

A Quick Primer on Common Core State Standards

What's in a name? Common Core State Standards vs. National Common Core

- Initiated and led by the National Governors Association (NGA) and Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) -- ACT/Achieve Inc. behind the scenes.
- In the past, standards would have been initiated by content associations: NCTM, NSTA, NCSS (or each discipline inside social studies) result was too much and great variety in format (had to learn to read each document, level of detail varies, some expectations crafted as content expectations and some as performance expectations).
- Back to the politics...with the governors and states "leading" the charge along the way this tactic was embraced (the word "national" dropped off and replaced by "state"). States initially committed to the, "intent" to use and ultimately state board adoption. MI SBOE adopted June 15. See the as of 3/2011 41 states have adopted.
<http://www.corestandards.org/>
- MDE's energy has been focused on producing discrepancy analyses and influencing development of new assessments. MDE produced alignment documents CCSS:HSCE's/GLCE's these are available at <http://www.glce.wikispaces.org>(ELA) and <http://www.MICTM.org> (Mathematics).

Why do we have a CCSS – what drove this effort?

- Unintended consequences of standards movement gone awry (see above point)
- International comparisons (U.S. not ranking as well as it should as a developed, literate nation).
- Globalization – competitive global economy
- Technology – students need to know and be able to use as repertoire of 21st Century Skills
- Current economy – we are truly inefficient and poorly equipped to create high quality curriculum. "State vs. Federal" philosophy has cost us.

What do we have in the CCSS?

- ELA and Mathematics *College and Career Ready Standards*, think of these as Exit Outcomes – where we want students to be at conclusion of grade 12.
- K-12 ELA/Mathematics Standards – these are our grade level expectations.
- Science and Social Studies and Literature Integrations – interdisciplinary informational reading and writing
- Features/Deliverables/Promises: fewer, internationally benchmarked, research/evidence-based, sequenced in a manner to suggest learning progressions, higher/rigorous = college-career ready.
- At the time of adoption, states had the latitude to add up to 15% of additional content to the CCSS – MI did NOT add.

What are we finding in the CCSS?

- Mathematical Practices
- Interdisciplinary connections/expectations
- Text complexity illustrated through helpful exemplars
- Greater emphasis on informational reading – less emphasis on narrative
- Some of the mathematics actually moved back (from MI) to grades a bit more reasonable)
- Yes, rigorous a.k.a. college-career ready

What about the assessment?

- 2014-15 we expect a new assessment to replace MEAP for ELA/Math – we don't know yet what will happen with MME.
- MI will use what is created through Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)– one of two national consortia of states creating state assessment packages. MI is a governing state.
- Assessment package from SBAC suggests: 1 summative given last 12 weeks of school – given online, 78% constructed response and performance events/tasks; interim benchmark (these will be optional– created to give as predictive/use in formative manner); formative assessment tools, provided through professional development.
- Computer adaptive test – adjusts in real time to the test taker – benefits include: 1) test doesn't have to be too long, 2) challenges very able student and does not overly frustrate struggling student, 3) permits more constructed response enabling more testing for “understanding.”

What are the implications for local districts?

- Get familiar with the documents/expectations – now
- Build awareness with community/BOE – now. College-Career Ready is a big idea and it is underneath all of the education policy districts are currently experiencing, in MI and nationally.
- Engage faculty in alignment work over next 18-24months – (analysis about where we might want to make some changes: scope/sequence, materials, practices).
- Engage faculty in professional development in “gap” areas revealed as they engage in awareness and alignment.
- Tie school improvement plan goals/strategies/Title \$ to gaps identified and to student achievement information reflecting gaps.
- Explicitly draw connections for school personnel and public about current change initiatives (Response to Intervention) and implementation of CCSS.
- Curriculum will be developed nationally (prediction), and ISDs/RESA's and content associations will develop some curriculum in the state of MI (fact) therefore, would not overemphasize this activity locally. Example www.commoncore.org
- Format assessment in a manner to mimic constructed response and performance tasks.
- Invest in professional development around the issue of, assessment literacy. Legislation on Educator Evaluation and measurement issues inherent in this act demand assessment literacy.

What will the IISD assistance look like?

- Awareness session held Nov. 22, 2010
- Web-based resources – for district use <http://www.inghamisd.org/programsandservices/sds/curriculum/commoncore/>
- Virtual support/community – webinars, wiki, blog, other (stay tuned)
- Technical Assistance sessions 1 x per semester, next two years for district designated CCSS Implementation teams (Session 1 - winter 2011)
- Contribute to statewide ISD Curriculum Collaborative (ongoing/emerging resources) bring back to districts
- Contribute to statewide assessment consortium (MI Assessment Consortium) bring PD and resources back to districts. <http://www.michiganassessmentconsortium.org>
- IISD consultant staff keep up to date through leadership on statewide organizations, MDE committees, state professional associations – purpose remain current, influence policy, bring resources and information to constituent districts.