

Indicate the content domain for your comments:	Select a grade level:	Please leave your comment:	MORe sident?	Relations hip to Missouri schools?	Zip code?
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 2	<p>To: MO Department of Elementary and Secondary Education From: J. Wilkerson, B.S.Ed 7307 Rt. C Lohman, MO 65053  Phone: 573-782-3573 Date: December 26, 2014 -----</p> <p>----- I am an educator of 20 years ( Bachelor's of Science in Special Education, Certification in Regular Education (Grades 1-8) , Learning Disability (Grades 1-12) Mental Retardation (Grades 1-12), Behavior Disorder (Grades 1-12). I have also administered hundreds of IQ and Achievement Tests over the years and have been a classroom teacher in the public school system. My daughter is close to pulling her child from the public school system because of the Common Core approach to math for the 2nd Grade. This child is having difficulty with the Common Core methods for learning math in the areas of problem solving (addition and subtraction equations, etc.). The strategies being used for these areas are not working for this child, who is above average in intelligence. There have been no previous school difficulties in the area of math until this year with Common Core. I have carefully looked at the state standards for math being implemented at the second grade level. "Hands on" and concrete methods in which a student can visually see relationships between numbers and objects, I heartily approve of for this grade level. Developmentally, most second grade children have the ability to see those relationships. At this stage they are still concrete learners. By the end of the second grade school year, most of them should also have the ability to retain memorization of addition and subtraction facts when given number prompts. Although I understand the theory of Common Core in initiating abstract reasoning at the second grade level, in my experience, many children are just not developmentally ready. The majority of students at the second grade level simply have not yet developed the higher order thinking skills needed for abstract reasoning. There will always be a few exceptions to that statement. Under 2nd Grade "Mathematical Practices" as currently written, to "Reason abstractly" and "To construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others" seems developmentally out of place. They do well to commit all the basic number facts of addition and subtraction to memory, as well as understand visual correlation between numbers, shapes, coins, and measurement. Only after children master the basics, with a strong foundational and fundamental background, will they be able to develop more abstract reasoning principles. Since second graders are still within the concrete stage of learning abilities for the most part, to introduce confusing abstract concepts (unknowns, non-digit symbols for unknowns, various addition/subtraction operation properties), may hinder the educational math process instead of helping it. I foresee educational problems ahead for young students if higher order reasoning concepts are introduced before the children are developmentally able to grasp them. Abstract learning will not take place until the brain is developmentally ready. Higher order math concepts cannot precede the lower order ones. As one does not build a house, beginning in the middle first, without a foundation, neither can children begin to learn abstract thinking skills before mastering their fundamental concrete skills. This is true in any area of learning. Though educational theory may sound good, IF IT CANNOT BE PROVEN THROUGH PRACTICAL APPLICATION IN THE CLASSROOM, the theory stays just that, a THEORY. Although I find no fault with some of the aspects of Common Core, other seemingly "essential doctrine" needs much fine tuning. Please look at it carefully in your endeavors to correct the educational system in our state. With sincere thanks-J.</p>			
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 3	<p>This is a general comment regarding all mathematics standards. Many skills have been pushed down several grade levels younger. We have third graders doing work with fractions, that was previously learned in upper elementary and middle school. First graders must be able to think in abstract terms and complete word problems at higher levels of thinking. It is understandable that we need to help students increase those high levels of thinking; however, first a strong base of basic skills must be taught at a foundational level. I'm afraid that many common core skills may be developmentally not appropriate for a majority of young students. Some students with higher intellect may be able to move to those more abstract terms, but developmentally many students still think in concrete ways. Thinking abstractly is not possible at those developmental levels. Please keep students developmental abilities in mind when placing standards at particular grade levels. Thank you for your hard work for Missouri students!</p>	Yes	Educator	65078
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 4	<p>4.OA.B add, "Demonstrate, using area models, whether a whole number is prime or composite." Connecting area models through the grades would increase student fluency with them and area models can be very helpful in learning Algebra when students are very familiar at the lower grades: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/prog2area">http://tinyurl.com/prog2area</a></p>			

Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 3	While area models are not explicitly mentioned in 3OA.A, their use would logically follow that of multiplication and lead into other topics such as 3MD.C. and would ultimately be helpful to students in later grades. For that reason, I suggest adding "using area models" to 3OA.A. See progressions: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/prog2area">http://tinyurl.com/prog2area</a>			
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 2	Not developmentally appropriate	Yes	Educator	65762
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 4	I believe the new common core standards are hurting our children not helping them. I don't believe all children will rise to the HIGH expectations that others place on them. Who are they to put such stress on my child anyway. With these extreme standard on top of having a child with a learning disability this makes things much worse. Get rid of Common Core			
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 8	Grade 8 standards should set a minimum standard but allow for flexibility as mathematics courses for 8th graders varies by student strengths and development. Ideally, with minimal standards set for grade 8 MAP assessments, we can work toward an adaptive assessment that would assess students' achievement through high school algebra in which credit could be earned in the 8th grade. A single adaptive assessment that can measure achievement for all 8th graders in the state is essential. Carefully crafted standards can lead to useful assessments of student achievement toward those standards.	Yes	Educator	63366
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 4	I am enjoying teaching the standards that are currently in place.			
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 5	The way the math lessons are written are very confusing for students. When you throw this "new math" in at the 5th grade level and the students have already learned it another way, teachers have a difficult time of having the students "un-learn" what they know and do something differently that seems much more difficult because of the extra steps.	Yes	Educator	65570
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	High School	It would be great if the state would ask for general comments. This survey, by design I'm sure, will result in very little feedback. Keep the Common Core Standards/GLE mix and leave it alone!!!	Yes	Parent/guardian	63701
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 8	Grade 8 should always offer algebra as a math course. Our school has just dropped it and pushed it up to 9th grade. That is a detriment to students who are gifted in this area and will hold them back one year.			
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	High School	I don't have one specific standard that I'd like to comment on, but rather would like to say that the Standards for Mathematical Practice should be at the heart of any sound mathematics program for ALL GRADES (I had to select a grade so I chose high school and chose O&A Thinking). They provide the framework for developing problem solving skills and teaching for conceptual understanding!!! While there may be disagreement as to specific grades that the content standards are included in, the content standards outline and convey the important mathematics that all students should know and be able to do in order to be college and career ready.	Yes	Educator	65807
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	High School	The common core standards have been well planned out in the subject of mathematics. They expect a high degree of learning from the students and a teacher who is willing to provide the time and effort for students to accomplish those goals. By drastically changing the standards, once again, the education of Missouri students are being stalled. Teachers need to know the long term goals for each student so they can accomplish that mission K-12. When the standards are constantly changed, not just adapted, that makes the goals hard to attain in a short time frame. I have been teaching 30 years and have taught through at least 5 different sets of curriculum. When need to determine what our goal is for the education of Missouri youth and accomplish that goal. Not change the goal frequently.			
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	Grade 3	Include "using area models" in 3.OA.B Area models can connect dozens of standards throughout the grades, providing powerful concrete visualizations for Algebra if the students become solidly fluent with their use in the lower grades: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/prog2area">http://tinyurl.com/prog2area</a>			