Common Core Standards

Students who move from one part of the United States to another during their K-12 school careers are likely to encounter substantial variations in requirements for graduation. The Common Core Standards Initiative (CCSI, 2010) stated: “We need standards to ensure that all students, no matter where they live, are prepared for success in postsecondary education and the workforce. Common standards will help ensure that students are receiving a high quality education consistently, from school to school and state to state. Common standards will provide a greater opportunity to share experiences and best practices within and across states that will improve our ability to best serve the needs of students."

Currently, standards for student performance vary widely by state. The roots of current state-to-state inconsistencies lie in the fact that public education in the United States has traditionally been a local responsibility. However, textbook publishers have created something of a “de facto” national curriculum, based on market needs. Consequently, many textbooks from major publishers have reflected the curricular choices that were made by educational groups in the largest states. Some publishers do create textbooks and other curricula for smaller markets.

Rothman (2009) summarized the efforts of various groups to create common standards across the United States. Initial efforts to foster development of national standards and a related system of assessments in the core subject areas began in the early 1990’s through awarding grants to a dozen national organizations.

The National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) launched the Common Core State Standards initiative in March 2009 after the nation's governors agreed in concept to adopt a uniform set of standards. The final report was issued on June 2, 2010 (NGA, 2010), and, by early 2011, 40 states have adopted the Standards. The adopting states are currently aligning them to their own state standards.

The Fordham Institute (Carmichael, et al. 2010) reported that the Common Core standards received high marks when compared to state standards across the country. The Institute suggests that Common Core Standards represent an opportunity for creating consistency and raising standards in all states.

Assessments

The implementation of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 has created a 50-state and 50-test environment in public education. As a result state-to-state expectations and performances vary greatly. States publish annual reports of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), which are required by federal law, but the meaning of “proficient” in those reports can vary widely from one state to another (Cronin, et al. 2007).

Larger testing companies market a variety of norm-referenced standardized tests. However, they are designed to rank students, rather than to determine how well students have mastered curricular objectives as criterion-referenced tests would do. The National Assessment of

Educational Progress (NAEP) publishes results that are technically adequate for state-to-state (and international) comparisons, but that assessment is not designed to produce individual student scores. NAEP requires a large sample of students to produce results. Most school systems are too small to qualify for testing that would produce local NAEP results. The tradition of local governance has led to inconsistent requirements and standards for student performance across the country. Thus, in 2010, the United States does not have a consistent set of academic assessments for grades K-12.

Two coalitions, together representing 44 states and the District of Columbia, won a U.S. Department of Education competition for $330 million dollars federal aid to design "comprehensive assessment systems" aligned to the Common Core and designed to measure whether students are on track for college and career success. The awards, announced in September 2010, were divided between the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), comprised of 26 states receiving $170 million, and the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium that comprises 31 states and received $160 million. At least 12 states participated in both coalitions and are waiting to decide which assessment system will best meet their needs. An advantage of having assessments that are used in more than one state is that results from all participating states could be compared.

Why not national standards or assessments?

The most common arguments against adopting the Common Core Standards for K-12 center on two issues: 1) the cost and difficulty of changing the existing curriculum and assessments and (2) the sovereignty of states in issues related to education and local control. Governor Rick Perry of Texas stated that the Race to the Top funding would only generate a one-time amount of $75 per student, yet cost Texas taxpayers an additional $3 million. A third argument is that the individual state standards might be more rigorous. However, states that adopt the Common Core are permitted to add 15 percent more in content.

Another concern is the potential to use scores from the student assessments as a major component of teacher evaluations and merit pay plans, an idea that has popular appeal. (*TIME*, 2010). In August 2010, ten of the nation's premier educational researchers (Baker, Barton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, Ladd, Linn, Ravtich, Rothstein, Shavelson & Shepard, 2010) co-authored a report that cautioned against relying on student test scores as a major indicator for evaluating teachers, citing the technical problems associated with using scores from standardized student assessments in value-added statistical models.

Does the United States need a national curriculum?

The U.S. Department of Education presents the view that, since the developers of the Common Core Standards and the proposed assessments have been groups with state representation rather than the federal government, neither program is a federal initiative. (U.S. Department of Education, 2010, March 13). In March 2011, the Albert Shanker Institute issued a call for common curriculum guidelines (Albert Shanker Institute, 2011; Gewertz, C. 2011, March). This document voices the concern that common assessments are being developed from the common standards with no curriculum in between. In May 2011, another group published an article with a

different view: “Closing the Door on Innovation: Why One National Curriculum is Bad for America” (2011), discussed by Gewertz, C. (2011, May). The article also cites the prohibition against a federal curriculum contained in the 1965 ESEA.

References

Albert Shanker Institute. (2011, March 7). A call for common content: Core curriculum must build a bridge from standards to achievement. Retrieved from http://www.ashankerinst.org/curriculum.html

Baker, E.L., Barton, P.E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H.F., Linn, R.L., Ravitch, D., Rothstein, R., Richardson, R.J. & Shepard, L.A. (2010, August). EPI briefing paper: Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers. Retrieved from Economic Policy Institute: http://epi.3cdn.net/b9667271ee6c154195_t9m6iij8k.pdf

Carmichael, S. M., Martino, G., Porter-Magee, K. & Wilson, W.S. (2010, July). The state of state standards--and the Common Core--in 2010. Retrieved from http://www.edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2010/201007_state_education_standards_common_standards/SOSSandCC2010_FullReportFINAL.pdf

"Closing the Door on Innovation: Why One National Curriculum Is Bad for America." Retrieved from http://www.k12innovation.com/Manifesto/_V2_Home.html

Common Core Standards Initiative. (2010). Common Core Standards Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org

Cronin, J., Dahlin, M., Adkins, D. & Kingsbury, G.G. (2007, October). The proficiency illusion. Retrieved from http://www.edexcellence.net/publications-issues/publications/theproficiencyillusion.html

Gewertz, C. (March 7, 2011). Leaders call for shared curriculum guidelines. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/03/09/23curriculum.h30.html?tkn=SONFPm%2FzvbaH3lJupk0%2FYdzDaTb7O0ajGL04&cmp=clp-edweek

Gewertz, C. (May 9, 2011). Conservative 'Manifesto' Blasts Shared Curriculum, Tests. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/curriculum/2011/05/conservative_manifesto_blasts.html

Rothman, R. (2009, December 19). Common Standards: The time is now. Issue Brief. P.5. Retrieved from http://www.all4ed.org/files/TheTimeIsNow.pdf

TIME. (2010, September 9). TIME poll results: Americans' views on teacher tenure, merit pay, and other education reforms. Retrieved from http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2016994,00.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2010, March 13). Elementary and Secondary Education: ESEA reauthorization: A blueprint for reform. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/index.html

Produced by the LWVUS The Education Study: The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

© 2011 by the League of Women Voters of the United States