

Feedback on Proposed Missouri Learning Standards – February 2016

<p>Reading Standard 1A: Develop and apply skills to the reading process.</p>	<p>Need explicit descriptors for grades 4 & 5. Given that this is the comprehension strand of our proposed standards, there are comprehension skills that should be addressed explicitly at these grade levels. By not providing explicit descriptors, teachers of these grades are more apt to assume mastery at the previous grade levels.</p>
<p>Reading Standard 1B: Develop an understanding of vocabulary</p>	<p>The standards listed here should fall under “Language” and not reading. Prefixes, suffixes, affixes, are all parts of speech, or parts of our English system. Please consolidate these skills with the proposed language standards.</p>
<p>Reading Standard 1C: Making Connections</p>	<p>Please consider taking these standards completely out. Making connections is a very surface level comprehension strategy. Finding evidence, supporting thoughts/ideas, synthesizing information are much better measures of comprehension. Making connections and predictions are two examples of low-level cognitively demanding comprehension strategies.</p>
<p>Reading Standard 1D: Reading independently for a sustained period of time</p>	<p>This standard has the same goal for every grade level. Standards that are identical in nature rarely are understood well or measured by educators. What is the success criteria at each grade level? How would we know when we have reached it when it’s the same thing for all students, basically, from K-5?</p>
<p>Reading Standard 2A: Comprehend, analyze & evaluate fiction... from a variety of cultures and times.</p>	<p>Very descriptive – many too hard to measure. Too many elements needing to be mastered for 1 standard. Break this standard into two or merge more with nonfiction. Many of the skills are the same with only a few nuances separating the genres.</p>
<p>Reading Standard 2B: Comprehend, analyze & evaluate poetry...from a variety of cultures and times.</p>	<p>How is this measured? What does success look like? Can’t poetry be one of the text types listed in the general reading standards? Why a “stand alone” standard?</p>
<p>Reading Standard 2C: Comprehend, analyze & evaluate...drama from a variety of cultures and times.</p>	<p>Can this standard be combined with fictional texts? Why a stand-alone standard for “drama”? How is understanding “drama” and how to read it or act it out a real-life applicable skill?</p>
<p>Reading Standard 3A: Nonfiction (narrative, information, persuasive, argument)</p>	<p>Text features are important to understanding the structure of nonfiction text. These standards are fine.</p>
<p>Reading Standard 3B: Nonfiction (narrative, information, persuasive, argument)</p>	<p>Infer & draw conclusions: Why do both grade 1 and grade 2 have “distinguish between fiction and nonfiction?” That is a low cognitive skill that should be mastered quite quickly and should not be on both grade levels. Most 1st graders can answer that question. Grade 4 e: Choose words and phrases to convey ideas precisely (What does this mean? Why/How does the author choose those words? Are the students choosing those words? Is this a reading task? Needs more clarification)</p>

Reading Standard 3C: Nonfiction (narrative, information, persuasive, argument)	Text structures: The standards listed here encourage higher level thinking.
Reading Standard 4A: Media and digital form impact meaning	What does the success criteria for this standard look like in grades K-5?
Reading Foundations 1A: Understand how English is written and read	Take the “parts of a book” out of 1 st grade if you want it mastered in K. Also, “recognizing that sentences are comprised of words separated by spaces” – is also listed as K and 1 st grade standard. Also, grade 1c: recognize that spoken words are represented by letters written in sequences – this is identical to K-e – just worded differently. Please have this as K standard and remove it from 1 st . Please only list standards where mastery is expected at grade level. Have fewer with the expectation of mastery. It gives clear guidance to teachers.
Reading Foundations 2A: Understand how English is written and read PHONEMIC AWARENESS	Truly written for K/1 – without a progression here, the message is that these skills will be taught and mastered in K/1 with no attention paid to them in subsequent grade levels. By design, this makes sense, although may 2 nd graders may need extension here.
Reading Foundations 3A: Understand how English is written and read PHONICS	This should be a part of the language skills and not in the “reading” skills area. There are too many “rules” here for this to be a part of the reading process. This is a part of grammar/language skills. Please move this. Entirely too many sub-steps under this standard. Too few higher level thinking reading skills in the proposed standards – WAY too many “list” skills that are not as important. By giving them so much emphasis by listing them, teachers will focus specifically on the small steps. We need “thinking” standards, not just process or product standards.
Reading Foundations 3A: Understand how English is written and read FLUENCY(?)	This standard is the same for grades 1-5. Teachers discount blanket standards. What does success at each grade level look like?
Writing 1A: Apply a writing process to develop a text for audience and purpose.	What are the pre-writing strategies recommended to teach these skills? Too vague and quite similar across grade levels.
Writing 1B: Apply a writing process to develop a text for audience and purpose.	Couldn’t these standards be weaved into narrative, information and opinion writing? Why a pre-writing activity only?
Writing 1C: Apply a writing process to develop a text for	Revision/editing – what are the conventions that should be mastered at each grade level? The standard says “edit for language conventions” – should they be listed here for easier teacher access?

audience and purpose.	
Writing 1D: Apply a writing process to develop a text for audience and purpose.	Again the repetition of the same skill for multiple grade levels often leads to ambiguity among teachers. Please take the time to outline the expectation by grade level and the progression to the next. Please do not use the same standard over and over again. Keyboarding instruction beginning at Grade 2 – will we receive any support for this instruction if mandated by the State at this grade level?
Writing 2A: Compose well-developed writing texts for audience and purpose.	Opinion texts: Similar to current MLS
Writing 2B: Compose well-developed writing texts for audience and purpose.	Information texts: Similar to current MLS
Writing 2C: Compose well-developed writing texts for audience and purpose.	Narrative/Fiction texts: Similar to current MLS
Writing 3A: Gather & evaluate information from a variety of sources (research standard)	Could these standards be incorporated into the Information writing standards? Why are they separated when they are such an integral part of information writing? It makes the Writing strand of standards incredibly long and cumbersome. Any aspects on presenting his/her research could also be addressed in the speaking and listening strand. 14 sub-steps (from a. to n.) for Grade 5 under this heading is entirely too many. Can these standards be consolidated and placed with similar and appropriate anchor standards?
Language 1A: Communicate using conventions of English language	Cursive taught in grade 2? Historically it's been taught in 3 rd . Can some of the standards listed for reading actually be listed under grammar (knowing roots, affixes, suffixes, prefixes)?
Language 1B: Communicate using conventions of English language	These standards should be combined with the “vocabulary” strand from the reading standards. The vocabulary strand (1B) uses parts of speech, etc. There are too many standards focusing on discrete, isolated skills with only the hope that these will lead to higher level thinking. There are very few higher level thinking standards anywhere in the ELA section of this document.
Speaking & Listening 1A:	Listening strategies
Speaking & Listening 2A:	Incorporate these skills (since they are still “listening”) into 1A. The same standard for each grade level K-5 leads teachers to dismiss the standard completely. It adds too many standards to a lengthy document. If the standard is completely the same for each grade level, why not mentioned it only in the grade level where you want/need it monitored and/or measured?

Speaking & Listening 3A: Speak effectively in collaborative discussions	Very hard to measure.
Speaking & Listening 4A: Speak effectively when presenting.	No change needed.

From: [Becky Stanley](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on Proposed Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 7:33:16 AM
Attachments: [Feedback on Proposed Missouri Learning Standards.pdf](#)

Good morning,

Attached you will find the feedback gathered on the proposed MLS. We certainly hope that committee members, State School Board members, as well as our trusted officials at DESE will take a closer look at the proposed standards. Unfortunately they lack the rigor necessary to prepare our students to end of school outcomes like the ACT and the SAT. There are very, very few higher level thinking standards.

To me that 1 CCSS standard that should encompass reading is as follows:

Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.

Shouldn't this standard guide all of our literacy work?

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback and sincerely hope we are not returning to lists of isolated skills in "hope" that they will lead to higher level thinking. It's time for a step forward, certainly not a step back as the proposed standards reflect.

Sincerely,
Becky Stanley

Becky Stanley, EdD NBCT
K-5 Language Arts Coordinator
Columbia Public Schools
1818 W. Worley
Columbia, MO 65203
(573) 214-3990

From: [Erica Mott](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Math Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 7:56:16 AM

I feel that there are not any standards to support multiplication and division from second grade to third grade. If you expect third graders to be fluent in multiplying and dividing from 100 they need to have practiced multiplication before third grade. It is not until multiplication is mastered that students will be able to divide with success.

From: [Ashley Klein](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 8:01:06 AM

To whom it may concern,

I am a first grade educator for the Sedalia 200 School District. After reviewing the proposed learning standards, reading many comments, and looking through hearing transcripts, I am unsure how the proposed standards are developmentally appropriate for each grade level. When adopting the common core standards our goal was to teach fewer standards, but go more in depth in order to reach higher level thinking. By allowing and encouraging our students to reach higher level thinking skills meant most of the students left our classroom mastering the skills needed for the succeeding grade. When reviewing the proposed learning standards and thinking of my future students I am unsure how students will gain mastery at higher level thinking skills when so many standards are expected to be taught, tested, and mastered in the grade level. If these [the MO learning standards] are adopted for the 2016-2017 school year, will our students truly be college and career ready?

Thank you for reading my concerns. Have a great day!

Ashley Klein
1st grade Teacher
Sedalia 200 School District

From: [Kim Gaines](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: K-5 math and additional ELA comments
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 8:05:38 AM

After comparing these standards to the Missouri Learning Standards, they are basically the same with a few additions--time, money, etc. I am concerned about the inconsistency in vocabulary--sums and differences. It's addition and subtraction. One of the standards is, "Demonstrate fluency with sums and differences." The teachers aren't going to have time to teach math to the depth needed because of K-5 ELA.

When I taught English, I never gave feedback to students in red ink. If I could, I would send the entire K-12 ELA standards back with a large "Try Again" written in red ink. There are too many standards to teach to any depth; there are alignment issues between K-5 and 6-12; 6-12 lacks clarity; etc.

Missouri can do better than this!

--

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: [Declan FitzPatrick](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: What impact will ESSA have on adopting these standards?
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 8:08:53 AM

I can't help thinking that conditions have changed significantly since HB1490 was written.

ESSA provides for more state and local control of over assessment systems. Although the specifics of this are yet to be interpreted in MO, ESSA will create a wave of change that we will all have to learn about, adjust to, and expend resources on.

No matter the heroic efforts of the standards writing teams and the folks at DESE who have tried to bring alignment here, if these new standards generate create new assessments that are tied to MSIP and APR we will have two waves of change the may work in conflict to each other. This creates a serious risk of undermining the relevance of the entire accountability process.

I think there are two reasonable courses of action:

Adopt these standards (in order to comply with the law), and delay the timeline for implementing new assessments in order to synchronize with the provisions of ESSA. In the meantime reconvene the standards writing teams with the goal of approaching the task with a common set of priorities, principles, and frameworks.

OR

Reject these standards because they aren't built upon a common set of priorities, principles, and frameworks, because the intent of the law HB1490 has been accomplished with the passage of ESSA. And then reconvene the standards writing teams with the goal of approaching the task with a common set of priorities, principles, and frameworks.

Either way if these standards as written generate new APR accountable tests in the spring of 2018, it will require the expenditure of enormous resources to align curriculum, instruction, and materials, again.

--



I've switched to gmail!

fitzpatrickd@foxc6.org

Declan FitzPatrick
Exe. Dir.-C&I
636-296-8000 x7178
C: 314-713-2241

From: [Anne Burgio](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Middle School ELA
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 8:24:14 AM

My comments are in regards to the middle school ELA standards.

1. Although I appreciate the language standards being addressed through writing these are very vague and essentially the same for grade 6-8. More specific standards would be helpful.
2. In general the standards seem very vague. This will put students at a disadvantage when it comes to testing as the standards can be interpreted differently by different people therefore making it unsure what students will be tested on.

Thank you,

--

Anne Burgio
Truman Middle School
Mentor
English Department Chair
314-729-2400 X 7232

[Follow my Blog!](#)

From: [Kim Gaines](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: SS K-5 comment
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 8:43:29 AM

What is the rationale for moving Missouri History to 3rd grade?

In 6-12 SS, I see Themes--Theme 1, 2, etc. What are the themes? Is Theme 1 Tools of Social Inquiry? These are confusing.

--

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: [Terri Parks](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Christine Syron](#)
Subject: Proposed standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 8:54:00 AM
Attachments: [Proposed standards.docx](#)

Dear DESE~

Attached are comments from our ELA 9-12 Department Chair, Christine Syron. We have been encouraging all our curriculum teams, department experts, and teacher leaders to send their comments.

Thank you for giving educators the opportunity to offer comments again to the proposed standards.

Have a great day!

Terri A. Parks, Ed. D.

@DistrictMVR3

Assistant Superintendent
Meramec Valley R-III School District
126 N. Payne St.
Pacific, Missouri 63069
(636) 271-1400

MISSION—"TOGETHER WE MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN DOING WHAT'S BEST FOR KIDS."

The information transmitted (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521, is intended only for the person(s) or entity/entities to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Proposed standards

(9-12)

Likes and Dislikes

Biggest concern: A new teacher could not pick these up and know what they mean. A teacher who has used the Missouri Learning Standards understands the complexity of these standards and can immediately interject the complexity into the standard. In three years that will not that be the case. When the Common Core was written, it was done so that it included several components. The increased Lexile's, the anchor texts, and the emphasis on reading on or above level readings were all included to ensure that rigor was already in place. As I saw last year, without these components, teachers would have continued to use materials well below grade level, because they liked the literature and it was in our old textbooks. When Missouri used the Common Core as a base to create the new standards, they seemed to have forgotten this crucial part. Most importantly, they have taken out small details that may not mean much now, but in the long run could create a lot of confusion among teachers.

New name/ format.- These are more out of frustration than anything else. I really don't care what they call it as long as they stick with something. I am also aware that this may be more of secondary problem than an elementary problem. At the secondary level we have had at least four different names to the standards. Pick something and stick with it!

- Why are we going back to GLE's? We have already done GLE's, and they were ridiculously easy compared to these. **Suggestion:** They should change it back to Missouri Learning Standards or give it a new name altogether. Course Level Expectations (CLE) aren't any better.
- Why is it formatted like this? This is super confusing. I get that they are trying to align it better with K-5; but what you have here is weird. Again I feel like they are trying to put new standards (or the Missouri Learning Standards) into the old model. The old model was broken, they need to leave it alone.

Literature:

1. Comprehend and Interpret Texts

- A. Added: "Draw conclusions, infer, and analyze". The addition makes the standard sound wordy, repetitive, and confusing. The original Missouri Learning standard was already clear and implied that students are using evidence from the text to support their analysis.

B. This standard is fine until the end. The proposed standard ends with "including figurative and connotative meanings **using context, affixes, and reference materials.**" This implies that figurative and connotative meanings can be found by looking at the affix of a word or in reference material. While this might help them to determine the meaning of the word, the figurative language or the connotative meaning an author uses to get the emotions across to the reader are not going to be found in reference materials. These features can only be found by analyzing the author and the information given. I feel like this standard misleads teachers and student into believing that these can be found in reference materials.

Secondly this standard should be less about defining words and more about the meaning that is being created. This standard helps students to look at specific words to understand tone of the situation or the characters. Tone has been completely taken out of this standard. This standard now reads more like a vocabulary standard, rather than one designed to look at important words an author has included to get their point across to the reader.

D. This one is also confusing because they left certain words in the proposed standard, yet took other important words out. One example of this is keeping the words "provide a concise summary of the text". Yet they took out the word "central idea". The gist of this standard, as it is written now, is to analyze theme. While I can see the importance of students understanding how the theme is developed, I am not sure that giving a summary is that helpful to just establish the theme. If you aren't giving the central idea why do you need a concise summary of the story?

The next concern I have about this standard is that students are asked to identify theme and relate it to "life experience". This seems like a weird request. I get it, they want the students to actively engage with the story and understand it on a deeper level. My concern is that this isn't something that is always necessary or possible for every student. I feel that this is more of a good teaching practice than something that should be stated on a state standard.

The third problem with this standards is that they are specifying that we look at two or more themes. What about a story when identifying and analyzing one theme is sufficient? Forcing two themes on a story, where one is obvious and sufficient, sets kids up for failure. We are forcing them to analyze the story for something that may not be there or may be a stretch to what the author is really trying to say.

Approaching Texts as a Writer

- C. This standard is fine, but the complexity was removed when they took out "reflect historical and cultural perspectives". By eliminating these words, teachers can focus just on point of view. I worry that the focus of the point of view will not remain complex. When we focus our analysis of point of view on "historical and cultural perspectives", we expect students to understand where characters come from and why they make the decisions they do. I also feel that this is a huge component of literature in the 9th and 10th grade level.

Approaching Texts as a Researcher

- D. My biggest concern for this standard is that it does not state that it is grade level literature. While this may seem like a small detail, this is imperative for teachers to understand and accept that student must be reading grade level materials. When we did our textbook adoption last year, one of the things we discussed at length, was the importance of on level text. In the end the realization that the textbook we were using had so many texts that were significantly below grade level, helped all teacher to get on board with the new books. If reading grade level material is implied, than the standard should be taken out and addressed somewhere else.

Informational Text:

Approaching Texts as a Reader

- D. This standard has the opposite problem of the Literature standard. In this standard they have taken out the word theme, yet have included the words "central idea". I am not sure why students can't analyze theme in informational texts or identify central idea in literature?

Writing standards

Overall they look good. I am glad that separated them. This makes it much easier to track kids who are struggling or are not completing certain aspects of the writing process.

Boeckmann (DESE), Julie

From: Maria Scopino <scopino@foxc6.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2016 9:13 AM
To: 1490Comments
Subject: CONCERNS

With ESA coming around and changing everything we need to not change the entire system without knowing what the new accountability system will be.

Thank you,
Maria

Miss Maria Scopino, Ed.S

Fox C-6 School District
College and Career Readiness Coordinator
745 Jeffco Blvd.
Arnold MO 63010
636-296-8000 ext. 7171



Follow me on Twitter

From: [LODES, KRISTINA](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: New Proposed Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 9:43:52 AM

To Whom it may Concern:

I feel the level of rigor in the proposed standards is lower, alignment isn't possible K-12 when elementary and secondary proposed standards are in completely different formats and coded differently, it isn't fair to school district, teachers, and most importantly students to change all standards (ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies) within the same year (who would fund PD, be able to give PD on all brand new standards, and new resources for ALL areas except health would need to be purchased).

Sincerely,
Kristina Lodes

5th Grade Teacher
Central Elementary School

From: [Todd Fraley](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: learning standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 10:41:27 AM

Was not the purpose of creating the Missouri Learning Standards to exemplify critical thinking skills and overall problem solving? Instead it appears that through this process we are right back to square one. Too many standards to effectively cover seems to be the result. Quality over quantity should be the goal. Overall essential questions and power standards should supplant detailed expectations that foster only a surface level approach. Schools will once again be trying to rush through curriculum to cover all the components in order to achieve good scores on the state test. Why spend all the time and effort and just go back to the GLE's if this is the case?

There are also development concerns with many of these standards and the appropriateness of when they should be taught. Overall, our education system must break away from the norm it has been yoked to for the last few decades. Instead it appears that we repackage the same old thing with a new name to appease the political process. You want better schools? Then allow for depth, creativity, and critical thinking. Go a mile deep and not a mile wide.

"Remember, the hardest students to love are the ones that need it the most."

Dr. Eric Fraley

Principal

Horace Mann Elementary

1100 W. 16th Street

Sedalia, MO 65301

Phone (660) 826-6441

Fax (660) 829-0767

fraleyt@sedalia.k12.mo.us



From: [Hannah Julian](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Math Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 10:44:12 AM

To whom it may concern,

The gap between 2nd and 3rd grade math standards is too wide. The standards for math in 2nd grade shoot from knowing little about multiplication and nothing about division, to understanding both within 100 in 3rd grade. That is too much information for a child to understand in on years time. In addition, the 3rd grade students are expected to learn expanded form, the 4 properties of operations, use the 4 operations to solve problems involving lengths, liquid volumes or weights given in the same units, AREA and much more without any previous knowledge. I feel that if these standards are expected to be met in 3rd grade, there has to be some sort of standard for the areas in grade levels before 3rd.

From: [Gena McCluskey](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Fwd: Standards Feedback
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 10:54:36 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Parisa Stoddard** <parisastoddard@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 24, 2016 at 4:03 PM
Subject: Fwd: Standards Feedback
To: Gena McCluskey <genamcccluskey@moberlyspartans.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Zach McMains** <zachmcmains@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 24, 2016 at 3:57 PM
Subject: Fwd: Standards Feedback
To: Parisa Stoddard <parisastoddard@moberlyspartans.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sandy McKeown** <sandymckeown@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 22, 2016 at 7:00 AM
Subject: Standards Feedback
To: Zach McMains <zachmcmains@moberlyspartans.org>

I like that the standards are more detailed for math in grades 6-8. It is clear to see what is supposed to be taught.

Algebra I standards are more detailed as well.

Algebra II standards are not very detailed and there are a lot of blanks. For example, creating equations only has standards in Alg. I and not in Alg. II (p. 120).

Alg. I is expected to teach a lot of material that is normally taught in Alg. II.

Thanks,
Sandy

--

Sandy McKeown
MHS Math Educator
MS CC

"It's a great time to be a Spartan!"

--

Zach McMains
Principal
Moberly High School



--

Parisa Stoddard
Asst. Superintendent
Moberly School District

"The meaning of life is to find your gift. The purpose of life is to give it away."
~William Shakespeare

--

Gena McCluskey
Superintendent of Schools
Moberly School District

From: [Gena McCluskey](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Fwd: Survey and Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 10:54:48 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Parisa Stoddard** <parisastoddard@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 24, 2016 at 4:02 PM
Subject: Fwd: Survey and Standards
To: Gena McCluskey <genamcccluskey@moberlyspartans.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Zach McMains** <zachmcmains@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 24, 2016 at 10:56 AM
Subject: Fwd: Survey and Standards
To: Parisa Stoddard <parisastoddard@moberlyspartans.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kyle Wiechens** <kylewiechens@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 22, 2016 at 7:00 AM
Subject: Re: Survey and Standards
To: Zach McMains <zachmcmains@moberlyspartans.org>

For Algebra 1 and 2 the organizational structure seems off. Putting linear equations (Algebra 1) and logarithmic functions (algebra 2) in the same category seems off. Also, algebraic probability should probably not be in Geometry.

On Mon, Feb 22, 2016 at 5:52 AM, Zach McMains <zachmcmains@moberlyspartans.org> wrote:

Survey

<https://www.pbisassessment.org/Anon/tpu20BFI200>

<http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/ProposedStandardsFeb2016.pdf>

--

Zach McMains
Principal
Moberly High School



--

Kyle Wiechens
Moberly High School
MACC-Dual Credit

--

Zach McMains
Principal
Moberly High School



--

Parisa Stoddard
Asst. Superintendent
Moberly School District

"The meaning of life is to find your gift. The purpose of life is to give it away."
~William Shakespeare

--

Gena McCluskey
Superintendent of Schools
Moberly School District

From: [Gena McCluskey](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Fwd: Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 10:55:10 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Parisa Stoddard** <parisastoddard@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 24, 2016 at 4:02 PM
Subject: Fwd: Standards
To: Gena McCluskey <genamccluskey@moberlyspartans.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Zach McMains** <zachmcmains@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Wed, Feb 24, 2016 at 10:56 AM
Subject: Fwd: Standards
To: Parisa Stoddard <parisastoddard@moberlyspartans.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Julie Tucker** <julietucker@moberlyspartans.org>
Date: Mon, Feb 22, 2016 at 6:39 AM
Subject: Standards
To: Zach McMains <zachmcmains@moberlyspartans.org>

Many of the Geometry Standards are not specific. For example, prove theorems about triangles doesn't state which theorems. There are quite a few full chapters of theorems about triangles in any Geometry text, and it is too general to state in that way without a specific breakdown. For the Algebra 1 and Algebra 2 Standards, they are organized side by side, yet they don't coordinate well.

--

Julie Tucker
Geometry, Algebra 2
Moberly High School

--

Zach McMains
Principal
Moberly High School



--

Parisa Stoddard
Asst. Superintendent
Moberly School District

"The meaning of life is to find your gift. The purpose of life is to give it away."
~William Shakespeare

--

Gena McCluskey
Superintendent of Schools
Moberly School District

From: [Angela Huesgen](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Missouri Learning Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 12:02:42 PM

I am in favor of keeping the current Missouri Learning Standards and not in support of the proposed standards for reasons indicated below:

- The K-5 standards for Science and Social Studies do NOT have a well-designed progression from Kindergarten-5th grade and thus would be difficult for teachers to see the "big picture" in terms of what students need to know and be able to do by the time they leave 5th grade.
- Additionally, I am not in favor of the K-5 proposed ELA standards *at all*. Extensive work has been done in collaboration with teachers to understand the conceptual flow and progression of the current MLS and K-5 teachers are heading into a productive period of grade level and vertical (K-5) work that will lend itself to more student growth. In an effort to make these new standards more "robust" it actually further marginalizes what teachers are expected to teach and in turn will expose students to **less** under the guise of "more". Furthermore, as a parent of school-aged children in MO public schools, I adamantly oppose implementation of these new standards as I feel my own children will have gaps in their education. While they may receive instruction that covers a wide range.....none of it will be executed very deeply. This in turn will not enable our children to be college and career-ready or to have the problem-solving capabilities necessary to compete in a global society.

Angie Huesgen
Instructional Specialist
Drummond Elementary
Pattonville School District
ahuesgen@psdr3.org
Ext. 2814



privileged or copyright information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient(s), please call (314) 213-8050 and reply to sender to inform us that you have received this message in error and destroy all copies of the original message. Please do not copy, distribute or use this email or the information contained in it for any purpose without permission of the sender. Computer viruses can be transmitted via email. The district has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this email; however, we cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments.

From: [Wade Steinhoff](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: HB1490
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 12:16:04 PM

I am in support of the following message/options as they relate to HB1490 (see below).

I can't help thinking that conditions have changed significantly since HB1490 was written.

ESSA provides for more state and local control of over assessment systems. Although the specifics of this are yet to be interpreted in MO, ESSA will create a wave of change that we will all have to learn about, adjust to, and expend resources on.

No matter the heroic efforts of the standards writing teams and the folks at DESE who have tried to bring alignment here, if these new standards generate create new assessments that are tied to MSIP and APR we will have two waves of change the may work in conflict to each other. This creates a serious risk of undermining the relevance of the entire accountability process.

I think there are two reasonable courses of action:

1.) Adopt these standards (in order to comply with the law), and delay the timeline for implementing new assessments in order to synchronize with the provisions of ESSA. In the meantime reconvene the standards writing teams with the goal of approaching the task with a common set of priorities, principles, and frameworks.

OR

2.) Reject these standards because they aren't built upon a common set of priorities, principles, and frameworks, because the intent of the law HB1490 has been accomplished with the passage of ESSA. And then reconvene the standards writing teams with the goal of approaching the task with a common set of priorities, principles, and frameworks.

Either way if these standards as written generate new APR accountable tests in the spring of 2018, it will require the expenditure of enormous resources to align curriculum, instruction, and materials, again.

--

Dr. Wade D. Steinhoff
Assistant Superintendent
[Orchard Farm R-V School District](#)
636-250-5231

From: [Lingle, Lisa](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Secondary Mathematics Standards feedback
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 12:37:39 PM

I am very pleased with the proposed 6-12 Mathematics Grade-Level Expectations. I only have a few clarifying questions.

- Algebra 2 - F.IF.A.1 - Can you specify what types of functions should Algebra 2 students be expected to graph? Algebra 1 clearly identifies that the focus is linear, quadratic and exponential. I would assume Algebra 2 adds absolute value, radical, and logarithmic. Does it include rational?
- Algebra 2 - A.REI.B.1 - Does this standard include 3 x 3 systems?
- Geometry - G.CO.C.3 - What types of polygons does this include? Triangles are polygons (G.CO.C.2) Can these two standards be combined?
- Geometry - G.CO.D.1 - What types of geometric figures should Geometry students be expected to construct?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Lisa Lingle
Secondary Mathematics Facilitator
Rockwood School District
linglelisa@rsdmo.org
(636) 733-2155

From: [Kendra Watson](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Standards- Draft
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 12:53:11 PM

I am a 4th grade teacher.

The **science expectations** are so different from the previous standards. I'm concerned with the access to materials to teach the concepts listed. We use the Nature Unleashed program in 4th, and I noticed the standards we taught in 4th grade have been moved to 3rd grade. The electricity unit has been moved to 3rd grade as well.

Being from a small school, it is difficult to purchase new materials. These standards have changed so drastically that it will be difficult to teach them. My other concern is as a teacher learning all the new curriculum. Without resources available I feel we aren't prepared to teach these standards.

The math standards look great. They are user friendly and have incorporated the previous standards very well. I like how the previous standards have been made clearer.

The English Language Arts standards look great as well. They are user friendly and have incorporated the previous standards very well.

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: MS 6-8 Physical Science
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:37:13 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the MS 6-8 Physical Science standards:

Standards are written almost exclusively at DOK Level 3. The majority of the students will not be able to function at this high of a level in demonstrating what they know/can do. For many students, this is the first time they have really been exposed to several of these concepts at more than a superficial level, and to expect them to perform consistently at this high of a level of understanding is kind of ludicrous. We would expect even our gifted students would have a hard time meeting these standards on a consistent basis.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: MS 6-8 Life Science
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:39:10 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the MS 6-8 Life Science standards:

The standards' DOK levels are consistently too high: most are at Level 3.

How can we teach the variation of genetic traits standard under evolution, but not teach anything about heredity? Wouldn't there need to be some sort of heredity standard that would precede the genetics standard? We believe it is unwise to teach a more advanced idea without teaching the more basic, foundational idea first.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: MS 6-8 Earth Science
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:42:18 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the MS 6-8 Earth Science standards:

The majority of the standards are written to the maximum DOK level of 3. The fact that the "clarification statements" are so numerous and detailed indicates the writers knew this and had to specify which DOK level 1 content was important.

The majority of the students will not be able to function at this high of a level in demonstrating what they know/can do. For many students, this is the first time they have really been exposed to several of these concepts at more than a superficial level, and to expect them to perform consistently at this high of a level of understanding is difficult. We would expect even gifted students would have a hard time meeting these standards on a consistent basis.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: K Math
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:44:58 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Kindergarten math standards:

The following are recommendations for K Math revisions:

K.NS.B.6- Remove dot cards and playing cards from list.

K. NS.C.9- Compare written numbers between 1-10 without objects is too abstract for kindergarten. Comparing with objects is more age appropriate.

Patterns are not on kindergarten curriculum. We think that patterns should be in K.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade 9 ELA
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:47:24 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade 9 ELA standards:

All Writing and Speaking standards are concerns for us. Writing and Speaking have both lost substance with the new proposal. Our concern is that students will not be sufficiently trained in analysis and using evidence and gives equal weight to unsubstantiated opinion.

For instance,

SL 2.9-10 - original standard and current proposed standard are two separate skill sets

SL5 - We are concerned that the proposed standard does not fully involve students in the way that the original standard did. It removes content in lieu of behavior.

WR3 - Takes substance out in favor of syntax and grammar which sends the message that what you say is less important than how nice it looks.

RL11 - This is out of date and poorly written.

RL3 - We like the inclusion of visual elements.

Most of the reading doesn't change, but the new standards does make it less rigorous by excluding traditional texts. This is a digression.

The new standards direct students away from developing ideas to simply summarizing.

Overall, the current Missouri Learning Standards are more thorough, relevant to our learners, and consistent with the rigor demanded of 21st century learners.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade K Social Studies
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:49:21 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade K Social Studies standards:

We feel as if the proposed standards are appropriate for kindergarten and are very similar to the previous standards.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: psisson@montrose.k12.mo.us
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Middle School Science
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:49:45 PM

After reading through the science portion of the proposed standards, it appears to me that inheritance of traits is not covered at all until the 9th grade. I understand that the Mendelian genetics model is somewhat flawed in explaining dominant and recessive traits, but it is a simpler way of explaining why some traits appear while others do not. It does do a good job of explaining why some traits persist in a population even though they are uncommon. It is those traits which might provide the means for the survival of a species in times of stress.

Notice of Confidentiality:

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.

Montrose R-XIV School District, 307 East 2nd Street, Montrose, MO 64770 - www.montroser14.com

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade 2 - Social Studies
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:51:06 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade 2 Social Studies standards:

There are many of these standards that are not age appropriate for 2nd grade. They discuss topics which 2nd graders are not yet ready to comprehend.

We feel these standards set expectations that are not realistic for or achievable by 2nd graders.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade 1 Social Studies
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:52:40 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade 1 Social Studies standards:

Social Studies standards are grade level appropriate. Reading skills are inherently more important in order to grasp Social Studies concepts; we try to incorporate appropriate Social Studies skills as needed.

Some Social Studies skills can possibly be too rigorous based upon prior knowledge, comprehension skills, and reading ability.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Middle School - World Geography
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:55:09 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Middle School World Geography standards:

Need clarification on exactly what regions we are supposed to teach.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Middle School American History
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:56:28 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Middle School American History standards:

The proposed standards look very similar to the current 8th grade GLEs. It would require only minor adaptation for us to implement. These proposed standards are closely aligned with the current GLEs.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: HS 9-12 Earth Science
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:58:20 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the HS 9-12 Earth Science standards:

Follow the current GLEs and CLEs rather than the new wording. The updated format is so condensed that it gives no direction as to what has to be covered in regards to specifics.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade 3 Social Studies
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:01:55 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade 3 Social Studies standards:

We have major concerns about the developmentally appropriateness for the material (in particular the Missouri history concepts) being taught in the 3rd grade. Also being able to find materials to teach these concepts at a 3rd grade reading level may be a challenge. Third graders have trouble understanding the difference between their state and country. To have to teach Missouri history without the context of where it fits in American history will add to the problems of effectively teaching these concepts to 3rd graders. We are unsure of the reasoning for pushing Missouri history to this grade level.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Algebra I standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:03:54 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Algebra 1 standards:

Some of the standards that are being requested are at inappropriate grade levels for students. For instance, deriving the quadratic formula from standard form is not necessary nor appropriate for this level of students. Another example would be where on the graph of a function is positive, negative, increasing or decreasing. There is over emphasis on recursive functions.

Examples were given in the current MLS to help explain what exactly was being asked that are now missing from the standards.

Several places the standards were given more detail, such as linear, simple quadratic and simple exponential which was found to be helpful.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: HS 9-12 Physical Science
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:06:28 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the HS 9-12 Physical Science standards:

Questions from HS Science staff:

HS-PS1-2: What exactly would students be revising? Are they expected to identify the type of reaction or predict the products?

HS-PS1-4: Not appropriate for introductory classes nor for general chemistry courses

HS-PS1-5: What type of model would students be expected to do?

HS-PS 1-7: Not appropriate for chemistry I nor physical science.

The standards are simply too vague to be helpful to help prepare teachers to instruct students. There are many standards no longer covered - these are important concepts and shouldn't be deleted. We would need sample activities for all standards because the wording is so vague that it is difficult to determine how the students would be tested over that standard. It seems that they took many of the old standards and compressed them into one standard. The problem with this is that we don't know which parts of the old standard are still valid. The proposed standards are simply not user friendly.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade 7 ELA standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:08:47 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade 7 ELA standards:

Negatives:

RL.2 - The current MLS Standards provide a more specific outline of literal and figurative language. The revision does not have the specific information teachers will need to prepare the students.

RL.3 - The skills of interpreting visual elements could be more specific for teachers to prepare students, including listing the types of visual elements.

RL.4 - Summarizing key details of text and theme should NOT be combined together in one strand.

RL.7 and RI.7 - Tone, word choice, and syntax could be more descriptive like the current MLS standards to help teachers prepare students.

RI.2 - The current MLS provide more examples of what the standard is asking. We think teachers need these small examples to refer to each strand.

All writing standards - The current MLS provides a separation of research skills that we like better because these skills are very complex and they need their own strands. The proposed standards are too simplified and teachers and students need to see the examples and elaborations.

Positives:

RL.4, 5, and 6 - The revised versions are clearer and condensed.

RI.8 - We like the usage of the word EVALUATE better than DELINEATE.

SL.4 - The proposed standards are more simple and this is the only time we liked the simplified version better because we feel the MLS repeated concepts covered in other strands.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: HS 9-12 Life Science standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:11:42 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the HS 9-12 Life Science standards:

There are a number of concepts that are not covered in these standards or are insufficiently covered. Organic chemistry, cell transportation, and the scientific method are insufficiently covered. These need to be added and elaborated on in order to properly understand biology at an introductory level. There was not a single standard regarding cell structures and function. There needs to be a standard that discusses organelle function and its relation to the overall survival of an organism, and not just regarding energy and water transport. HS-LS1-8 should say something about the function of the organic compounds, not just what atoms they are composed of.

The following are questions we had after reviewing the standards: Why do the standards mention modeling so much? How are we supposed to assess their ability to use a model? Is their modeling going to be assessed on the EOC? Regarding HS-LS1-2, at what level are you meaning (cell, organ, organ system, all?). Regarding HS-LS2-1 is the mathematical representation just referring to the 10% rule, will we now teach probability and statistics?

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade 1 Math
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:13:28 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade 1 Math standards:

1st Grade felt like they were very close to the previous standards. They like having money and calendar back into the curriculum. Counting backwards from 20 was added also, which is a good thing.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: HS 9-12 Physical Science
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:19:53 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the HS 9-12 Physical Science standards:

Comments:

HS-PS1-2 modify to be more specific...do students have to predict products and then explain why?

HS-PS1-4 This standard does not seem to be appropriate for Gen. Chemistry nor for Physical Science

HS-PS1-7 This standard does not seem to be appropriate for Gen. Chemistry nor for Physical Science

HS-PS2-3 Use the words impulse standard, get rid of "macroscopic" and just the word "egg".

HS-PS3-2 Chang to "total energy of an object is the sum of the kinetic and potential energy of the object".

HS-PS3-4 Just say in clarification statement.... $\Delta Q = mc\Delta T$ for one object is equal to $-\Delta Q$ for other object.

The following are questions we had after reviewing the standards:

HS-PS1-2 Wondering what students are going to be expected to do. What exactly are they supposed to revise?

HS-PS1-3 Do writers have a specific activity in mind for this standard? How about a suggested learning activity?

HS-PS1-5 There already is a model...is there something else you want them to develop? Are students supposed to interpret reaction energy graphs? Are students supposed to create reaction energy graphs?

Acids/Bases seem to be under emphasized?

Energy Standards seem to under emphasized?

HS-PS2 No velocity/acceleration standards? No P-T/V-T graphing/interpretation? Establishing those standards seems necessary for standards HS-PS2-1 through 4. Include a standard for Newton's 3rd Law, or at least some acknowledgement.

HS-PS3-1 Do you intend for students to create a model, or use one already created? Is this standard written to address Conservation of Energy? That seemed unclear.

HS-PS3-4 How is energy "more uniformly distributed"?

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade 8 Math standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:21:47 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade 8 Math standards:

8.F.B.4 - determining the x intercept is not a skill needed until students work with parabolas which is not an 8th grade concept.

8.GM.C.9 - Surface area of pyramids should not be included in this grade level. This should be included with the surface area of all three dimensional figures.

While students can be taught all of these concepts as a process, many have not reached the cognitive maturity needed and do not fully understand underlying mathematical theory. Thus, they are unable to gain the depth of knowledge necessary to apply the concept to a different situation. For example: the laws of exponents, functions, combined transformations on a coordinate plane, radical numbers.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Craig Hounsom](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Grade 5 Science
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:23:21 PM

Administrators and teachers in the Rolla 31 district met to review the newly proposed standards brought about by HB 1490.

The following comments apply to the Grade 5 Science standards:

When it lists to create a model, we would like to have a more specific guideline. More information about exactly what kind of model would be helpful to teachers.

Thanks.

Craig Hounsom
Rolla Public Schools

From: [Korell, Debra J](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Baldwin, Beccy](#)
Subject: Science K-5, 6-12 comments
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:39:43 PM

Overall, I first want to say that the format/layout of this document looks very professional and teacher friendly. You did a great job in making it systematic for grades K-12.. Well done!! Also, Loved seeing the NGSS engineering standards added to all grade levels and grade bans. 😊

Here are my thoughts/concerns/questions:

K-5 Science:

1. Seems like in Grade 2 Life Science (LS1.A.2nd grade) the standard is less rigor than in Grade 1 (LS1.A.1st grade). This new 2nd grade standard was once a 1st grade standard; knowing the external structures (proposed 2nd grade standard) should be done prior to designing a solution to mimic how animals use their external parts (proposed 1st grade standard). Seems like they should be switched.
2. I like seeing the rigor implemented within the standards (mainly due to the insertion of the NGSS), especially in Grade 3 LS3 and LS4; my question is ... is it too rigorous for a 3rd graders thinking?
3. Terminology that was captured within our GLEs is not stated within the new proposed standards (example: consumer, producer, predator, prey) and insulator, conductors); is it just implied that teachers will pick up on these terms or should the terms be inserted within the appropriate standard? The only place I see electricity is in PS 4th grade with “electric currents”.
4. Are the science inquiry standards now captured within the 8 practices; if so, I noticed that graphs and measuring are found in 3rd and 5th grade only (unless I have missed it); also, the 8th practice (obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information is only seen in K, 3rd, and 5th grade and Practice 5 (using mathematics and computational thinking) in grade 5 only (I know this will be probably covered in Mathematics standards)
5. The only place I noticed “Ask questions” was within the ETS standards.. in engineering; should this practice also be incorporated within the science content standards ... working on the testable question, hypothesis?

Science MS/HS

1. Once again the format/layout looks very professional! 😊
2. I like how this team took the NGSS and enhanced it make it more teacher friendly in understanding the intent/meaning of the standard;
3. I did however, get confused on the coding. I was analyzing the new proposed standards for its alignment to the NGSS; the proposed coding being used resembles the NGSS coding, however, it did not match. I do not know if the team wanted to use the NGSS coding or if

they just wanted to put it in an order (For example: LS4C --- 6-8 LS4 4 on the proposed standard read like 6-8 LS4-6). I am not sure if this makes any difference, but if it does, there is a misalignment in coding.

Overall... great job!

I am sure you have thought about adding a coversheet explaining the new coding system and other information applicable in implementing the standards. This would be beneficial for teachers.

Thanks again for the work your committee has done on these proposed standards; from the first exposure of these proposed science standards to this document, ... what a pleasing outcome.

Sincerely,
Debi Korell

From: [Erin Cashel](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Social Studies Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 2:58:15 PM

As a 3rd grade teacher, I have major concerns about the draft of the Social Studies MLS. Why were the standards, or many of them, moved down an entire year? These concepts are very abstract. Additionally, most reading materials that relate to these topics are a much higher reading level than third grade and there is a reason for that. Please reconsider. Remember that our third graders are 8 years old and need a solid foundation before being able to move on successfully.

From: [Michelle Taggart](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: K Standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 4:31:47 PM

I have been a kindergarten teacher for thirteen years. I loved the changes common core brought and how it challenged teachers to teach higher standards to students. Teaching kindergarten has drastically changed over the years since I first started. In the first few years I remember if a child knew most of their letters and sounds they were considered ready for first grade. Our district currently has the expectation of students reading on a Fountas and Pinnell level D or E by the end of kindergarten. These books have a 100 words or more and deal with vowel patterns and many "tricky words." I was happy to see that for the most part the new proposed standards are very similar to what we currently teach. However, I feel that the reading foundations part needs to be stepped up to include harder skills than cvc words. Students are capable of being exposed to long vowels and long vowel patterns as early as kindergarten. I have had great success with getting students to level E and even higher because I teach cvcc words, blends, and even some vowel patterns in kindergarten. I feel like the phonics falls short and at least in the common core standards they had referenced teaching long and short spelling graphemes for the 5 major vowels. On a side note I feel like the Reading 1Bd picture dictionary usage is a little dated. Most teachers do not have these types of books in their classroom anymore. All in all I was very pleased with the draft and happy to see money and times will be addressed in kindergarten. Thanks for all your hard work!

Michelle Taggart

--

*Michelle Taggart
Coverdell Elementary
Kindergarten*

From: [Jori Davison](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: New proposed standards
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2016 5:21:29 PM

To whom it may concern,

For the social studies standards, it seems to me that you are trying to cram more history into the limited number of school years. I'm a fourth grade teacher and our school has purchased very nice books to teach Missouri history, which has been the majority of the fourth grade standards for many years now. The new proposed standards are moving almost all of that down to the third grade and pushing U.S. history down to fourth grade. My kids are way too young to be learning U.S. history and I can't imagine third graders trying to wrap their heads around Missouri history. They are still so self-centered and just learning the fundamental skills of reading maps and using non-fiction texts to learn. Third graders are still learning how to read, not how to learn from reading. By moving the standards down a grade level, the books we own for Missouri history would be useless. The ideas in them are so large that third graders would struggle with the material. I highly suggest that you keep fourth grade as the Missouri history year and move U.S. history back to fifth grade and older. If not, this would be a waste of resources and textbooks that our district (and I'm sure many others) already owns. Please reconsider this HUGE move for the social studies standards.

--

Jori Davison
Fourth Grade Teacher
Avenue City School District
18069 Highway 169
Cosby, MO 64436
[816-662-2305](tel:816-662-2305) Phone
[816-662-3201](tel:816-662-3201) Fax
jdavison@avenuecityschool.org