-on-the-tallest-tales-about-common-core-state-standards/><http://iowansforlocalcontrol.com/2012/12/nine-common-core-myths-vs-facts/><http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/344519/truth-about-common-core-kathleen-porter-magee><http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/04/19/common-core-standards-attacked-by-republicans/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/03/debunking-nine-common-core-myths/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/04/ben-swann-gives-ohioans-against-common-core-a-shout-out/><https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B558bfJRCLuuOXdsVXJmZy1IRms/edit><http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9gyZDtzgta8><http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-ZulH8g2BnA> |
| * The CCSS was a state-led (Governors and education commissioners) initiative that established clear standards for K-12 in ELA and Math that states voluntarily adopted.
* Teachers, parents, school administrators and experts from across the country together with state leaders provided input into the development of the standards.
* Local teachers, principals, and superintendents are leading the implementation of the Common Core.
* The standards are evidence-based, aligned with college and work expectations, include rigorous content and skills, and are informed by other top performing countries. They were developed in consultation with teachers and parents from across the country so they are also realistic and practical for the classroom.

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf> | **Funding**: States and local districts use a wide variety of funding sources to deliver upon the promise of public education. This has been true in the past and continues to be true.<http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts> | **Federa**l: Federal Stimulus funds and NCLB waiver coercion prodded states to rush CCSS adoption without sufficient analysis by stakeholders in each state. | * The CCSS was privately and corporate funded. Too many strings were attached.
* The General Educational Provisions Act prohibits federal overreach by prohibiting departments of US from exercising control over curriculum, or instruction and yet the assessment consortia have published curriculum models.
* To prevent rollback, proponents will have to show that the Core or even continuing standards-based school improving is somehow different than the previous remedies for the nation’s educational problems.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eHUMgxEKszk><http://iowansforlocalcontrol.com/2012/12/nine-common-core-myths-vs-facts/><http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/04/19/common-core-standards-attacked-by-republicans/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/03/debunking-nine-common-core-myths/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/04/ben-swann-gives-ohioans-against-common-core-a-shout-out/><https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B558bfJRCLuuOXdsVXJmZy1IRms/edit><http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9gyZDtzgta8><http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-ZulH8g2BnA><http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/05/why-national-standards-won-t-fix-american-education-misalignment-of-power-and-incentives> |
| "States are still responsible as they were previously to report their accountability (on tests and other student assessments), but Common Core doesn’t add any new data reporting, said Margaret Millar, the CCSSO’s director of membership services.Kathleen Porter-Magee, an education expert at the Thomas B. Fordham Institute who has studied Common Core, agreed that there are no requirements for any sort of data collection or data mining."If a state chooses to collect achievement data, that is a decision the state chooses to make," she said. "But is not lumped in with Common Core."<http://www.politifact.com/georgia/statements/2013/jun/17/angela-bean/common-core-opponent-goes-too-far-claim-about-data/> <http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/Learning%20and%20Innovative%20Services%20Documents/FACT_SHEET_DColl_CC.pdf>  | **Privacy:** The CCSS do not contain requirements to collect data. States do collect data to support efforts to provide schools and districts with necessary data to inform instruction and ensure every student receives the most appropriate education possible.<http://www.corestandards.org/resources/frequently-asked-questions> <http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts> | **Privacy**: Implementation of the CCSS will violate student privacy rights. | * The federal education stimulus funds required states to develop longitudinal data collection system which bypasses FERPA and violates student privacy rights.
* The inBloom Corporation will control student data and bypasses FERPA.
* The assessment consortia are already violating student privacy rights in their pilot testing.

<http://www.cwfa.org/images/content/StopCommonCoreIA.pdf><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7NjqOBEc3HU><http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oz7XOKcyRE0> <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/05/29/us-usa-education-database-idUSBRE94S0YU20130529> <http://excelined.org/2013/05/myth-v-fact-taking-on-the-tallest-tales-about-common-core-state-standards/><http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/04/19/common-core-standards-attacked-by-republicans/><https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B558bfJRCLuuOXdsVXJmZy1IRms/edit><http://www.losbanoslive.com/paper/?p=3479><http://www.rightsidenews.com/2013052632596/life-and-science/health-and-education/push-against-common-core-gains-momentum.html> |
| The best understanding of what works in the classroom comes from the teachers who are in them. That’s why these standards will establish *what* students need to learn, but they will not dictate *how* teachers should teach. Instead, schools and teachers will decide how best to help students reach the standards.<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf>* The development of the CCSS was state-led and was coordinated by the Council of the Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. As with the initial development, future revisions to the CCSS will be discussed and decided upon at the state level.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* The federal government is not developing a national test. The federal government has provided funding to two coalitions of states – in which 44 states and the District of Columbia are all participating in at least one. The two coalitions are: The SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC or Partnership). Both consortia are developing assessment systems that will include summative tests in addition to formative measures. By working together, states can spend more on development than they could alone because they are sharing costs. Having formative items that are closely aligned to CCSS will provide teachers and administrators opportunities to measure student progress throughout the school year, and data can be used to modify instruction where needed and/or to tailor instruction to meet individual student needs. Teachers and administrators, including principals and superintendents, will decide *how* the standards are to be taught and will establish the curriculum, just as they currently do—allowing for continued flexibility and creativity. Teachers will continue to create lesson plans and tailor instruction to the needs of the students in their classrooms.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* In addition to ensuring young people graduate with the skills and knowledge they need today, consistent English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards shared by states offer an unprecedented opportunity to pool expertise and resources. Every state currently spends time and money creating, revising, and implementing standards on its own. By working together, states won’t have to duplicate efforts, which will be more efficient. States that have adopted the CCSS will benefit from shared tools and practices, including professional development designed to support teaching of the CCSS, and formative/interim assessments that can immediately inform instructional decision-making. In addition, aligned instructional materials (vendor developed and open-source) will be available.

 While states, districts, and schools will unquestionably benefit from the sharing of costs, teachers, parents, and students will finally have clear, consistent guidelines of what students are expected to learn whether they live in Maine, California, or states in-between.<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/hunt-institute-briefing-packet.pdf>* The Common CSS impacts teachers by:
* Providing goals and benchmarks to ensure students are achieving certain skills and knowledge by the end of each year;
* Helping colleges and professional development programs better prepare teachers;
* Providing the opportunity for teachers to be involved in the development of assessments linked to these top-quality standards;
* Allowing states to develop and provide better assessments that more accurately measure whether or not students have learned what was taught; and
* Guiding educators toward curricula and teaching strategies that will give students a deep understanding of the subject and the skills they need to apply their knowledge.

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf>* Parental engagement is (doing with parents versus doing to) about a home environment that: 1) encourages learning, 2) communicates high expectations for children’s achievement and future careers, and 3) involvement at school and in the community. No legislative policy can make parental engagement happen. Engagement occurs at the classroom teacher and parent level.

<http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may11/vol68/num08/Involvement-or-Engagement%C2%A2.aspx> | **College Ready vs. College Eligible:** The CCSS is about all students having a successful first year after HS regardless of their career pathway or choice of education. Students will be ready for post-secondary if educators focus on the end-result not the tests. Tests will come and go, but if a student is truly prepared they will pass any test that is thrown in their path. *In other words stop worrying about the test.*  | **Parent Rights**: CCSS suppresses parental choice and could destroy the successful homeschooling movement. | * No legislative action was taken when the states adopted the core. Only appointed boards of education were involved.
* A top-down centralized educational policy does not encourage parental engagement.
* The CCSS will affect college entrance exams and will hurt the home schooling movement by hurting homeschoolers chances for getting into college.

<http://www.cwfa.org/images/content/StopCommonCoreIA.pdf><http://blog.heritage.org/2013/06/23/common-cores-nationalizing-tentacles-sat-act-and-ged-alignment/><http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/05/03/common-core-curriculum-k-12-could-have-far-reaching-effects-higher-education> <http://excelined.org/2013/05/myth-v-fact-taking-on-the-tallest-tales-about-common-core-state-standards/><http://www.wiscnews.com/portagedailyregister/news/opinion/mailbag/article_d6cba016-aec3-11e2-8ee8-0019bb2963f4.html><http://www.teapartyperspective.com/2013/05/02/an-open-letter-to-republican-state-officials-on-common-core-state-standards/><https://arkansashomeschool.org/index.php/2013/05/23/common-core-state-standards-initiative-too-close-to-a-national-curriculum/> |
| * The common core state standards drafting process relied on teachers and standards experts from across the country. In addition, there were many state experts that came together to create the most thoughtful and transparent process of standard setting. This was only made possible by many states working together.
* The federal government had no role in the development of the Common Core State Standards and will not have a role in their implementation. The Common Core State Standards Initiative is a state-led effort that is not part of No Child Left Behind and adoption of the standards is in no way mandatory.

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf> | **Foundation**: It is Iowa’s heritage and Chapter 12 law to deliver a comprehensive curriculum involving core, career/tech, arts, and physical education/health. Each discipline passes on how that content area organizes it’s “knowledge.”* The standards are solid and traditional. They honor every discipline in a comprehensive educational program. They expect students to know their facts, to read the nation’s founding documents and to evaluate evidence and come to independent judgments. They are more rigorous than what most states had in place.
* Local school boards in collaboration with local educators will continue to follow local school board policy to develop the district’s instructional units.
* Local school boards and educators will continue to follow local board policy on the review and purchase of instructional materials.
* The standards do inhibit creativity of educators.

<http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts> | **Indoctrination**: Students will be indoctrinated into a politically correct, liberal philosophy through CCSS’s standardized, aligned instructional materials. | * The core will make students into automatons.
* It replaces classics with government propaganda.
* CCSS implementation creates a progressive secularism curriculum so students are ready for a social-justice agenda.
* The core teaches one what to think instead of how to think.
* This is the ultimate liberal bait and switch.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L-PbcIulMl8><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eHUMgxEKszk><http://www.scribd.com/doc/34511068/Innocence-Report-Bias-and-Indoctrination-in-the-Iowa-Core-Curriculum><http://iowansforlocalcontrol.com/2012/12/nine-common-core-myths-vs-facts/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/03/debunking-nine-common-core-myths/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/04/ben-swann-gives-ohioans-against-common-core-a-shout-out/><http://www.beaufortobserver.net/Articles-NEWS-and-COMMENTARY-c-2013-05-13-266807.112112-COMMON-CORE-Common-Core-or-Rotten-to-the-Core-You-Decide.html><http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0X0EFeH25bw>[*http://www.utahsrepublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Common-Core-State-Standards-and-Race-to-the-Top-An-Introduction-to-Marxism-101.pdf*](http://www.utahsrepublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Common-Core-State-Standards-and-Race-to-the-Top-An-Introduction-to-Marxism-101.pdf) |
| * There are no data collection requirements of states adopting the CCSS. Standards define expectations for what students should know and be able to do by the end of each grade. Implementing the CCSS does not require data collection. The means of assessing students and the data that results from those assessments are up to the discretion of each state and are separate and unique from the CCSS.
* <http://highercorestandards.org/student-privacy/>

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf>* In Tennessee 76% of educators polled in 2013 support the CCSS.

<http://www.tnscore.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/TNScoreMemoFin-May-2013.pdf>* NEA Representative Assembly voted July 1issued their strongest and most public statement of support for the CCSS even though it has been on board since 2009-10.

<http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2013/07/nea_delegates_endorse_common-core-.html>  | **Implementation:** States set the timeline for implementation of any new set of standards. There is already evidence that timelines are being revised from initial published schedules. This often happens in states.* Professional development will improve because the educational community will be able to use the synergy of shared adult learning materials to not only save dollars but to use the best PD from across the nation.
* Secretary of Education Duncan has stated he is agreeable to flexibility on the assessment schedule for states with a NCLB waiver.

<http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts>* CCSS increases rigor and prepare students for success after high school. <http://teaching.about.com/od/assess/f/What-Are-Some-Pros-And-Cons-Of-The-Common-Core-Standards.htm>
 | **Timeline**: The CCSS implementation and assessment timeline is too fast leaving students and educators unprepared, and conditioned for failure. | * The CCSS creates an atmosphere that will reduce teacher creativity.
* Teachers were left out in the development of the CCSS and now left out in implementation.
* Some distractors do not disagree with the reasoning behind the CCSS adoption. But states and districts lack the necessary resources to meet the Core’s rapid implementation schedule, including developing the new teaching materials and tests and the infrastructure to support them.

<http://www.parents4publicschools.org/Documents/Common_core_chart_final.pdf><http://www.teapartyperspective.com/2013/05/02/an-open-letter-to-republican-state-officials-on-common-core-state-standards/><http://www.beaufortobserver.net/Articles-NEWS-and-COMMENTARY-c-2013-05-13-266807.112112-COMMON-CORE-Common-Core-or-Rotten-to-the-Core-You-Decide.html> |
| * Secretary of Education Duncan has stated he is agreeable to flexibility on the assessment schedule for states with a NCLB waiver.

<http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts>* The CCSS will allow states to compare student performance.
* CCSS testing will cost less because 44 states that had developed their own will have reduced development and scoring costs.
* The CCSS assessments will allow teachers to monitor students’ progress throughout the year.
* States that adopted the Common Core State Standards are currently collaborating to develop common assessments that will be aligned to the standards and replace existing end of year state assessments. These assessments will be available in the 2014-2015 school year.
* Two consortia of states are developing common assessments – the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC) and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). These state-led consortia on assessment are grounded in the following principles:
* Allow for comparison across students, schools, districts, states and nations;
* Create economies of scale;
* Provide information and support more effective teaching and learning; and
* Prepare students for college and careers.

<http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFacts.pdf> | **Evaluation/Assessment:** The educational community has learned a lot about assessment in the past 50 years. State and district assessment systems strive for a balance of comparing peers and growing individuals.* The tests will cover multiple skills per question and therefore will increase critical thinking and problem-solving skill measurement that a multiple-choice test cannot provide.
* Interim assessments allow for educators to track student progress across time and during the year. They also serve with response to intervention efforts.
* Daily formative assessment or assessment for learning encourages student growth.
* Common standards make for easier transitions between schools for students from military bases and frequent movers.
* A quality assessment system drives instruction.
* A quality assessment system tells parents both how their child compares to peers, and how a child is growing over time.

<http://www.corestandards.org/resources/myths-vs-facts>The CCSS is about all students having a successful first year after HS regardless of their career pathway or choice of education. Students will be ready for post-secondary if educators focus on the end-result not the tests. Tests will come and go but if a student is truly prepared they will pass any test that is thrown on their path. | **Testing**: The CCSS assessments add to the testing overload. | * Too much testing causes teaching to the test and creates over-anxious students.
* 33% of day will be testing.
* More testing is not the answer to improving student achievement.
* The CCSS does not guarantee improvements in testing on a global scale.
* Pairing the Common Core standards with high-stakes tests for students and new forms of teacher evaluation has the potential to undermine effective instruction and learning.
* The accountability system should not be deployed until the standards are applied in the classroom. The timeline is way too fast.

<http://www.parents4publicschools.org/Documents/Common_core_chart_final.pdf><http://iowansforlocalcontrol.com/2012/12/nine-common-core-myths-vs-facts/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/03/debunking-nine-common-core-myths/><http://ohioansagainstcommoncore.com/2013/04/ben-swann-gives-ohioans-against-common-core-a-shout-out/><https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B558bfJRCLuuOXdsVXJmZy1IRms/edit><http://www.rightsidenews.com/2013052632596/life-and-science/health-and-education/push-against-common-core-gains-momentum.html> <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/05/why-national-standards-won-t-fix-american-education-misalignment-of-power-and-incentives> |
|  | A good general website that supports the CCSS from a conservative perspective is at [**http://highercorestandards.org/about-common-core/**](http://highercorestandards.org/about-common-core/) |  |  |
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