

Common Core

- The Common Core standards are a nationalized set of K-12 Content standards that will establish federal curriculum requirements, standardized testing system, and data collection of students and teachers. Claiming to be internationally benchmarked to make students' college and 21st century career ready. The AIMS test will be done away with and currently Arizona has adopted the PARCC test which will analyze students and teachers, is still in the writing stage and not available for even brief evaluation. With the first tests to be given in the 2014-2015 school year.
- A nonprofit organization called Achieve Inc, in Washington D.C. is the main driving force behind creating the Common Core Initiative. The Common Core standards were initiated by private interests in Washington, D.C.

“Eventually the creators of the Common Core realized the need to present a façade of state involvement, and therefore, enlisted the National Governors Association {a trade association that doesn't include all governors}, and the Council of Chief State School Officers, another DC-based trade association. Neither of these groups have grant authority from any particular state or states to write the standards. The bulk of the creative work was done by Achieve, Inc., which includes many progressive education reformers who have been advocating national standards ad curriculum for decades. Massive funding for all this came from private interests such as The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, GE, Intel Corp, Boeing, etc.

- The whole Common Core Standards has not even been fully designed. Social Studies and Science standards have yet to be completed, yet we have adopted it. Some of the changes include controversial non-fiction suggested material, that is not teaching principles, but coaching children with swayed one sided information.
- From the Achieve Inc. website it states that full implementation of the Common Core will include P-20 data collection or Statewide longitudinal Data System (SLDS). Schools will collect data and report to the AZED. This student data is then shared with other states *and* the federal

government. These systems are being developed to track our students from preschool through college. So what will be tracked? From the SLDS website this is what will be tracked: “a unique identifier for each student; student enrollment history; tracks if a student drops out or switches school; tracks student test scores; matches student performance to teachers; tracks transcripts of “remedial” classes; tracks student data to determine if they are “prepared to success in college”, student religion, parents political party, visits to school nurse, and a “character” report card. The Achieve Inc. website explains that this information will benefit a “*wide array of stakeholders*”. Achieve also states on their website that “While the Common Core Standards are a critical *first* step, they alone will not bring about the instructional changes necessary to improve student achievement and attainment. What more do they want from us? This clearly violates the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). In fact it is suggested that this law will need to be reformed through legislation to make it legal for schools to collect and distribute this information.

- The Arizona State Board of Education adopted Common Core on June 28, 2010 in the failed attempt to acquire Race-to-the-Top funding. Arizona was “hooked” into the Common Core movement with Race-to-the-Top grants they applied for in 2009-2010 and with that application, they were allowed to apply for “No-Child-Left-Behind Waivers” if they adopted the Common Core Standards verbatim!
- How much money? "Accountability Works, in their study of Common Core, estimated that the total additional costs (one-time plus a 7-year time period for implementation) to state taxpayers will amount to \$15.8 billion across participating states. This constitutes a "mid-range" estimate that only addresses expenditures required for implementation of the new standards. It does not include the cost of additional expenses or controversial reforms that are sometimes recommended to help students meet high standards, such as performance-based compensation or reduced class sizes. That estimate includes the following additional expenses for the states: \$1.2 billion for participation in the new assessments; \$5.3 billion for professional development; \$2.5 billion for textbooks and instructional materials; and \$6.9 billion for technology infrastructure and support.”

THE FINANCIAL BREAKDOWN

Substitute Teachers — Schools have to send teachers to be a part of the curriculum mapping process for Common Core Standards. These trainings will be over multiple days which will take teachers out of the classroom . . . There is a cost to have a substitute teacher in the classroom for multiple days.

New Textbooks — Textbooks are outrageously expensive . . . even if we do find internet options, the publishers who created those options are certainly not offering them for free.

The Cost of Time — Teachers spend a great deal of time trying to educate themselves on the changes from their old standards to those of the Common Core . . . The cost of time is a big reality for schools.

Training Teachers — Bringing in outside experts or consultants is very expensive. In order to properly train teachers, school districts must offer professional development in order to ensure that educators can master the Common Core Standards. These trainings are not a one-shot deal and will cost school districts money.

- Implementation costs will be even more problematic in larger states like California. The California Department of Education estimates that Common Core will cost the state about \$760 million. Outside estimates place California's fiscal commitment at up to \$1.6 billion. California already expects a \$3 billion deficit at the end of fiscal year 2011, and a \$10 billion deficit in 2012-13. In addition, General Fund revenues for 2011-12 are lower than expected, triggering a \$2 billion cut to state programs beginning in January. "Adding up to a billion-and-a-half-dollar expenditure to implement national standards under these circumstances is fiscal madness," said Lance Izumi, senior director of education studies at the Pacific Research Institute.

- Common Core Standards are not internationally benchmarked. Dr. Sandra Stotsky, a Common Core Validation Committee Board Member, did not sign off on the English Language Arts Standards! Why? She states, “Common Core’s ‘college readiness’ standards for English Language arts and reading do not aim for a level of achievement that signifies readiness for authentic college-level work. They point to no more than readiness for a high school diploma (and possible not even that, depending on where the cut score is set). Despite claims to the contrary, they are not internationally benchmarked. States adopting common Core’s standard will damage the academic integrity of both their post-secondary institutions and their high schools precisely because Common Core’s standards do not strengthen the high school curriculum and cannot reduce the current amount of post-secondary remedial coursework in a legitimate way. Their standards may lead to reduced enrollment in advanced high school courses and weaken post-secondary coursework because Common Core’s ‘college readiness’ ELA/R standards are designed to enable a large number of high school students to be declared ‘college ready’ and to enroll in post-secondary institutions that will have to place them in credit-bearing courses. These institutions will then be likely under pressure from the United States Department of Education (USDE) to retain these students in order to increase college graduation rates.”

Dr. James Milgram a Common Core Validation Committee Board member, who did not sign off on the Math standards! Why? He states, “The Common Core standards claim to be ‘benchmarked against international standards’ but this phrase is meaningless. They are actually two or more years behind international expectations by eighth grade, and only fall further behind as they talk about grades 8-1. Indeed, they don’t even fully cover the material in a solid geometry course, or in the second year algebra course.”

References

- Dr. Sandra Stotsky's testimony before the Texas Legislature-
<http://coehp.uark.edu/colleague/9863.php>
- Dr. James Milgram's testimony before the Indiana State Senate Committee - <http://hoosiersagainstcommoncore.com/james-milgram-testimony-to-the-indiana-senate-committee/>
- FERPA -
<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>
- Character Report Card and student sensors-
<http://www.ed.gov/edblogs/technology/files/2013/02/OET-Draft-Grit-Report-2-17-13.pdf>
- Information on Achieve and SLDS- <http://www.achieve.org/>
Including -<http://www.achieve.org/measurthatmatter>
- National Governors Association -
<http://www.nga.org/cms/home.html>
- Council of Chief State School Officers-<http://www.ccsso.org/>
- Accountability Works- <http://www.accountabilityworks.org/>