

From: [Lisa Reid](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: feedback on Life Science standard
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 11:05:20 AM

The only standard that sticks out to me as difficult to implement as well as having vague language is:

9-12-LS1-3 Plan and conduct an investigation to provide evidence that feedback mechanisms maintain homeostasis.

While I appreciate that not every standard is not "develop and use a model," I am surprised that THIS is the standard to plan and conduct an investigation about. Possibly adding a few examples could clarify this standard further.

Thank you,

Lisa Reid

Science Instructor
Academic Team Coach
National Honor Society Advisor
Purdy High School
417-629-8419
lreid@purdyk12.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by email reply.

From: [Patty Johnson](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: English Language Arts Proposed Curriculum
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 11:27:14 AM

I reviewed the new English Language Arts proposed curriculum, Grades 6-12, and I think these goals and standards are more in line with what our students need to be taught. Although I am currently a business teacher, I taught English for 12 years and hold certification in grades 5-9. I try to incorporate math, language arts, science, and history in all of my business classes.

--

Patricia A. "Patty" Johnson
Business Ed Teacher/FBLA Sponsor
Portageville High School
904 King Avenue
Portageville, MO 63873
573-379-3810 School 573-391-0576 Cell

From: [Nicole Garner](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 12:22:54 PM

Although I have commented already, I would like to add a final statement. The proposed standards are above the cognitive level of the students in those grade levels. The standards we have now for our grade level are proving to be too difficult for the students to understand. They are frustrated and the teachers are frustrated. If the new proposed standards are put into effect, it will not prepare the students for college and the workforce, because they will not understand the curriculum and will give up. Thank you for the opportunity to provide my opinion based on my personal experience in the classroom.

--

[Nicole Garner](#)
[Third Grade Teacher](#)
[Bernie Elementary](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient (s) and may contain confidential, privileged, or proprietary information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately by reply e-mail. Please delete the original message without making any copies.

From: [Zachary Hopper](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: ELA Standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 12:23:35 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

There is a typographical error on page 61. Expectation 2B for 9-10 ELA reads, "Analyze how points of view of is reflected in the characters, setting, and plot." It should read, "Analyze how points of view is reflected in the characters, setting, and plot."

On page 62, expectation 3C for 9-10 ELA reads, "Analyze how multiple texts reflect the historical and/or cultural contexts." It should read, "Analyze how multiple texts reflect historical and/or cultural contexts," or "Analyze how multiple texts reflect the historical and/or cultural contexts of the texts." As it stands, the article is unnecessary and awkward.

Best,
Zachary Hopper
Sophomore Reading/Writing Instructor
Hogan Preparatory Academy High School

From: [Leanne Hausdorf](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Social Studies standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 12:24:22 PM

I am very disappointed to see that Missouri history has been moved from 4th grade, where it has been forever, down to 3rd grade. What is the rationale for this change? Fourth grade is the perfect age group to introduce Missouri history. Please don't make this change to our curriculum!

--

Leanne Hausdorf
4th Grade Teacher
Canton R-V Elementary

From: [Sonya Taylor](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 12:38:40 PM

I am concerned with the following standard:

h. recognizing and
using syllabication
patterns to decode
words including:
CVC , CV, VCe
final stable syllable,
vowel diphthong and
digraphs, rcontrolled
vowels
including er, ir, ur,
ar, and or

I do not believe this is developmentally appropriate for first grade. I do think first graders could recognize and use the CVC, CV, and VCe syllable patterns. The vowel diphthongs, vowel digraphs, and r controlled vowels should be moved to second grade.

Sincerely,
Sonya Taylor
Black Hawk Elementary
Second Grade Teacher

From: [Kim Gaines](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: ELA K-5
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 12:55:21 PM

Really? The sheer number of standards alone is enough to reject this work. When will teachers have time to teach anything else?

K - 103 total ELA ("to knows and dos") standards/indicators

1st - 125

2nd - 128

3rd - 142 (first year for standardized testing)

4th - 128

5th - 135

When developing the standards, was the work of Reeves, Ainsworth, Marzano, etc. considered? Marzano states, "The sheer number of standards is the biggest impediment to implementing standards" (2001).

--

Kim Gaines

Superintendent

"Upon the subject of education, I can only say that I view it as the most important subject which we as a people may be engaged in." Abraham Lincoln

From: [Farr, William](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: History standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 1:13:42 PM

I guess my biggest question is which one, American History or World History, will be taught in 6th grade. If a test is going to happen in each grade and you have both, American History and World History listed in 6-8 there is no way something taught in 6th grade will be remembered in 8th unless it is reinforced each year. I also don't see how you can cover both History's in one year with the objectives you have posted. A little unclear with the way the standards are listed. Need to know the standards per grade level and not in a group.

From: [Nicole Abel](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 1:22:10 PM

The new standards are not as focused and the language is not as developed as the Common Core. I would prefer to stay with Common Core in English.

--

Nicole Abel
Sturgeon High School
Communication Arts I, II
Echoes Adviser

From: [Sara Vassallie](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: new standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 1:23:27 PM

As a 7th and 8th grade math teacher, I think that the new standards are written clearly and have good flow between grade levels.

Sara Vassallie

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: [Sabra Mayberry](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 1:30:30 PM

In general, the new standards are too vague. They use complex terminology that can be interpreted in many different ways. The old learning standards were more detailed and contained examples as well as specific grade levels in which they were to be taught, including upper grades. I don't think it is an improvement when more is left to individual interpretation. I prefer a blanket, detailed statement, that applies to all. I felt the old standards spread certain subject reviews too far apart as well. I believe for a students best information retention it must be reviewed often and built upon yearly.

Sabra Mayberry
Bernie R-XIII
Science 5th-6th
573.293.5334 ext 252

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient (s) and may contain confidential, privileged, or proprietary information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately by reply e-mail. Please delete the original message without making any copies.

From: [Louise Losos](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Request for Assistance
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 1:36:34 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Louise Losos, PhD
Director of Curriculum
Confluence Charter Schools

From: Cindy Kalachek
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 1:30 PM
To: Louise Losos
Subject: RE: Request for Assistance

RL 4.6 and 4.7 don't know the difference. RL 11.7 doesn't seem like a complete thought.

- c

From: Louise Losos
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 1:08 PM
To: Resource Office Conference Rm 1; Arionna Ralleigh; Catherine Todd; Christine Nobbe; Debra Bahr; Kristoffer Quint; Maria Casaleggi; Melinda Mylinarski; Shaire Duncan; Adam Winebright; Angela Bernier [Staff]; Cherise Locke; Jennifer Luker; NiRita BakerBradford; Allison Webster; Anna CollierMoore; Ashanti Moorehead; Bernita Rossmitchell; Brandi Bedinger; Brandice Huling; Brionne Smith; Casey McBride; Deborah Bertish; Deborah Meng; Heather Kristof; Janice Smith; Jennifer Susa; John Titsworth; Katherine Clarke; Lauren Quick; Loreal Wilhite; Martin Harrigan; Michael Levendoski; Patricia Henry; Pearlie Smith; Sarah Howell; Sarah Urch; Shamika Williams; Tameka Cooley; Teonna Brenson; Terri Pruitt; Theresa Bates; Alexander Rearick; Ashley Tate; Cindy Kalachek; Damen Martin; Eric Theby; Erica Snelson; Evan Smith; Keith Williams; Matt Naes; Megan Clayton; Tanisha Staniel
Subject: FW: Request for Assistance

Please read below. This is likely our last chance to weigh in on the standards before they are approved. If it helps to see the changes, here is the crosswalk that DESE created between the old and the new:

<http://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/curriculum/hb-1490-work-group-process/hb1490-proposed-standards-crosswalks>

Louise Losos, PhD
Director of Curriculum
Confluence Charter Schools

From: Jennifer Tiller [<mailto:jtiller@edplus.org>]
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 10:34 AM
To: St. Louis Area Curriculum Coordinators Association
Cc: EdPlus Cabinet
Subject: FW: Request for Assistance

I am sure most of you are already on this list serve but just in case you are not, I am forwarding along. This is a critical time for DESE (and us) as it relates to the MO Learning Standards. I know that you and your teams have spent countless hours aligning curriculum to CCSS and want to assure that you have a chance to weigh in.

Happy Monday!

Jen

Dr. Jennifer Tiller
Chief Academic Officer
314.692.1264 O
jtiller@edplus.org



From: Margie Vandeven <Margie.Vandeven@dese.mo.gov>
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 at 10:13 AM
To: "administrators@lists.mo.gov" <administrators@lists.mo.gov>
Subject: Request for Assistance

Greetings from Jefferson City! Hope all is well with you and that you were able to enjoy some of the spring-like weather over the weekend.

I wanted to provide you with a quick update on where we are with the Missouri Learning Standards and ask for your assistance. At the State Board of Education meeting last week, staff presented updated proposed Missouri Learning Standards for English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies based on the standards from the work groups. We are down to the wire and are doing all we can to ensure that these proposed standards are designed to better prepare Missouri students for college, the workforce and life. The State Board is expected to vote at their board meeting on March 15, 2016.

Things you should know:

- The proposed standards include changes from our current standards in all four content areas, i.e. the Common Core State Standards are not being recommended in English language arts and mathematics.

- Revisions were made in accordance with state statute. The Department's attempt to get input from stakeholders went above and beyond the dictates of state statute.
- Upon receipt of the work group recommendations, Department staff made necessary alignment and formatting changes drawn from the 3,000 comments received from educators, the public, the Joint Committee on Education and academic researchers.

Request for assistance:

I am requesting that you ask your staff to review the proposed standards this week. If concerns are identified, please provide specific recommendations for rectifying. Comments may be sent to 1490Comments@dese.mo.gov by Friday, March 4. The proposed standards are posted here: <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/ProposedStandardsFeb2016.pdf>. You will be linked first to the board presentation for an overview; the proposed standards follow in their entirety.

Thank you for your continued support of this critical work. Many of your staff have already contributed countless hours to the work group product, while others have provided valuable input through the commenting process. We are grateful for the many dedicated educators working on behalf of Missouri students every day. I am very aware of how busy schools are at this time of year. Yet, it is critical that you have the opportunity to review the proposed standards before they are adopted in March. Thank you in advance for any help you and your staff can give. As always, feel free to contact me or Blaine Henningsen at blaine.henningsen@dese.mo.gov if you have any questions.

Thanks again,

Margie

From: [Jami School](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Social studies 4th grade
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 1:37:50 PM

What is the rationale for moving almost all of the 4th grade standards to 3rd grade? The Missouri history standards have been in 4th grade for as long as I can remember. Can they remain in 4th grade?

Thanks,
Jami Troth

Sent from my iPad

From: [keri borchers](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: English 6-12 Standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 2:05:04 PM

After reviewing the proposed standards, I have to say that the improvement in the speaking and listening is tremendous--extremely specific and precise. I also like the writing portion of the standards--9-10/11-12 using a "blending" of types.

My only question would be in the informational text section--what is considered "literary nonfiction"? Biographies/Autobiographies instead of an article about Civil War hospitals?

Keri Borchers
10-12 English, Speech & Drama, NHS Sponsor, Prom Sponsor
Santa Fe High School
Alma, MO 64001
660-674-2236

From: [Phil McKinley](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Repetition
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 2:28:54 PM

Schools are receiving training from the Southwest Center in Webb City regarding classroom instruction. Trainers are encouraging teacher that it is not important for students to know their math facts. Generally speaking, they are discouraging repetition/homework in the classroom. As a teacher and a parent reading through the standards, I find myself thinking the following: What difference do the standards make if training from PD facilities discourages healthy learning practices. As far as I can tell, the standards look fine. They are a little complicated but seem to comprehensively represent what students should learn. I believe teachers misinterpret from time to time the grade level issues, not emphasizing skills already addressed. A student has not learned if he cannot remember what he has learned. As a parent and an educator, I believe in drilling students regularly in the basics. Something for your committee to consider.

From: [Michele Schaefer](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 3:26:21 PM

I am a third grade teacher and have the following questions.

Reading

- Which prefixes and suffixes are "common" for 3rd graders?
- Which text and graphic features are 3rd graders expected to know?
- Do 3rd graders only need to learn similes, metaphors, and alliteration? In some places "figurative language" is referenced, in another place similes, metaphors, and alliteration are written.
- What are the "general academic and domain specific words and phrases" for 3rd graders?

Writing

- How many paragraphs does a 3rd grader need for a "multiple paragraph text"?

Math

- Do 3rd graders need to measure using both customary and metric measurements?
- Do they measure to the nearest $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, or inch? Or are they expected to find the exact measurement?

From: [Brouk, Matthew](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Ryerson, Joyce](#); [Marshall, Chris](#)
Subject: Comments for Science 9-12 Standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 3:28:55 PM

Dear Sir or Madam,

Thank you for taking the time to review these comments.

9-12-PS1-5 Develop a model to illustrate that the release or absorption of energy from a chemical reaction system depends upon the changes in total bond energy

I don't know what this standard even means. Please provide an example.

9-12-PS3-2 Develop and use models to illustrate that energy at the macroscopic scale can be accounted for as a combination of energy associated with the motions of particles (objects) and energy associated with the relative position of particles (objects).

Please provide some examples of models.

9-12-PS4-3 Communicate technical information about how electromagnetic radiation interacts with matter.

This standard is too broad. Limit the types of information. Is it ok to say that EM radiation of wavelengths equal to or shorter than UV cause death and or mutation to living matter? Do we describe the penetration depth of various kinds of matter? Like X-rays go through low dense matter, but not through more dense matter? Specify if the matter is living matter, non-living matter, or both.

9-12-ESS3-3 Create a computational simulation to illustrate the relationships among management of natural resources, the sustainability of human populations, and biodiversity

How does one do that? Don't they have entire majors on the subject of resource management? What would sample work look like for someone who masters this standard?

9-12-ESS3-5 Analyze geoscientific data and the results from global climate models to make an evidence-based forecast of the current rate of global or regional climate change and associated future impacts to Earth systems.

Where do we get this data? Does DESE provide a website?

9-12-ETS -4 Use a computer simulation to model the impact of proposed solutions to a complex real-world problem with numerous criteria and constraints on interactions within and between systems relevant to the problem.

What computer simulator programs are out there to do complete this task? One example might be to use West Point's Bridge Builder software. If this is going to be a standard, then teachers are going to need help finding the software to use, just like they will need help to find the data for 9-12-ESS3-5.

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of Morgan County R-II School District, Versailles, Missouri, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

From: [Danny Loughridge](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Social Studies
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 3:51:48 PM

If we switch Mo History to 3rd grade for next year the 3rd graders this year will never receive Mo. history. Also, I feel 5th graders have a better grasp of Revolutionary War. World I and II should be left in 6th grade as they would grasp it better. We seem to want to move everything down a grade level. It is important that we pushed our students to learn but some standards are better left in the grades they are currently in.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

This e-mail message may contain confidential information that is intended only for the named recipient(s) above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this e-mail and deleting the message and any attachments from your system.

From: [John Wilbers](#)
To: [1490Comments](#); [Henningsen, Blaine](#)
Subject: Common Core Math Feedback
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 3:59:03 PM

Concerns / Questions:

1) It appears that the MLS for math are so nearly the same as common core that they are essentially clones. Respectfully, what substantive changes have taken place? In what way have we made these "our" Missouri standards? I see that we have sort of cajoled the common core words into our old "GLE format" document.... but the words themselves appear to be nothing but common core with a few minor semantic changes. The formatting is nice, but fundamentally I do not see what we have done differently from where we started. Please elaborate.

2) In the geometry section.... Why have we selected the "pyramid, cone, and sphere" as the sole and special 3D shapes worthy of surface area and volume calculations? Then further reduced to the pyramid for the surface area? Seems absurdly incomplete.

Proposed Change to be more rational and comprehensive:

A. Be able to calculate the areas of fundamental shapes in 2D (square, circle, rectangle, triangle, semi-circle, etc.) using both real numbers and algebraic representations (ex. Length $2x$ * Width $2x = 4x^2$)

B. Be able to calculate volumes of fundamental shapes in 3D (cube, cylinder, sphere, rectangular-prism, pyramid, hemi-sphere, etc.), compare volumes between shapes, and algebraically solve for various dimensions.

C. Given algebraic formulas, accurately calculate surface areas for fundamental 2D and 3D shapes as given above.

D. Apply volume and area calculations to real world scenarios

3. In the section on Data Analysis, it seems the Missouri GLE 2.0 was much more comprehensive. In similar fashion to how the common core focuses oddly on Pyramids for volume, the data analysis focuses exclusively on scatter plots.

What is missing from their mention of scatter plots: Explicit trend identification, linear equation writing to the best fit, extrapolating or interpolating from the data for a real-world analogous purpose.

Also missing is any other type of statistical measure. The language from GLE 2,0 would be a good addition:

- *select, create and use appropriate graphical representation of data (including scatter plots) and box plots (box and whiskers)*
- *find, use and interpret measures of center, outliers and spread, including range and interquartile range*
- *compare different representations of the same data and evaluate how well each representation shows important aspects of the data*

4. In the section on FUNCTIONS, why include only LINEAR. We used to compare and contrast linear data /functions / graphs to non-linear Exponential graphs. Proposal to add:

- A. Compare and identify linear vs exponential data in graphic or table form**
- B. Be able to apply Exponential Equations to basic real world scenarios (using the form AB^N) and or Linear Equations ($y=MX + B$)**

5. In the section on under Functions, this part is a **not** very useful exploration of tedium with scant relatable applications for 8th graders (its also something well covered in ALGEBRA 1 and need not be in 8th grade specifically) :

Explore the concept of functions. (The use of function notation is not required.)

a. Understand that a function assigns to each input exactly one output. b.

Determine if a relation is a function

6. *In the expressions category, the statement "d. Solve systems of two linear equations."* is much too broad. This again something covered in great detail under Algebra 1 (or should be). Without further explanation this leaves the door wide open for exceedingly difficult problems at nascent 8th grade . It needs specific clarification such as

"Solve systems of two linear equations algebraically, such that two $MX + B$ equations may be set equal to each other and solved." Otherwise we are looking at various types of elimination solving, scaled elimination, $Ax + By = C$ conversion, etc. This gets all to lengthy in the scope of a pre-algebra and introductory pan-8th grade math.

7. Specify "Perform operations with numbers expressed in scientific notation." as **"Perform operations with numbers expressed in scientific notation to solve basic real world problems (example: The speed of light is 3.0×10^8 m/s and the planet Saturn is 1.4×10^{12} m away, how long does it take the image of Saturn to reach earth?)"** In other words, put the math to practical and straight forward use, otherwise what is the point exactly?

8. in Algebra I i think "derive the quadratic" would be more practical as "apply the quadratic formula"

9. Add clearly to Algebra i : **"Solve systems of two linear equations using multiple methods."**

I have given much of this feedback before on other forms but never received any feedback, nor seen any changes take place in the MLS. I am wondering if the public comment is collected for the purpose of "taking feedback" but stored in "file 13" after being thoroughly and bureaucratically documented and summarily ignored. Please give me some re-assurance by replying to my itemized comments in detail if possible.

Sincerely,

John Wilbers

Mexico Middle School Math

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE AND DISCLAIMER: This email and any attachments may be confidential and may contain privileged or copyright information. If you are not the intended recipient, please call (573) 581-3773 and inform us that you have received this message in error. Please do not copy, distribute or use this email or the information contained in it for any purpose.

From: [Angela Drwenski](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: kindergarten math
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 4:04:53 PM

I believe that kindergarten is capable and needs to be pushed to recognize and give the amount of worth for the quarter and half dollar as well as the penny, nickel, and dime. We also need to work on patterns and using a calendar as well.

From: [Michael hallockm](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Desired improvement in Science Standards presentation
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 4:21:43 PM

As a Middle School and High School Teacher who deals with both Math and Science, I must comment that the Math Standards are presented in much better format than are the Science Standards. The Math are separated by grade level, giving the teaching staff some direction of what topics are intended for each level. The Science Standards, on the other hand, are only separated into MS and HS sections.

I am not a new teacher, I have taught since 1976, am currently certified in Missouri for HS Chem, HS Physics, MS Science, HS Math, MS Math and HS Business Ed. I hate to think of the confusion our younger teachers must feel.

From: [Jennifer Paulsen](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed GLE's
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 4:52:43 PM

After looking at the proposed ELA standards for 6-8, they seem thorough in the areas of literary and informational reading. The area of writing seems easier because everything is condensed into three standards. I am somewhat concerned that there is no longer any separate language standards.

Thanks,

Jennifer Paulsen
Spring Bluff R-XV

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: [Michele Spitzmiller](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: High school geometry standards
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 6:15:04 PM

Concerns about the state standards in high school Geometry

“CO A 1 Define angle, circle, perpendicular line, parallel lines, line segment and ray.”

This is too simple and on the lower end of Bloom’s taxonomy. Looking at the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades objectives and what they need to with angles, circles, perpendicular line, and so on that if they can not define such terms they are having problems way before high school geometry.

“GMD B 1 Identify the shapes of two-dimensional cross sections of three-dimensional objects.”

Not enough specifics given to know how the high geometry standard differs from the 7th grade GM A 3 standard

Overall there seems to be not enough specifics given in the high school geometry standards to know what is meant and how it differentiates itself from the 6th through 8th grade standards.

Michele Spitzmiller

Math Department Chair
Arcadia Valley High School
520 Park Drive, Ironton, Mo 63650

NOTE: This electronic mail message contains information that is or may be (a) LEGALLY PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, PROPRIETARY OR OTHERWISE PROTECTED BY LAW FROM DISCLOSURE, and (b) INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE(S) NAMED. If you are NOT the intended recipient, an addressee, or the person responsible for delivering this to an addressee, you are hereby notified that reading, using, copying, or distributing any part of this message is strictly prohibited. If you ARE the intended recipient or an addressee, you are hereby notified that copying, forwarding or in any other fashion distributing any part of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic mail message in error, please contact me immediately and take the steps necessary to delete the message completely from your computer system. Thank you.

From: [Marie Ebbesmeyer](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Vitt, Aaron](#)
Subject: comments
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 7:31:38 PM

The math standards for 5th grade seem reasonable. I like that 5th graders just have to understand division of fraction with models and representation, not use the algorithm. I think the 6th grade standards have many abstract concepts in the equations and algebraic topics that some students may not be developmentally ready for because they are too abstract.

In the Science standards, PS1, what are students expected to make or do to "develop a model to describe that matter is made of particles too small to be seen." You are asking them to model something that they can not see or experience. The concept is too abstract for 5th graders to master.

I am not sure what this standard means. ETS1 "Define a simple design problem reflecting a need or a want that includes specified criteria for success and constraints on materials, time, or cost." Are they to find a problem with some existing machine and tell about it or are they to think of the solution for a problem they see in the world? I don't think this is a very clear standard.

The 6-8 grade Science and Social Studies standards are not specific as to which should be covered in which grade. This could cause difficulty and gaps for students that move from district to district in Missouri during those years. They could potentially get geography multiple times and never world history if the school they attend are on a different rotation of topics.

--
Marie Ebbesmeyer

From: [Goodner, Michelle](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Dese standards input
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 8:38:48 PM

The only thing I take issue with is the Social Studies k-5, where the learning goals are broken up into sections by year: 4th grade -up until 1800, 5th grade -1800 until 2000. This will be very difficult to divide history based on this random year....for example, westward expansion wasn't a huge issue until the late 1700s and early 1800s...how do you just stop at 1800? It's the beginning, but you can't just stop at 1800.... Westward expansion continued well into the century. How do you teach Westward expansion without discussing the Louisiana Purchase (1803) and Lewis and Clark? This is NOT the way to teach social studies and have students understand the full impact of a piece of our history. It also puts 200 years worth of history on 5th graders.... that's asking a lot from a 10 year old. We need to find a better way to divide this curriculum.

Shelli Goodner
Grandview C4

From: [Clapp, Julie](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: MLS
Date: Monday, February 22, 2016 10:15:52 PM

Concerning the MLS---Foundational Skills--3A1.h

While I completely agree with teaching syllable types as an explicit way to increase decoding at the foundational level, I am concerned with the way this is stated in the MLS as it is written now.

I don't think learning all six types to automaticity is appropriate for first graders and I think that is how teachers will read this----that may be the way it is intended. It reads "recognize and use syllable patterns to decode...." and then goes on to list all six types. The second and third grade read "use common syllable types". I believe an introduction of all six types with closed, open, and VCe taught explicitly and to automaticity would be more developmentally appropriate for first graders. If that were to be accomplished, with the other three being introduced, it would be very easy for second grade teachers to explicitly teach the last three.

I am pleased to see specifics listed in the MLS for Foundational Reading. We still have the "reading wars" out here in the districts, but this might help us to begin to get appropriate information to teachers and get more of our K-2 students into third grade able to pull words off the page.

Thanks for the opportunity to share my thoughts.

Julie Clapp
Literacy Consultant
Northeast Missouri
660-465-6707
jclapp@truman.edu