

**From:** [1490Comments](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Feedback on the Proposed MLS  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 09, 2015 1:03:04 PM  
**Attachments:** [EnglishLanguageArts-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)  
[ATT00001.htm](#)  
[Mathematics-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)  
[ATT00002.htm](#)  
[Science-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)  
[ATT00003.htm](#)  
[SocialStudies-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)  
[ATT00004.htm](#)

---

**From:** Fowler, Amy [mailto:FowlerA@OSAGESCHOOLS.ORG]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 4:59 PM  
**To:** 1490Comments  
**Cc:** Nelson, Laura  
**Subject:** Feedback on the Proposed MLS

I have attached the feedback from the teachers of my school district. I appreciate all of the time that has been put in by all four work groups. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

**English Language Arts**  
**Feedback on Proposed MLS**

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<p style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; color: red;">1</p> <p><b>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</b></p>	<p style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; color: red;">2</p> <p><b>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</b></p>	<p style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; color: red;">3</p> <p><b>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</b></p>	<p style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; color: red;">4</p> <p><b>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</b></p>
--	--	--	--

English Language Arts K-5									
Strand	GRADE	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Reading Foundations	K	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Aa Kdg Should read recognize and name rather than identifying.
	- 2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Ac Kdg Should read follow words from left to right not understand.
		1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Aa 1st Should read recognize and name not

								identify.
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ad 1st move this standard to kdg.
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ae 1st and Kdg not just 1st
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ag 1st move to Kdg not 1st
	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	RF2Ae Kdg should read CVC words not simple words
	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	RF2Af,g,h should be reorganized. Put g first, then h, then f
	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	RF2Ag 1st should read medial vowel.
	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	RF3Ac Kdg provide dolch word list of 50 words
	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	RF3Am 1st provide dolch words list of 220 words
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	RF3An 1st need to list reading strategies. Look at the picture. Reread. Read around and go back, Try both vowel sounds...
	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	RF3Ai 2nd What is grade

November, 2015  
 School of the Osage

									appropriate?
		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	RF4A 1st and 2nd Provide a list of reading strategies
	3 - 5	3	4	3	2	2	2	1	RF3A 3rd-5th add a list of grade appropriate high frequency words, not coherent in the skills, the skills are in isolation and do not build upon each other
<b>Reading</b>	K - 2	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R1A Kdg should include RI.K.6 from current MLS Need an awareness of author and illustrator (define and identify)
		3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R1B 1st should include L.1.4 c from current MLS
		3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R2C 1st a. needs to be moved to kindergarten
	3 - 5	4	4	4	1	2	4	4	R1A 3rd- e. Keep R1C-Take out, does not need whole standard, put connections with comprehension strategies,



									contrast, R3Cc. add using textual evidence, R3C 4th-Use wording of RI4.1, b. take out, confusing, c. use wording from RI4.8, R3C 5th-add RI.5.1and RI 5.8, R4-Do not scaffold in a stair step approach to each grade level, Add RI3.5, RF3A 3rd-5th, add list of grade specific high frequency words per grade level.
Writing	K - 2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	W1Aa 1st Include using graphic organizer.
	3 - 5	4	3	2	2	3	2	3	The research strand is not developmentally appropriate. Don't change the language and standards from the current standards.
Speaking & Listening	K - 2	3	2	2	3	1	1	1	SL1A Kdg Should still include continue a conversation through multiple exchanges.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL1A 1st should

November, 2015  
 School of the Osage

									include b. & c. from current MLS
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL1A 2nd Should include b. & c. from current MLS
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL2A 1st & 2nd should include apply skill to TEXTS.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL3A Kdg & 1st & 2nd should include requesting clarification if something is not understood.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL4A Kdg add speak audibly and express thoughts, feelings, and ideas clearly.
	3 - 5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
<b>Language</b>	K - 2	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	L1A 2nd a. Need to include introduce cursive but not master
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B Kdg f. Need to include the list of appropriate sight words.
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B 1st e. Need to include the list of appropriate

									sight words.
		3	3	3	3	1	1	1	L1B 2nd d. & e. move to 1st grade
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B 2nd g. & i. define grade appropriate
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1A 1st a. Need to include current MLS print ALL Upper & Lowercase letters
	3 - 5	4	3	3	1	2	4	3	L1Aa. 3rd-Take cursive out or move to second grade. L1A 5th-change to demonstrate and apply, L1B 3rd-d, c, j. move back to second grade L1B4th-a. commas in series and commas with yes and no, move to 3rd,

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</b>	<b>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</b>

English Language Arts 6-12									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Reading Literary Texts	O M S	1	3 - RL6 This does not seem to build on each other. RL 7 Word Choice in 7th grade to signify tone does correlate with 6th grade sound device to create meaning.	2	3 - RL 5 - this seems very difficult to assess the validity of this. More guidance is needed. RL11 How can this be assessed?	3 RL4.7 - distinct (this would need to be defined) RL3 - what are visual elements? RL6 Is this point of view or viewpoint?	1	1	Need a glossary of terms (not open for interpretation) including literary devices, point of view vs. viewpoint, cite
	O H S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Language seems to match ACT language better: example "synthesize"



November, 2015  
School of the Osage

	H S								
--	--------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mathematics**  
**Feedback on Proposed MLS**

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</b>	<b>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</b>

Mathematics K-5									
Strand	GRADE	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness</u> upon graduation.	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass</u> the breadth of the content.	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Number Sense (K-1)	K								
	1								
Number Sense & Operations in Base Ten	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3.NBT.A.2-through 10,000 instead of 100,000 3.NBT.A.3-What is

									efficiency-clarify with specific problems and amount of time
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	Questionable especially to parents
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
<b>Number Sense &amp; Operations in Fractions</b>	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.NF.A.1-4-The verb "understand" is vague-How do you assess "understand"? We also would like to make sure that our fractions do not go over 1 on a number line.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	The language clarity is much improved for both teachers and parents.
	5	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	The verbs used to assess are very broad and

									not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
<b>Relationships &amp; Algebraic Thinking</b>	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	3.RA.A.1-The verb "interpret" is unclear. A more specific description would be helpful 3.RA.B.1-They are not developmentally ready for distributive property. 3.RA.D.1-possibly change to a two-step addition and subtraction and one-step multiplication and division (With us just learning multiplication at this level and the keywords that go with it, it would be nice to start with a smaller foundation of solving

									multiplication/division word problems)
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	For parents, when examples are provided, parents will have a better understanding of the standard.
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
<b>Geometry &amp; Measurement</b>	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.GM.A.1-2-Not a real life skill. Tiling an area is an unlikely strategy to use when finding area. Would like to see it piggyback off of our multiplication and just work on length times width. 3.GM.C.3-Take completely out for same reason

									as above. 3.GM.D.2-Clarify what the verb "understand" means There is no working with money that shows up in any standards. 2nd grade covers counting money/4th grade covers solving problems with money...but there is no work with money at our level. We would hate for them to lose this skill by not working with it.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	For parents, when examples are provided, parents will have a better understanding of the standard.
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
<b>Data &amp; Statistics</b>	K								

	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Line plots are nice for interpreting, but creating a line plot is an unrealistic skill.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	Much improved
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</b>	<b>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</b>

Mathematics 6-8								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
<b>Ratios &amp; Proportional Relationships (RP)</b>	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	

					education.			
<b>Number Sense &amp; Operations (NS)</b>	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	It was very helpful to have some examples written with the standards. We believe students are more developmentally ready to understand integers in grades 3-5 than fraction and decimals along with their operations. Fractions and decimals could be more easily implemented at the middle grade level while teaching ratios and proportional relationships. We propose delaying teaching fractions and decimals to the middle grades and replace with integers.
<b>Expressions, Equations &amp; Inequalities (EEI)</b>	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be	1	It would be helpful to know what standards are the priority standards and what are the supporting standards, so

					for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.		we would not have to look at two different documents. Having all the information in one document would create a more seamless understanding.
<b>Geometry &amp; Measurement (GM)</b>	1	3 - Angles and angle relationships are taught heavily in 3rd and 4th grade, and are not addressed again until 7th grade. The students are not retaining the information because they are not seeing/reviewing the concepts consistently every year.	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	
<b>Data Analysis, Statistics &amp; Probability (DSP)</b>	3 - 6th Grade students are not developmentally ready to understand much of what is taught in this strand at 6th grade. They can follow the methodical process to solve statistical	3 -The heart of statistics is covered in 6th grade. This is too much with all the other skills that need to be covered in 6th grade. Possible solution - teach statistics in	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th	1	

	questions and create box plots, but they do not understand the analysis and interpretation of what they are creating/doing.	both 6th and 7th grade, and probability in 8th grade.			who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.		
<b>Functions (F)</b>	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	



**Science**  
**Feedback on Proposed MLS**

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</b>	<b>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</b>

Science K-5									
Strand	GRADE	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Matter & Its Interactions (PS1)	K-1	1	1	1	1	2 - perhaps define "illustrate" in 1st grade objective, or use a different word	1	1	
	2	1	1	1 - conduct an investigation, analyze data	1	2 - maybe add an example to PS1-A for 2nd grade	1	1	took a lot of standards and compiled them into 1 broader standard
	3	1	4	1	1	1	1	3	Use current standards. Not covered in other grade levels.

	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	2	2	2	3	4		3	What exactly is the expectation of a model?
<b>Motion &amp; Stability; Forces &amp; Interactions (PS2)</b>	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	2 - no standard on magnetism until 3rd grade, used to be a big standard in 2nd grade	1	1	2 - again took a lot of standards and compiled them into 1 broader standard without examples	1	1	Only thing I see in 2nd grade that has to do with magnets is sorting...
	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	2	2	3	3	3		3 - Very simple	What exactly is the expectation of an argument?
<b>Energy (PS3)</b>	K - 1	N/A							
	2								
	3								
	4	3	4 - Where are the units-there are just fragments of units scattered throughout	1	2	2	1	1	
	5	2	2	PS3-B not rigorous PS3C is rigorous	3	3		3	What are the expectations of a model? Are formulas required?
<b>Waves &amp; Applications</b>	K -	1	3 - PS4-A is the same objective	1	3 - include examples of how	1	1	1	

<b>in Technology for Information Transfers (PS4)</b>	1		in kindergarten and 1st grade		to assess this strand				
	2	1	1	1	1	2 - add examples??	1	1	same as before - lots of specific standard combined into 1 broader standard
	3								
	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	
	5	3	3	3	3	3		3	What exactly is the expectation of a model? Very vague!
<b>From Molecules to Organisms: Structure &amp; Process (LS1)</b>	K - 1	4 - 1st grade's objectives are very difficult to understand which makes all of these areas difficult to judge	4	4	4	4	4	4	
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	no change
	3	1	4	2	1	2	1	2	Not covered in other grades. Needs to be more specific for types of animals being compared.
	4	4	4	1	3	2	2	1	
	5	2	4 - Vertebrate/Invertebrate?????	1	3	2		2	Needs to say skeletal. What is the expectation for an argument!
<b>Ecosystems: Interactions, Energy, &amp; Dynamics (LS2)</b>	K - 1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	only change is the addition of

									dispersing seeds or pollinating plants	
	3									
	4									
	5	2	2	2	2	3		2	What is the expectation of a model?	
<b>Heredity &amp; Inheritance: Variation of Traits (LS3)</b>	K - 1	2	3 - too big of a gap between 1st grade and 3rd grade. Not addressed in 2nd.	1	1	3 - please add examples to the 3rd grade students		1	1	
	2									
	3	4	3	1	3	3		2	3	Need clarification of standard
	4									
	5									
<b>Biological Evolution: Unity &amp; Diversity (LS4)</b>	K - 1									
	2									
	3	4	3	1	3	3		2	3	Not covered in other grades. Argument, mates, and making a claim on merit is not appropriate for third grade and should be moved to a higher grade.
	4									
	5									Descriptors are

									needed for expectations. Unified vocabulary of terms and their meanings. Where is the engineering and technology? Unwrapping the standard will not be consist through grade levels in district and out of the district.
<b>Earth's Place in the Universe (ESS1)</b>	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	1	1	1	2 - explain "Earth events"	1	1	like this wording much better
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	3	3	3	3	3		3	Argument and what is expected of a graphical display?
<b>Earth's Systems (ESS2)</b>	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	added standards dealing with preventing erosion and where water can be found on Earth
	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	Move to a lower grade.

November, 2015  
 School of the Osage

	4	4	3	1	4 - only through observation	1	1	1	
	5	1	1	1	1	1		1	
<b>Earth &amp; Human Activity (ESS3)</b>	K - 1								This is only addressed in kindergarten. It may be problematic for the sustainability of our environment to not have this addressed again.
	2								removed how humans use rocks and soil
	3								
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	3	3	3	3	3	3		What does the term science ideas mean?







<b>for Information Transfers (HS-PS4)</b>								
<b>From Molecules to Organisms: Structure &amp; Process (HS-LS1)</b>	1 - We feel that teaching cellular organelles in the MS is not developmentally appropriate. An introduction to this suitable but mastery is not developmentally appropriate in the MS.	3 - there are gaps in content between MS and HS	1	1	3 - HS-LS2 is not clear	1	1	HS-LS1 covers content that will need reinforcement by high school teachers (specifically with cellular organelles and cell transport)
<b>Ecosystems: Interactions, Energy, &amp; Dynamics (HS-LS2)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
<b>Heredity &amp; Inheritance: Variation of Traits (HS-LS3)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
<b>Biological Evolution: Unity &amp; Diversity (HS-LS4)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
<b>Earth's Place in the Universe (HS-ESS1)</b>								
<b>Earth's Systems (HS-ESS2)</b>								
<b>Earth &amp;</b>								

November, 2015

School of the Osage

<b>Human Activity (HS-ESS3)</b>								
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Social Studies**  
**Feedback on Proposed MLS**

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</b>	<b>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</b>

Social Studies K-5									
Strand	GRADE	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Document Shaping Constitutional Democracy	K - 2								
	3	4 - Seems VERY abstract when getting into state-level government	4 - Does build sequentially but not developmentally. 3rd grade was to be state focused but when comparing/contrasting to the national	4 - because of the abstract nature, this seem too rigorous	4 - This is not project based, rather constructed response.	4 - Too general/broad, not sure which areas of the topic to cover from one grade level to the next	4 - Does seem to be rigorous but, again, very deep for the third grade level	According to whom or what?	The number of standards needed to be covered have been overwhelmingly increased

			level it is necessary to teach both in order to truly have the understanding for comparing/contrasting.						
	4	4	4	4 - outside the realm of their cognitive understanding.	1	3 - too complex for parents and stakeholders	1	4 - these concepts go way too deep. (ie. inalienable rights, redress of grievances)	
	5	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	Some of these seem like they might be hard to assess. I am also concerned that some standards are a bit vague or broad for parents
<b>Governance Systems</b>	K - 2								
	3	4	4	4 - too rigorous	4	4 - GS.2.D.3 can be understood. The others are very difficult to comprehend.	4	?	
	4	4	4	4 - outside the realm of their cognitive understanding	4 - cannot assess	4 - standards are way too broad	3	3	
	5	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	Confused of analyzing peaceful





November, 2015  
School of the Osage

										is not having the materials to teach it and time to teach it all. I love the time period and content, but worry about fitting it all in and finding necessary resources.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</b>	<b>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</b>	<b>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</b>

Social Studies 6-12									
Strand	GRADE	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
History: Continuity & Change	O M S	1	1	1	1	2 - could be more specific and measurable	1	1	At times, wording is nonspecific
	O H S	1	1	1	1	2 - Clarification may be need to explain these standards to stakeholders.	1	1	
Government Systems & Principles	O M S	1	1	1	2 - concern that some of the objectives are broad-how will new teachers know the specifics for testing; or the consistency of	2 - could be more specific and measurable	1	1	

					teachers across the board				
	O H S	2-Except T3S2B Standard B which requires mastery of both Articles of Confederation and the Constitution in order to compare to ideals present in the Declaration of Independence. This could be done at a basic level with some sophomores and a more advanced level with others.	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Geographical Study</b>	O M S		1	1	2 - again some non-specific language for the US History	2 - language non-specific	1	1	
	O H S		1	1	1	1	1	1	These standards are most applicable in chapters that examine voting practices and representation (apportionment, gerrymandering)
<b>Economic Concepts</b>	O M S		1	1	1	1	1	1	
	O H S		1	1	1	3	1	1	More clarification is needed on standard T1S4A in order to



**From:** [Heather Epperson](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Concerns  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 4:08:56 PM

---

I am writing in regards to the new proposed learning standards. I'm writing on behalf of a team of 4 Third grade teachers in Trenton, Missouri. We have the following concerns:

W.3.A. a-k- We feel that this is not age appropriate

W.1.D.a- We feel that publishing writing is not age appropriate

R.1.B.d- We feel that palindromes are not necessary to understand language/  
vocabulary

Thank you!

--

**Heather Epperson**

3rd Grade

S. M. Rissler

Trenton R- IX

**From:** [Wagner, Jennifer](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Comments and Suggestions  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 4:08:55 PM

---

The third grade teachers at Stoutland R-II Elementary School would like to acknowledge our support and approval of the following proposed standards:

- R.2.B 3.5-Poetry changes
- L.A. 3.1:a
- SL.3
- 3.NF.A-all sub strands more clearly portrayed
- 3.NF.A.6-Limited denominators
- 3.RA-all strands more clearly portrayed
- 3.RA.B.1-Appreciate the omission of the formal names of properties being used by students

We would also like to express our concern over material that is not grade-level appropriate for the following proposed standards:

- W.2.A. W.3.1: c and d
- W.3.7 & W.3.8: f, i, j, k
- R.2.A. 3.9: e & f
- R.4/R.I. 3.5
- 3.NBT.A.2-Expanded Notation is rare in third grade curriculum and is an additional skill which takes away from areas of greater importance.

Thank you,

Third Grade Teachers,  
Stoutland R-II Elementary School

--

*Stoutland Schools: Providing a safe, respectful, responsible environment that encourages learning... today...tomorrow...Always!*

**From:** [madams@salem.k12.mo.us](mailto:madams@salem.k12.mo.us)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** ELA and Math Proposed Standards  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 3:07:38 PM

---

I feel really good about the proposed math standards. I love that they are adding money! I am not really sure how I feel about some of the proposed ELA standards. I feel that we are losing some important skills such as commas in dates and gaining some that are not needed such as recurring phrases. It seems like we are already using some of the standards that have been added on. They are just written with more detail.

Micah Adams  
William Lynch Elementary  
First Grade Teacher

**From:** [1490Comments](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments from Knox County High School Teachers  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 09, 2015 12:59:26 PM  
**Attachments:** [Comments on HB1490 workgroups.docx](#)

---

**From:** Brown, Brian [mailto:brian.brown@knoxr1.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 2:32 PM  
**To:** 1490Comments  
**Subject:** Comments from Knox County High School Teachers

Please see attached document.

Thank you.

--

Brian Brown  
**Principal**  
**Knox County R-1 High School**

Comments on HB1490:

1. I think the variety of individuals to serve on the work groups will allow for a diverse range of opinion and viewpoints which will allow for the standards to be well-rounded.
2. Not necessarily a comment about the house bill or standards, but I think it would be beneficial to attend the public hearings about the revisions of the standards - would be a good PD opportunity and chance for continued ed.
3. As a vocational instructor that does not have a set standard represented in this HB and accompanying documents, I appreciate that the standards are broken into subsets that are easy for me to use to crosswalk with my current standards and curriculum. As I am writing new curriculum now it has made it fairly easy to transition some of the old into the new.
4. I do not see much difference in the standards that have been proposed and the pre-existing standards that will affect the choices I use for standards that fit in my curriculum, however in the data available to myself (crosswalks provided for certain courses through the DESE curriculum links) I have noticed they are vary subtle differences. For myself - this is handy and comforting while trying to re-write curriculum.

---

Proposed Standard -

RL.2.9-10 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings.

CCS-

RL.9- 10.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone (e.g., how the language evokes a sense of time and place; how it sets a formal or informal tone).

I feel if this standard is broadened to what the proposed standard states students will miss out on the analyzing portion of figurative and connotative language. They will miss out of important conversations needed to help students understand how words can be used in multiple ways and how these uses can impact a text.

Proposed Standard-

RI.11.9- 10 Analyze how multiple texts reflect the historical and/or cultural contexts.

RI.11.9- 10 Analyze how multiple texts reflect the historical and/or cultural contexts.

I like that they have added these standards in. I personally already teach multiple texts over several historical events, however, I could see how other teachers may not hit multiple texts without this standard. It is vital to look at different point of views over one event and have discussions over how these pov's affect the readers.

Proposed Standard-

RI.10.9- 10 Evaluate how effectively two or more texts develop similar ideas/topics.

Current Standard-

RI.9- 10.9 Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington's Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt's Four Freedoms speech, King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail"), including how they address related themes and concepts.

I like how this standard has been broadened and allows the teacher to choose texts that our students can better relate too. I also like how the writing standards have been written. Several CCS standards have been combined, as well as the standard focusing on editing has been written with more detail.

- 
1. I noticed that there appears to be a shift from memorization and rote learning to more hands-on and creative learning.

2. There are less standards here than were on the old CLE's.
  3. It appears they have incorporated STEM components as well as interdisciplinary tie-ins.
- 

1. I am glad to see that government has its own standards and that we are no longer lumped in together with Language Arts.

2. I like the fact that a citizen's personal responsibility is part of the standards.

3. I also like the fact that having political differences are worked into the standards.

---

Overall I view the new learning standards as being too vague in terms of the materials we are to cover in secondary Language Arts classes.

Many of the proposed reading standards seem to leave the content to be instructed up to the teacher, which could create an issue with uniformity in the curricula.

The proposed writing standard (WR.2.11-12) does not emphasize the techniques we should encourage students to develop, rather condensing the standard down to a short grab-bag of potential techniques to cover or blend.

---

- 1) I think they are similar to the NEXT Generation Science Standards
  - 2) A lot of project based and creation of models
  - 3) Requires more higher level thinking
- 

The introductory statements for the themes are very informative and naturally break the standards into units unlike before where the standards would be used multiple times and have different meanings with each unit.

The possible sources of study that come with each theme is a great resource to find primary and secondary sources.

The proposed standards are the same as previous standards however the key concepts are much more detailed and easier to follow.

---

As I browsed the proposed standards, I did not find anything regarding the other courses that are offered which I believe play a big role in the education of students. In order for all to be "on the same page" I think it is crucial to also include elective classes like foreign language, P.E, art, etc.

From what I have seen, it looks like some of the previous standards are being simplified while others are getting added with so much information. That makes it confusing to understand what the actual expectation is.

Section 160.518. 2 states that "....assessment system shall only permit the academic performance of students in each school in the state to be tracked against prior academic performance in the same school. How will that work for students that transfer late in the school year?"

---

A1.NQ.A.1 - Language seems very specific as related to rational exponents and as compared to other domain standards. It is also a standard that is addressed in Algebra II. My concern is that these standards (A.1 and A.2) go beyond Algebra I.

A1.NQ.A.2 - Same as above.

Standards A1.CED.B.4 through B.7 - All contain concrete language that is readily understandable.

Overall, the new standards do a better job of defining the standards and adding specificity to their meanings. The CCS were, in general, more vague in their descriptions of the standard.

---

A2.SSE.D.14 - Appreciated the clearer language and specific expectations about logarithms

G.CP.B.7 - This standard lays out the expectation for understanding and applying the Addition Rule for probabilities. I feel like there should be a similar standard for the Multiplication Rule for probabilities, but it's sort of unclearly described in the conditional probability rules instead.

The geometry standards in general: "Theorems should include the following:" - does this mean those are the only theorems that should be included, or are there others and those are just examples?

**From:** [Branden Piatt](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Missouri Learning Standards  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 2:03:36 PM

---

I feel as though the math portion of the standards are really good for 1<sup>st</sup> grade. I feel like what was taken out and added will be a good thing. ELA I'm not so sure about. I feel as though there are some silly ones that I'm not sure why they are there. One of those being explain the function of recurring phrases. I also feel like we need to continue to teach commas in dates and to separate single words in a series. The commas were taken out of the new standards.

Branden Piatt  
William Lynch Elementary  
1<sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher

**From:** [Lape, Sally](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** ELA Proposed Standards  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 11:58:55 AM

---

Dear DESE panel members for the ELA Proposed Standards,

I was in the process of completing the Survey Monkey for the English 6-12 Standards Comments, and I was kicked out of the program as I was finishing up the questions about the Reading Informational Text Strand.

Therefore, I am going to make comments about the Reading Literature Text Strand, Reading Informational Text Strand, and the Writing Strand.

**The Reading Literature Text Strand requires major changes because of the following reasons:**

- The standards do not show a differentiation of instruction among the grade levels 6-12.
- A progression of difficulty should be present as students move through higher grade levels.
- Teachers will not know at what grade level they should introduce and reinforce literary techniques and different literary genres for students to master and understand.
- There is too much “sameness” in the language among the standards.

Reading Informational Text Strand requires major changes because of the following reasons:

- The standards do not show a differentiation of instruction among the grade levels 6-12.
- A progression of difficulty should be present as students move through higher grade levels.
- Teachers will not know at what grade level they should introduce and reinforce specific techniques associated to non-fiction writings (e.g., fact/opinion, bias, bandwagon, etc.) so that students can understand and analyze difficult non-fiction texts.
- There is too much “sameness” in the language among the standards.

Writing Strand requires a MAJOR OVERHAUL because of the following reasons:

- The research standard (WR.1) shows NO increase in the level of difficulty. It is entirely too general with no consideration of what each grade level needs to address. Students need to learn each component of the research process so that by the time they are juniors and seniors, they can compose a well-developed research assignment with multiple sources. This standard does not break it down for teachers to follow.
- WR.2 should be separated into to three separate standards: argumentative, informative/explanatory, and narrative.
- There should be a standard for analytical writing.
- There should be a strand for descriptive writing.
- WR.3 should be broken down into a separate STRAND for LANGUAGE (grammar usage and mechanics) at each grade level. Teachers need to know at what grade level all aspects of grammar usage and mechanics should be introduced, reinforced, and mastered so that students can become strong writers.

I hope you will consider these suggestions to improve the English Language Proposed Standards for

grades 6-12. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to make comments.

Respectfully,

Sally M. Lape

English Academic Coach for Sikeston R6 (grades 7-12)

**This email and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error. State and federal laws prohibit the review or distribution of communications received in error. If you have received this communication in error, please notify Sikeston Public Schools at (573) 472-2581 and destroy all copies of the email and any attachments.**

**From:** [Charlotte Tinsley](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Cierpiot, Mike](#); [Rebecca.Roeber@house.mo.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Roeber@house.mo.gov); [Cross, Gary](#); [Kraus, Will](#)  
**Subject:** HB1490  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 10:46:05 AM

---

Good Morning:

If one can read at an eighth grade level one can read most high school and college textbooks. If they can write in cursive, they can READ cursive. (Today when I send out letters to any young people I have to print because most cannot read the cursive writing). If they learn the rules of phonics, and the rules of grammar and spelling, they can read and write most anything. If they know their addition, subtraction, multiplication and division tables through the 12's backwards and forwards, understand and can do fractions, decimals and long division, children can successfully function in the world today. Those are really all the standards we need (until advanced math in high school) - the rest is all hype. Maybe DESE and the Missouri Board of Education should pattern our standards after that of a coach - fundamentals, fundamentals, fundamentals. That's what wins games - and that's what will make each and every one of our students successful.

Please return us to the pre-1955 traditional curriculum and add in the technology piece. Please implement the basics again, when we were number 1 in the world in education. It's not rocket science – It's really quite simple – just get out of the way and let our teachers teach instead of monitoring, recording and testing.

If you want to ensure our teachers are performing well, design any standardized test on the above academic criteria– then we can easily see who is doing what they were hired to do.

Sincerely,  
Rose Tinsley

**From:** [1490Comments](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on Standards  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 09, 2015 12:34:47 PM

---

**From:** Linda Florence [mailto:lflorence@lexington.k12.mo.us]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 01, 2015 4:52 PM  
**To:** 1490Comments  
**Subject:** Comments on Standards

Here are my few comments relating to the standards.

ELA--

I appreciate how the standards are organized in that format. It makes it easy to look at individual standards across the grade levels.

I like the changes that have been made to the different kinds of reading (poetry, drama, etc.) It appears that we are encouraging students to spend more time reading!

I think breaking down the listening and speaking into the categories is helpful also.

Math--

I don't care for the lay out of the standards in math. It seems a little complicated to follow.

Some of the standards are difficult to follow (too wordy). Although I do think it is important to be specific within the standards.

I do like the appendix information within the math.

Science/Social Studies--

I appreciate the standards being organized.

Thanks to those that have put in the work on the standards.  
Linda

**From:** [Eric Medlock](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Eric Medlock](#); [Nina Medlock](#)  
**Subject:** DESE public comment for HB1490  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 01, 2015 11:26:54 PM

---

I recently had my 7<sup>th</sup> grade son sign a medical form which he proceeded to print his name. When I asked him to redo the signature in cursive, he had no idea what I was talking about. Nearly the same week, an article in the October 28, 2015 issue of the Jefferson City's New Tribune. "Some area schools keeping cursive relevant" (<http://www.newtribune.com/news/2015/oct/28/some-area-schools-keeping-cursive-relevant/>) helped enlighten me on something I was not aware had been changing in our school systems as a whole. I also spoke about this with the middle school principal. Summarizing her response, basically cursive is no longer a standard and schools only have time to teach to the standards.

I spent some time going through DESE's webpages on standards. The more I learn about where the standards are trying to take students academically, the more concerned I'm becoming over losing the basics of what it takes to learn. Technology cannot take the place of learning through the repetition of writing, flash cards, memorization, etc. By removing cursive writing from the curriculum, a large part of student learning is also removed. Additionally, many documents were written in cursive and cannot be read by students or young adults. "We the people of the United States..." has more impact when you can read a copy of the original than when you read it in reproduced typed print!

In building upon the previous standard, it also appears it is academically assumed the standard was mastered and that does not appear to be the case with many of the student population. When it is noticed across the board by multiple teachers from various subjects and grade levels with whom I have spoken and they all see this common occurrence in a large portion of the student population, the school districts and DESE also need to step up and take responsibility. As I began taking a more active participation in my son's education, I became painfully aware of his lack of the ability to distinguish between proper spelling of similes, sentence structure and punctuation that I felt a 7<sup>th</sup> grader should know. In speaking with the school counselor, his English teacher, and IEP coordinator, it was explained that several of my concerns were already planned to be addressed with the 7<sup>th</sup> grade student population. It was felt by the staff that "texting" was a leading cause of poor sentence structure, spelling and punctuation due to auto-correct features. As my son does not have a cell phone, that did not explain the problem I was experiencing. I was additionally taken back when we discussed math and an example was given that if a student understood the concept of multiplication but simply had difficulty coming up with the right answer, they would teach the student how to properly use a calculator. What happened to learning multiplication tables? Calculators are not always available when the power is out, cell phones are drained, batteries go dead,

and so forth. Without a second thought, people should know  $1 \times 1 = 1$ ,  $2 \times 2 = 4$ ,  $3 \times 3 = 9$ , etc.

It is unrealistic to believe all students will be going on to secondary education. The research and documents on DESE's website indicate the disparity between college level texts and student expectation compared with the texts and student expectation in high school. By attempting to bring all students to the college level, we are doing a great disservice to those that are entering the workforce who cannot write without a computer in complete sentences and without correct spelling and punctuation nor able to do basic math in their head without a calculator. I recently spoke with a manager of a business that employs high school students during the summer. One of their interview questions is to complete a math question involving a real world scenario. The question is: "If a menu item is \$10 and the customer has a 20% discount card, how much will the customer need to pay assuming no tax?" The answers range widely and he was amazed at how many worksheets would have boxes scribbled across the top of the paper, long division problem solving trying to get the answer and an overall lack of the correct \$8 answer. Common Sense needs to replace Common Core! Or, at a very minimum, complement these common standards by not losing the basics of repetition of writing and memorization. Technology is a tool to assist learning. Teaching just to the standards in order to pass a standards test does not replace the need to learn and maintain the basics that are needed throughout life!

**From:** [Amy DuBois](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Crosswalk  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 01, 2015 1:25:00 PM

---

Hello,

In looking at the Proposed Standards on the Crosswalk for Third Grade, I see some things that concern me. First, in the area of Spelling, the current standards are very specific in listing high-frequency words, spelling patterns, ending rules, etc. However, the Proposed Standards only address spelling compound words and doubling the consonant/changing y to i before adding es. I think it is important to be as specific as the current standards are regarding spelling.

Also, R3C 3rd: RI 3.9: I think we should keep comparing/contrasting the most important points and key details in two texts of the same topic. This is a skill that really makes students think deeply about what is read.

As far as cursive handwriting, are we only expecting that in second and third grades? Shouldn't we extend that into all years following Third Grade? Otherwise, we have spent a lot of valuable instruction time teaching something that will never be expected again.

W1B 3rd : We have found that writing a multi-paragraph text proves to be very difficult at this level. I would rather see students write one or two really good paragraphs than an essay type piece that they struggle with completing.

Finally, R1D 3rd: What is text that is "Developmentally Appropriate"? Are we leaving this up to schools to decide? If so, this makes standardization very hard. I would like to see something more specific there.

Thank you for allowing us to voice our concerns.  
Third Grade Teacher

**From:** [1490Comments](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Liberty Public Schools Teacher Feedback on HB1490 Proposals  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 09, 2015 12:26:57 PM  
**Attachments:** [LPS HB1490 Feedback Nov 2015.docx](#)

---

**From:** Jeanette Westfall [mailto:[jwestfall@liberty.k12.mo.us](mailto:jwestfall@liberty.k12.mo.us)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 24, 2015 1:43 PM  
**To:** 1490Comments  
**Subject:** Liberty Public Schools Teacher Feedback on HB1490 Proposals

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for considering Liberty teacher input in your curriculum review and alignment next steps. We will also send this submission as certified mail with the USPS.

With respect,

Dr. Jeanette Westfall  
Director of Curriculum, Instruction & Staff Development  
Liberty 53 School District  
8 Victory Lane  
Liberty, MO 64068  
(816) 736-5320

*Inspire. Invest. Innovate.*



Date: December 20, 2015

To: Missouri State Board of Education

Liberty Public Schools has worked collaboratively in grade level and content area teacher teams to review the HB1490 Work Groups submissions. We appreciate the opportunity to offer our feedback to the continued work on the K-12 curriculum standards.

Our teachers, staff, and community members have been encouraged to submit input on-line, but many of our instructional staff also felt the need to submit additional information as a collective. Their feedback and input is included with this letter.

Thank you for listening to our teachers and including their thinking in the next iteration of the curriculum to be presented to the Board of Education. We would be honored for you to consider our work. Additionally, if DESE creates any additional teacher work groups to refine the input from stakeholders, Liberty teachers are eager to help. Please let us know if we can be of any assistance.

With deep respect,

*/s/ Jeanette Westfall*

Jeanette Westfall, EdD  
Director of Curriculum, Instruction & Staff Development  
Liberty Public Schools #53

**Dr. Jeanette Westfall**

8 Victory Lane, Liberty, MO 64068  
Phone: 816.736.6486 E-Mail: [jwestfall@liberty.k12.mo.us](mailto:jwestfall@liberty.k12.mo.us)

## Liberty Public Schools #53 Instructional Staff Feedback by Content

### High School Science:

The level of rigor and organization of the proposed standards (Grades 6 – 12) is significantly improved from the science standards previously adopted by DESE. Whereas the current standards are very knowledge-based, the proposed standards require that students apply higher-level thinking in science coursework. The three-dimensional learning practices that form the basis of the middle and high school standards will cause a shift in thinking among educators. This should significantly improve science education in the state of Missouri and will serve to prepare our students for the future, as this design integrates Disciplinary Core Ideas, Cross-Cutting Concepts, and Science & Engineering Practices into a cohesive structure for science instruction.

One example of an improvement in the standards is the requirement that students “...apply concepts of statistics and probability...” As this is an essential skill in scientific thinking, it is very impressive to see this overtly stated in the proposed standards. For too long, we have considered some science courses as requiring “no math” when mathematical concepts are essential to ALL areas of science. Other standards include the phrase “construct an argument based on evidence...” which is another critical scientific literacy skill. Constructing arguments and applying mathematical concepts will lead to higher levels of performance by all students. Further, it is anticipated that the proposed standards will also allow more students across the state to have an authentic laboratory experience in which they have opportunities to collect, analyze and report data. The organization of the new Missouri Learning Standards will require the integration of science practices throughout the course.

In an effort to provide the most comprehensive and cohesive model for science instruction in Missouri, it is suggested that the proposed elementary science standards receive additional review by educators to ensure that they work in tandem with the proposed middle and secondary standards to provide for thorough and rigorous science education for Missouri students. We believe the committee has made a good start with the elementary standards but that they need some reorganization to meet the needs of students.

High School Social Studies: There are slight concerns over some of the testing implications due to the increased vagueness in the proposed standards for government. There is also a clear shift away from economics and a change in emphasis on the philosophers that influenced the development of constitutional governments that I don't quite understand the reason for.

In world history, there is more of an emphasis on world history as opposed to European history, which I think is a good change. It is odd, however, why they choose to specifically focus on civilizations like the Gupta but then vaguely address East Asia and the Islamic Empires.

*Government:*

Theme 1 Strand 4: want to make sure we are talking about “opportunity costs” and benefits, not “costs” and benefits. Can be a little confusing

Theme 2 Strand 2: might want to add primary sources for Enlightenment Thinkers on Social Contract. Hobbes, Montesquieu, Locke, & Rousseau were heavily featured before. Not sure why the shift away from them.

Theme 3: mentions “Seminal Supreme Court Cases” for primary sources they would recommend. Would like to know which cases the state feels are seminal.

*US History:*

Theme 6: there is a concern that the history is too new to effectively “analyze” or “evaluate” and that lower levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy should dominate this theme

General questions:

Why aren’t Essential Questions provided by the state to guide instruction?

Possible primary and secondary sources: are these merely suggestions or are they tied to EOCs (particularly Government since this is the only one currently tested)? In other words, are those documents referenced in state tests?

High School Mathematics:

## Algebra 1

**Standard: A1.IF.C.7-** Graph functions, including simple piecewise defined functions (linear, simple quadratic and simple exponential), from their symbolic representation and show key features of the graph both by hand and by using technology.

**Proposed change:** Omit piecewise functions, or change to interpreting given piecewise functions (not graphing)

**Rationale:** Time would be better spent focusing on a deep understanding of the three types of functions. This is covered in upper level courses, and is very conceptually difficult for what is typically a freshmen level class.

**Standard: All of Data and Statistical Analysis Domain**

**Proposed change:** Significantly reduced or omitted from this course. (Keep scatterplots with linear relationships)

**Rationale:** Student have calculated measure of central tendency and represented data in different graphical representations in previous grades. Determining residuals from lines of fit, relative frequencies, and in depth analysis are far above what an average citizen would need to know to be able to make informed decisions, and several of these items are covered in Algebra 2. Putting so much focus on this unit uses considerable time that would be better spent on developing a deep understanding of Algebra, which is key for success in any future course.

**Standard: A1.REI.C.9def-** Solve mathematical and real-world problems involving quadratic equations in one variable. (methods: completing the square, quadratic formula, square roots, factoring; derive quadratic formula).

**Proposed change:** Omit completing the square, focus on solving by factoring and only simple quadratics ( $ax^2 + c = 0$ ) for solving.

**Rationale:** There is simply not enough time to realistically cover everything listed in the school year. Quadratics are covered extensively in Algebra 2. An introduction to basics is all that is necessary and feasible in Algebra 1. Derivation of the quadratic formula is very difficult, even for upper level students, and is too overwhelming for freshmen or younger students!

## Geometry

**Standard: G.SRT.A.1a** - Verify experimentally the properties of dilations given by a center and scale factor: A dilation takes a line not passing through the center of the dilation to a parallel line, and leaves a line passing through the center unchanged.

**Proposed change:** Omit

**Rationale:** A minute detail that does not impact students' understanding of properties of dilations given by a center and a scale factor.

**Standard: Probability Domain**

**Proposed change:** Omit

**Rationale:** It is typically covered in Algebra II. Not enough time to get to this before testing.

**Standard: G.S.RT.B.4** Prove theorems about triangles. (Theorems should include: a line parallel to one side of a triangle divides the other two side proportionally, and conversely, the Pythagorean Theorem proved using triangle similarity.

**Proposed change:** change prove theorems to use theorems

**Rationale:** It is more important to be able to use the concept correctly than spend time proving it.

## Algebra 2

**Standard: A2.APR.A.4** - Understand the Remainder Theorem: For a polynomial  $p(x)$  and a number  $a$ , the remainder on division of  $p(x)$  by  $(x-a)$  is  $p(a)$ , so  $p(a) = 0$  if and only if  $(x-a)$  is a factor of  $p(x)$ .

**Proposed Change:** Omit

**Rationale:** This is typically covered in Precalculus and College Algebra courses

**Standards: Data and Statistical Analysis Domain**

**Proposed Change:** Omit

**Rationale:** If the state test for juniors is going to be the ACT, data analysis and statistics are not tested on the ACT. As Algebra 2 is a course taken predominantly by juniors, we feel other standards should be considered, such as sequences and series and trigonometry. Sequences and patterns are commonly seen on the ACT, as well as simple trigonometry and Law of Sines and Law of Cosines. The Law of Sines and Law of Cosines are not included in the Geometry standards, but are tested on the ACT.

**Standards:** Review of Trigonometry, specifically addressing Law of Sines and Law of Cosines

**Proposed Change:** Add

**Rationale:** See above regarding the ACT Test. Copy and paste as necessary.

**Standards:** Sequences and Patterns

**Proposed Change:** Add

**Rationale:** See above regarding the ACT Test. Copy and paste as necessary.

## Middle School Social Studies

Grade Levels Taught	Standards to Address	Proposed Changes
6th	The current standards that we address are what students are capable of grasping and understanding especially when 6th grade is really the first year they are exposed to concentrated social studies class.	At present the students level of engagement is high because of the standards and present curriculum that we teach.
6th		World History Theme 1 = 6th through 8th World History Theme 2 and 3 = 6th World History Theme 4 = 7th Geography = 6th through 8th
6th/7th	We would like to see more an emphasis on the World Geography Standards. We would also like to see the standards that correlate Japan, Mayans, Incan, African Empires emphasized in the curriculum.	We would like to see the World Geography standards incorporated with the World History standards.
6th/8th	MS World History Theme 1- all social studies classes Themes 2-3 = 6th Grade Themes 4-5 = 7th Grade MS Geography Themes 1-2 - all social studies classes MS American History - all themes = 8th grade	The MS World History course expectations are not realistic for a one year course. Many of the geography standards are integrated into history expectations. Split World History into 2 courses and integrate geography.
7th	Geography is substantially shorter than other strands. Is there a recommended timeline? Could Geography be blended in with the world and US history?	
7th	The World History Theme 1 and 2 standards need to be merged with the Geography Theme 1 and 2 standards as they are repetitive and should be combined.	I would like to see middle school world history and geography course expectations combined as the 6th and 7th grade courses are set up now. Having worked at another local district that did not combine the geography and world history course expectations, I observed the students only received an education on ancient Greece and Egypt.

## Middle School Mathematics:

After having some good discussion about this yesterday at our meeting, the teachers said that there was nothing that they thought needed to be changed and they actually liked some of the new wording in the standards better.

## Middle School Science:

### *Praise:*

- We appreciate the level of quality resources used to create these standards.
- We appreciate that performance expectations from A Framework for K-12 Science Education as that brings the standards from a DOK 1 and 2 to a more appropriate DOK 3 and 4.
- We noticed and appreciate that amount of content has been shortened while deepening the content that was kept.
- We are excited that the standards now include multiple opportunities to tie in engineering, technology, and relevant careers.

### *Concerns:*

- It is felt that the STATE will need to delineate where each learning standard is taught to ensure that transient students have a consistent education when moving rather than leaving it up to each district which standards should be taught at each grade. We are concerned that the standards do not currently include grade level delineation. Thinking about the ability of 11-14 year old children to cognitively grasp abstract concepts and then further analyze and apply, there are DOK expectations included in the standards that are clearly better aligned to 8th graders rather than 6th graders. We would encourage the committee not to take a “one size fits all” approach children in 6th–8th grades as the standards are currently presented. This will also help transient students to have a consistent experience at any Missouri school and not miss/repeat content.
- Amount of time to get through standards
- Amount of background knowledge to even address goal

### *MS Science Standard-by-Standard Feedback:*

- MSPS1-1. Develop models to describe the atomic composition of simple molecules and extended structures. (Organic chemistry, too high???)
- MSLS1-3. Develop an argument supported by evidence for how multicellular organisms are organized by varying levels of complexity; cells, tissue, organs, organ systems. (How can this be augmented?)
- MSLS4-4. Interpret graphical representations to support explanations of how natural selection may lead to increases and decreases of specific traits in populations over time. (Will data be provided to support teachers in teaching standards that required data to teach?)
- The word “model” implies a physical model. This either needs to be reworded or clarified to ensure teachers don’t go back to “cakes of cell models” as this does not teach a standard that asked to compare/contrast organelles.
- MS-PS3-1- The clarification statement does not clarify. It is very confusing!
- MS-PE3-3 How will this as assessed on a state level test?
- MS-PS3-4 and 5 I do not think these are 7th grade level questions. These are asking for some pretty high level thinking and implying lots of background knowledge in order to get to this high level.

- MS-ESS1-1 In the clarification it talks about models can be “physical, graphical or conceptual” how does that clarify anything? Perhaps it should define if the model is merely to reproduce the system or is the goal to explain the relationship between the Earth, Sun and Moon?
- MS-ESS1-2 Same as above.
- MS-ESS1-4 Is it really necessary to have this objective? Seems a bit out of place.
- MS-ESS1-5 I don’t think this fits at all with this thread. This is more geologic history and fossil evidence. Having this objective here leads me to think we are to talk about the formation of the universe which unless you have super current information (not text book) you will be wrong and teaching vastly outdated material. If the intention is to teach the Big Bang or other widely accepted and scientifically backed theories of the formation of the universe then that needs to be stated. Personally, I’m ok with it because having those conversations allows students to see that science is constantly evolving and hopefully this realization would eliminate the “science keeps changing their mind” thought.
- We question why the current Missouri Learning Standards for human body systems has been deleted. The Missouri state Health standards do not address some of the process introductions needed for students to be successful in biology. Specific examples include the process of nutrients passing through a semi-permeable membrane of a cell and the cell’s ability to turn that into energy.
- We are wondering if leaving out specific references to scientists of the past (I.e. Newton) was intentional and if so – why? We think that starting with a historical perspective gives students insight into the discoveries of these scientific laws and theories

### Elementary Social Studies:

#### **Kindergarten**

(Not in proposed standards) PPG.2.A Participate in a democratic decision making processes. \*I think it would be good for kids to have a chance to practice/learn what it means to vote. We do this every year on Election Day.

H.3.B.K.b Compare your family in the past and present. \* I don’t think kindergarteners have enough life perspective to do this.

The following are all new to K-I’m not sure K’s have enough life perspective for the depth of these! Not developmentally appropriate standards for 5-6 year olds in my opinion.

RI.6.A.K Describe cultural characteristics of your family and class members (e.g., language, celebrations, customs, holidays, artistic expression, food, dress, & traditions).

Ideas and beliefs of different cultures

RI.6.C.K Share stories related to your family cultural traditions and family lore. Cultural heritage and preservation

RI.6.D.4 Describe how you and your family remember and commemorate your cultural heritage. the world?

**First Grade**

During 4th qtr. writer's workshop, 1st graders are supposed to write non-fiction pieces. They are no longer covering famous Americans during social studies in a way that is integrated between academic subjects. The famous Americans covered according the standards are related to holidays. This significantly decreases the number of famous Americans taught and therefore limits the number of famous Americans researched and written about.

We feel comfortable with the other items listed.

**Second Grade****Geographical Study**

EG.5.A.2.a. Read and construct maps with title and key (regions of state, U.S., world)

I feel that at our level, being able to construct a map with title and key is developmentally appropriate. I think maybe being able to locate our state on a map is okay, but not sure on details of the world?

ES 5.B.2.a Name and locate regions of the world (continents, oceans, hemispheres) I think having students locate and name oceans and continents and not hemispheres.

I really think understanding relationships between and among regions is a little over 2nd grade. Maybe focusing in on Missouri alone and then able to build on it to compare regions in 3rd grade?

I think they have added a lot to what we already do and some seem to overlap as well.

**Fourth Grade****Agree****GOVERNMENT**

Functions of governmental systems makes sense (state to federal and then to compare)

**HISTORY**

K - George Washington, Abe Lincoln

1st - MLK, Thomas Jefferson, Christopher Columbus

2nd - Inventors or Pioneers

3rd - Famous Missourians

4th - Significant individuals of 1800

5th - Significant individuals

1800-1940

**ECONOMICS**

Stayed the same

**GEOGRAPHY**

matches the government

**CULTURE STUDY**

New, but agree

**SOCIAL SCIENCE INQUIRY**

Same

QuestionableHISTORY

Civil War is introduced in third (gained 4th grades exact standard) then built in 5th. ?Why is this skipping 4th?

Why are the standards in history not introduced in chronological order?

Example, goes from Civil War(3rd), American Rev.(4th), back to Civil War(5th)

Student won't see the connections between time periods of time because events are taught out of chronological order

\*Concerned with topics being taught out of chronological order

Why do our history standards stop at 1940

Suggestion - Organize history standards chronologically

GEOGRAPHY

State level to national level

Elementary ELA:Writing Standards

Grade	Standard	Proposed Change (addition, deletion, modification in language, level or alignment)	Rationale for Change
5	Writing 1Db	Change two pages to one page.	Time doesn't allow for students to publish two pages. Very few pieces of our writing exceed five paragraphs.
5	Writing 3An	Bibliography - delete this	Intro/practice occurs with LMS; not age appropriate in classroom when the students are citing in their text.
5	Language 1Ab	Parts of speech - move to younger grade	Identify and use noun, pronoun, verb, adjective and adverb should occur earlier in elementary school
5	Language 1Bi	Apostrophes	Where did this previously occur?

Language Standards:

K	1Da	Give examples of digital tools	This would be helpful.
	1Bf	Use "reads" instead of "recognize" how to understand	The word recognize could cause confusion--what does it mean (spelling, reading, etc)
	1Bf	Use "reads" instead of "recognize" how to understand	The word recognize could cause confusion--what does it mean

## **Elementary Science:**

### Kindergarten feedback:

PS2B Observe that magnets cause some objects to move without touching them.

**Recommendation: Move to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade**

PS4A Compare and Contrast different sounds

Identify sounds and their source of vibration in everyday life.

Identify the ear as a receiver of vibrations that produce sounds.

**Recommendation: Move to 1<sup>st</sup> grade**

### First Grade feedback:

PS3A Compare the temperature of hot and cold objects using a simple thermometer.

PS3B Identify sources of thermal energy

PS4B Identify the source of energy causes an increase in temperature of an object.

**Recommendations: Move to 2<sup>nd</sup> grade**

### Second Grade feedback:

PS4-A Plan and conduct investigations to provide evidence that changes in vibration create change in sound.

Demonstrate that vibrating materials can create sounds and that sound can make materials vibrate.

Describe how the ear serves as a receiver of sounds.

Identify air, water and solids as media that sound travels through.

**Recommendations: Move to 1<sup>st</sup> grade**

### Third Grade feedback:

ESS1B Explain how the sun's position in the sky and the Earth's rotation affect the length and direction of shadows.

Observe and identify the moon is visible because it reflect light.

Describe how the sun, moon and stars appears to move slowly across the sky from east to west during the day and/or night due to the rotations of the Earth

Explain that the changing shape of the moon during positions of the earth, moon and sun rather than due to the Earth's shadow falling on the moon.

Identify the three things (light source, object and surface) necessary to produce a shadow.

Identify the Earth rotates on its axis once every 24 hours.

**Recommendation: Move to 1<sup>st</sup> grade**

PS1B Construct an argument with evidence that some changes caused by heating or cooling can be reversed and some cannot.

PS3B Identify sources of thermal energy (sun, stove, tire, body) that can cause solids to change to liquids and liquids to change to gas.

**Recommendation: Move to 2<sup>nd</sup> grade**

Fourth Grade feedback:

PS2A Make observation and or measurement of an objects motion to provide evidence that a pattern can be used to predict future motion

Plan and conduct an investigation to provide evidence of the effects of balanced and unbalanced forces on the motion of an object.

**Recommendation: Move to third grade**

PS2B Predict how changes in either the amount of force applied to an object or the mass of the object affects the motion (speed and direction) of the object

Observe the balanced forces do not affect an object's motion

Describe how unbalanced forces acting on an object changes its speed (faster/slower), direction of motion, or both.

**Recommendation: Move to third grade**Fifth Grade feedback:

**No change recommendations**

**From:** [Brian Meyer](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 24, 2015 7:30:30 AM

---

My only concern is about not having a vocabulary standard. My kids reading levels are very low and developing vocal seems like an important part of improving that.

Brian Meyer  
BMS Frosh Center  
SPED ELA & Science

**From:** [Bolton, Mollie](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Speaking and Listening/Language Standards  
**Date:** Monday, November 23, 2015 6:14:49 PM

---

I am very concerned that we are taking out many of the speaking and listening standards/language standards – as well as many of the standards that deal with collaboration. We have been told repeatedly by industries that this is what our students lack the most, yet we are not addressing it in our proposed standards.

## Mollie Bolton

Mollie Bolton  
Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction  
Special School District of St. Louis County  
314-989-8246

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

NOTICE: Any information contained in or attached to this message is intended solely for the use of the intended recipients(s) and may contain confidential information. Any review, retransmission, dissemination of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this communication by persons other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please contact the sender and discard the communication sent in error.

**From:** [Doug Abend](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** ela k-5 writing standards  
**Date:** Monday, November 16, 2015 1:56:45 PM

---

Hello,

Thank you for including the school, library, or home in Research Process 3.A for Grade K.  
Please include the library as a collaborating partner in grades 1-5 as well.

Thank you for reading,  
Doug

--

Doug Abend  
Librarian & Tech Director  
Rich Hill R-IV School District  
[dabend@richhill.k12.mo.us](mailto:dabend@richhill.k12.mo.us)  
<http://www.richhill.k12.mo.us>

Gymnasium of the mind. Learning Commons. Personal Learning Community.  
The new School Library.

**From:** [Kerby, Wendy](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Suggestions/Opinions Regarding HB 1490's Proposed Standards  
**Date:** Thursday, November 12, 2015 3:47:14 PM  
**Attachments:** [HB 1490 Suggestions & Opinions.docx](#)

---

## *Suggestions / Opinions Regarding Proposed ELA Standards for 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Grades*

### Suggestions:

- L1A 4<sup>th</sup> c. - This needs to specify verb TENSES.
  - d. - Adjectives need to be included with adverbs to identify and use.
  - g. - Students should be able to PRODUCE as well as identify the four types of sentences.
  - h. - Subject-verb agreement should be included here.
- L1A 5<sup>th</sup> d. - Subject-verb agreement should be included here.
- L1B 5<sup>th</sup> b. - This standard should not be in this grade level because it is already expected at 4<sup>th</sup> grade.
- R1B 4<sup>th</sup> e. - Figurative language should be more specific to include similes, metaphors, idioms, adages/proverbs.
- R1A 4<sup>th</sup> & R1A 5<sup>th</sup> - The reading skills and genre of text should be more specific here in order to guide instructors.
- R1B 5<sup>th</sup> -
  - I believe a paraphrase of CCR wording in RI.5.4 should be included here. Academic and domain-specific words and phrases are important areas to determine meaning.
  - I believe a paraphrase of CCR wording in L.5.4.b. should be included here. Greek and Latin affixes and roots as clues to meaning have incredible leverage in all subjects.
- R1D 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> - Be more specific regarding genre (at least fiction & non-fiction) of text in order to guide instructors and being sure students try a variety of texts.
- R2A5<sup>th</sup> b. - Be more specific about what works of fiction from which we determine theme. Include a story, drama, poem, etc.
  - e. - This wording "adventure stories" is too specific/limiting.
- R2B 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> ; R3A 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> ; R3B 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> - Reading, inferring and drawing conclusions should not be methods for identifying structural elements. I think this is a formatting mistake (a heading that was just not changed).
- R2C 5<sup>th</sup> - I don't understand the word "critical" in this standard. Maybe that word should be omitted.
- R3C 4<sup>th</sup> - This standard should include a paraphrase of CCR RI.4.1 about referring to "details and examples in a text when explaining

what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from text." This is very important.

- R3C 5<sup>th</sup> b. & c. - These standards are confusing and, *if* I understand them, too complex for 5<sup>th</sup> grade. CCR RI.5.5 is more eloquent, understandable, usable and relevant at this grade level.
- R4 4<sup>th</sup> d. - "Web page" is too specific for our vast electronic surroundings/sources. CCR RI.4.7 is more broad and relevant.
- RF3A 4<sup>th</sup> b. - "...important words from specific content curricula" is too subjective and broad. How are these to be determined?
- In Writing (Draft; Revise/Edit; Produce/Publish and Share Writing) standards, these should be less specific and more process related because specifics are given later with particular types of writing.
- W2C 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> b. - "...motivation" should not be included as a narrative technique. It can be inferred but is not a specific writing technique used.
- Research Process 5 o. - Who is to "evaluate how completely, accurately, and efficiently, the research question was explored or answered..." This does not seem like an expectation for a student, but for a teacher.

#### Opinions:

- Common Core standards are more eloquently and efficiently stated. I know they are no longer to be used, but I disagree with that decision!
- GLEs were established, respected and clear. They could be adopted again with some additions to address today's accelerated reading capabilities, collaborative culture, and technological advances.
- R1C 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> - So important to include!
- I appreciate the specificity of the standards given for all the different types of writing (Opinion/Argumentative; Informative/Explanatory; Narrative/Literacy...)
- SL1A 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> - CCR a. & b. should be included here as they are incredibly important for interacting in the world! Maybe this could be included in the Collaborative Discussions strand.
- I don't understand the sub-heading of "Entertainment" within Speaking and Listening as the standards are repetitive and just the ones in other sub-headings in that strand.

**From:** [Sasser, Mary](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** 6-12 ELA standards comments  
**Date:** Monday, November 09, 2015 12:28:35 PM

---

The 10 Writing standards have been replaced by just 3 standards. A major problem occurs when this happens. by combining all types of writing into one standard---. "Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, style, and voice are appropriate to the task, purpose and audience: self-select and blend (when appropriate) narrative, expository, and argumentative techniques

We then revert to a guessing game about what does this mean for each of the types of writing. How can we insure that each type of writing is being addressed in the curriculum? It means that those in charge of curriculum has to look at every writing assignment in a given class to determine if W-2.\_\_ in covering expository, narrative, or argumentative writing comprehensively throughout. This would be a nightmare. There should also be a better way to connect the data that would come back from an assesement like the EOC or MAP and a district curriculum to see where the gaps are with instruction.

Another issue I have is that the language standard have been eliminated and rolled into the writing standards. They need to be more clearly stated than they are in the new standard 3. These are pretty vague.

Mary Sasser

**From:** [Boeckmann \(DESE\), Julie](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Feedback  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 04, 2015 7:30:02 AM

---

Julie Boeckmann | Communications Technician | Communications | 573.751.3469 | [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Joellyn Szura [<mailto:szurafamily@icloud.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 6:34 PM  
To: webfeedback  
Subject: Feedback

Sent from my iPhone I felt all the reading standards were appropriate for first grade except the last ones about media.

**From:** [Michelle Finley](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** State Standards  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 03, 2015 11:42:55 AM

---

To Whom It May Concern:

I have looked at the proposed state standards. The only issue I have had thus far is that we need a scope and sequence for ELA 6th-12th. Each teacher who teaches ELA, including myself, would appreciate this for each grade level. I teach 6th-8th ELA and Reading, and I have spoken with one of the high school teachers who teach 9th and 10th grade ELA and she agrees as well. I need it especially for 8th grade, since I need to know what they need to learn before going to High School.

Thank you,

Michelle L. Finley  
6th-8th ELA/Reading Teacher  
Glenwood R-VIII School

--

"If you dare to teach, then you must dare to learn"-Harry Wong

"It is better to fail at originality than to succeed at being like everyone else." -Unknown

"There are two ways of spreading light: to be the candle or the mirror that reflects it."-  
Wharton

"The Lord is my light and salvation; whom shall I fear. The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid." -Psalms 27:1"