



# Arizonans Against Common Core



## “Arizonans Against Common Core” Rebuttal of the Arizona Department of Education’s (AZED’s) - Common Core “Myths vs. Facts”



**Myth:** The Arizona Common Core Standards are national standards.

**Fact:** The standards were developed through a state-led initiative spearheaded by governors and state school chiefs. The federal government was not involved in the development of the standards.

**Truth #1:** A nonprofit organization called [Achieve, Inc., in Washington, D.C.](#) is the main driving force behind creating the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI). The Common Core (CC) standards were initiated by private interests in Washington, D.C. From the [Achieve, Inc. website](#): "To this day, Achieve remains the only education reform organization led by a Board of Directors of governors and business leaders. This unique perspective has enabled Achieve to set a bold and visionary agenda over the past 15 years, leading Education Week in 2006 to rank Achieve as one of the most influential education policy organizations in the nation."

"Eventually the creators of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI) realized the need to present a facade of state involvement, and therefore, enlisted the [National Governors Association \(NGA\)](#) {a trade association that doesn't include all governors}, and the [Council of Chief State School Officers \(CCSSO\)](#), another DC-based trade association. **Neither of these groups have grant authority from any particular state or states to write the standards.** The bulk of the creative work was done by Achieve, Inc., a DC-based nonprofit that includes many progressive education reformers who have been advocating national standards and curriculum for decades. Massive funding for all this came from private interests such as [The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.](#)"



**Myth:** The standards are federally mandated.

**Fact:** The standards are not federally mandated. Arizona, along with 45 other states, voluntarily adopted the standards.

**Truth #2:** Arizona, like many other states, was failing to meet the requirements for the No-Child-Left-Behind Act which was signed into law in 2001 by President George W. Bush. Arizona was also in a budget crises and not able to balance their books in 2009-2010. **States were hooked into the Common Core movement with Race-to-the-Top (RTTT) grants they applied for in 2009-2010, and with that application, they were allowed to apply for "No-Child-Left-Behind (NCLB) Waivers" if they adopted the CCSSI verbatim!** Subsequently, each state was allowed to add 15% to these federal standards under the Common Core 15% Rule only *after* they adopted these CCSSI standards verbatim. [Read more on the "State Adoption of the Common Core: the Standards 15 Percent Rule."](#) AZ was one of those states that adopted the 15% Rule.



# Arizonans Against Common Core



**Myth: The Common Core shifts control of education from local school boards to the federal government.**

**Fact:** Local school boards retain their same level of authority as they had prior to the adoption of the standards.

**Truth #3:** Under Common Core, Local school districts will now be reporting personal student data in the State Longitudinal Database system (SLDS) to the AZED. This student data is then shared with other states *and* the federal government. What is being tracked? The State Longitudinal Database Systems (SLDS) are being developed to track our students- from preschool through college! From the SLDS website, this is what is tracked: "a unique identifier for each student; student enrollment history; tracks if a student drops out or switches schools; tracks students test scores; matches student performance to teachers; tracks transcripts of students in courses they have taken and their grades; tracks student data if they were enrolled in "remedial" classes; tracks student data to determine if they are "prepared to success in college" and the SLDS has the ability to share this data with other preschool through postsecondary education data systems. This sounds like REAL ID on steroids doesn't it AZ?? Do we not have a Federal law called the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)? This is breaking Federal law!



**Myth: Common Core will impede the work of charter schools.**

**Fact:** Charter schools in Arizona generally support Common Core because they can keep their unique missions.

**Truth #4:** Eileen Sigmund, President of the AZ Charter's Association, stated on January 30, 2012, during the American Conservative Educators (ACE) debate on Common Core, that "All new 'Non-Profit' Charter Schools [Schools that accept Federal Funding] are required to adopt Common Core when they fill out their application." So only "For-Profit" Charter Schools [Schools that do not accept Federal Funding] are truly protected from Common Core and can keep their "unique missions."



**Myth: Arizona is locked into the Common Core and cannot make changes to the standards.**

**Fact:** Arizona is committed to staying the course and supporting the implementation of the Common Core. However, the State Board of Education can make changes to academic standards at any time. Good standards shouldn't change too often, but over time should evolve based on what is learned from research, from educators in the field, and from student assessments.

**Truth #5:** Same comment as in **Truth #2**. Arizona, like many other states, was failing to meet the requirements for the No-Child-Left-Behind Act which was signed into law in 2001 by President George W. Bush. **States were hooked into the Common Core movement with Race-to-the-Top (RTTT) grants they applied for in 2009-2010, and with that application, they were allowed to apply for "No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Waivers" if they adopted the CCSSI verbatim!** Subsequently, each state was allowed to add 15% to these federal standards under the Common Core 15% Rule only *after* they adopted these CCSSI standards verbatim. **States are "locked into" Common Core with these NCLB waivers and because they accepted Federal funding (RTTP grants) to implement Common Core.**



# Arizonans Against Common Core



**Myth: The Common Core won't prepare students for college and career.**

**Fact:** The Standards reflect the real-world expectations of what is necessary for students to succeed in higher education and the workforce, including critical-thinking, problem solving, and effective communication skills. To this end, the standards were developed using evidence that includes scholarly research; surveys on what skills are required of students entering college and workforce training programs; assessment data identifying college and career-ready performance; and comparisons to standards from high-performing states and nations, among other data. Together with highly trained, well-supported teachers, the Standards will better prepare Arizona students for college and career.

**Truth #6: Dr. Sandra Stotsky, a Common Core Validation Committee Board Member, who did not sign off on the English Language Arts Standards! Why?? Dr. Stotsky states, "Common Core's 'college readiness' standards for English Language arts and reading do not aim for a level of achievement that signifies readiness for authentic college-level work. They point to no more than readiness for a high school diploma (and possibly not even that, depending on where the cut score is set). Despite claims to the contrary, they are *not* internationally benchmarked. States adopting Common Core's standards will damage the academic integrity of both their post-secondary institutions and their high schools precisely because Common Core's standards *do not strengthen* the high school curriculum and cannot reduce the current amount of post-secondary remedial coursework in a legitimate way. **Their standards may lead to *reduced enrollment* in advanced high school coursed and to weakened post secondary coursework because Common Core's 'college readiness' ELA/R standard are designed to enable a large number of high school students to be declared 'college ready' and to enroll in post-secondary institutions that will have to place them in credit-bearing courses.** These institutions will then be likely under pressure from the United States Department of Education (USDE) to retain these students in order to increase college graduation rates." Read more of [Dr. Sandra's Stotsky's testimony before the Texas Legislature](#) here.**

**Dr. James Milgram, a Common Core Validation Committee Board member, who did not sign off on the Math standards! Why?? Dr. Milgram states, "The Common Core standards claim to be 'benchmarked against to international standards' but this phrase is meaningless. **They are actually two or more years *behind* international expectations by eighth grade, and only fall *further behind* as they talk about grades 8-12. Indeed, they don't even fully cover the material in a solid geometry course, or in the second year algebra course."** Read more of [Dr. Milgram's testimony before the Indiana State Senate Committee](#) here.**

**Heritage Foundation- Dr. Sandra Stotsky testified on: "Common Core's Standards Devastating Impact on Literary Study and Analytical Thinking." Dr. Stotsky said, "Little attention has been paid to the academic quality of the mathematics, literature, and writing standards that NGA and CCSSO developed, despite the fact that they were not internationally benchmarked or research-based. The fatal flaws in the Common Core English Language Arts (ELA) standards went unnoticed because over 45 state boards of education and/or their governors hastily adopted the standards in 2010, in some cases long before they were written or finalized. **Most states agreeing to adopt the Common Core English Language Arts standards may well have thought they were strengthening high school English coursework.****



# Arizonans Against Common Core



However, the architects of Common Cores ELA standards never claimed that their standards would do so."

**"Why do Common Core's architects believe that reading more nonfiction and 'informational' texts in English classes (and in other high school classes) will improve students' college readiness? Their belief seems to be based on what they see as the logical implication of the fact that college students read more informational than literary texts. However, there is absolutely no empirical research to suggest that college readiness is promoted by informational or nonfiction reading in high school English classes (or in mathematics and science classes)."**

**"A diminished emphasis on literature in the secondary grades makes it unlikely that American students will study a meaningful range of culturally and historically significant literary works before graduation. It also prevents students from acquiring a rich understanding and use of the English language. Perhaps of greatest concern, it may lead to a decreased capacity for analytical thinking."** Read [Dr. Sandra Stotsky's entire article posted on the Heritage Foundation website](#) here.



**Myth: The Common Core is not internationally benchmarked.**

**Fact: The Standards draw from the best existing standards in the country and are benchmarked to the top performing nations around the world, ensuring that our students are well prepared to compete with their peers abroad for the jobs of the future.**

**Truth #7: [Dr. Sandra Stotsky's, Common Core Validation Committee Member. Dr. Stotsky's testimony before the Texas Legislature, on the Common Core English Language Arts Standards:](#)**

**"Common Core's 'college readiness' standards for English language arts and reading do not aim for a level of achievement that signifies readiness for authentic college-level work. They point to no more than readiness for a high school diploma (and possibly not even that, depending on where the cut score is set). Despite claims to the contrary, they are not internationally benchmarked. States adopting Common Core's standards will damage the academic integrity of both their post-secondary institutions and their high schools precisely because Common Core's standards do not strengthen the high school curriculum and cannot reduce the current amount of post-secondary remedial coursework in a legitimate way."**

**"After the Common Core Initiative was launched in early 2009, the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers never explained to the public what the qualifications were for membership on the standards-writing committees or how it would justify the specific standards they created. Most important, it never explained why Common Core's high school exit standards were equal to college admission requirements without qualification, even though this country's wide ranging post-secondary institutions use a variety of criteria for admission."**





# Arizonans Against Common Core



**"Eventually responding to the many charges of a lack of transparency, the names of the 24 members of the 'Standards Development Work Group' were revealed in a July 1, 2009 news release. The vast majority, it appeared, work for testing companies. Not only did [Common Core State Standards Initiative] (CCSSI) give no rationale for the composition of this Work Group, it gave no rationale for the people it put on the two three-member teams in charge of writing the grade-level standards."**

"Another seemingly important committee, a Validation Committee, was set up with great fanfare on September 24, 2009. The 25 members of this group were described as a group of national and international experts who would ensure that Common Core's standards were internationally benchmarked and supported by a body of research evidence. **Even though several of us regularly asked to examine this supposed body of research evidence, it became clear why our requests were ignored. In December 2009, the Parent Teacher Association indicated the real role of this committee--more like that of a rubber stamp.** The PTA predicted that: "both sets of standards will be approved simultaneously in February 2010 by members of the Validation Committee." Why did it think so? Why did the Gates Foundation think so, too? **Vicki Phillips and Carina Wong published an article in the February 2010 issue of Phi Delta Kappan talking about Common Core's standards as if they had already been approved. The final version of these standards didn't come out until June 2010.** After submitting many detailed critiques from October 2009 to May 2010 in a futile effort to remedy the basic deficiencies of Common Core's English/reading standards, **I, along with four other members of the Validation Committee, declined to sign off on the final version.**"

**So the Common Core Validation Committee was asked to "approve" the CCSSI in February 2010 *before* the final version of the standards came out in June 2010?** The "international benchmarks" were also not revealed to the Common Core Validation Committee Members *and* they were *only* given a list of the 24 members on the 'Standards Development Working Group' which work for the Common Core Testing companies ([Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium {SBAC}](#) and [Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers {PARCC}](#)). **No conflict of interest there...really?! WOW!!**

**[Dr. Sandra Stotsky's testimony to the Heritage Foundation, on the Common Core English Language Arts Standards, entitled "How Common Core Standards Have Begun to Damage School Curriculum."](#)** She was also on Common Core Validation Committee. **She said in this article: "First, the Common Core standards require English teachers to emphasize skills, not literary or cultural knowledge. They do so because the Common Core 'college readiness' reading standards are empty skills, not academic standards.** Why do authentic academic standards matter? Only such standards can guide development of a coherent and progressively demanding literature/reading curriculum in K-12, and only such a curriculum can prepare students adequately for a high school diploma, never mind authentic college coursework. Skills, processes, and strategies by themselves cannot propel intellectual development or serve as an intellectual framework for any K-12 curriculum."



# Arizonans Against Common Core



**"Second, the Common Core standards require English teachers to teach 'informational' texts for over 50% of their reading instructional time. This is not what English teachers are trained to teach.** But that isn't the most serious problem with this requirement. It eliminates authentic literary study as the focus of the secondary school English class, makes construction of a coherent literature curriculum impossible, and allows use of a large number of seeming 'informational' texts that are actually intended to promote attitude-formation."

**"Third, the Common Core college readiness standards are designed to lead to a uniform, federally controlled, and intellectually undemanding curriculum.** The two testing consortia that were funded by the [United States Department of Education] (USDE) to develop the common tests were also expected to develop curriculum guidelines or models. After all, tests must be based on the kinds of materials students are expected to have studied. **That is why Common Core's ELA standards' were not internationally benchmarked. Skills cannot be benchmarked.** "The current administration seeks to make all students college-ready, but the testing consortia have not indicated what readability level 'college readiness' means."

**Dr. James Milgram, Common Core Validation Committee Member.** This is his testimony to Indiana's State Education Committee on the Math Standards: "The Common Core standards claim to be 'benchmarked against the international standards' but this phrase is meaningless. **They are actually two or more years behind international expectations by eighth grade, and only fall further behind as they talk about grades 8-12. Indeed, they don't even fully cover the material in a solid geometry course, or in the second year algebra course.**"

"But- as someone who was at the middle of overseeing the writing process- my main duty on the [Council of Chief State School Officers] (CCSSO) Validation Committee- it became clear that the professional math community input to [Common Core State Standards Initiative] (CCSSI) was often ignored, which seemed not to be the case with the Indiana Standards. A particularly egregious example of this occurred in the sixth and seventh grade standards and commentary on ratios, rates, proportion and percents, where there are a number of serious errors and questionable examples. But the same issues are also present in the development of the basic algorithms for whole number arithmetic the most important topic in grades 1-5. **It was argued by some people on the Validation Committee that we should ignore such errors and misunderstandings as they will be cleared up in later versions, but I didn't buy into this argument, and currently there is no movement at all towards any revisions.**"

**How do they compare to the International standards? "As I indicated above, they are more than two years behind international expectations by eighth grade.** The top countries are starting algebra in seventh grade and geometry in eighth or ninth. By the end of ninth grade the students will have learned all of the material in a standard geometry course, all the material in a standard algebra I course, and some of the most important material in a standard algebra II course. This allows a huge percentage of them to finish calculus before graduating high school."



# Arizonans Against Common Core



**Myth:** Arizona's old standards are better than the Common Core Standards.

**Fact:** The Standards have been well-received and are regarded by most commentators – across the political spectrum – as an improvement on the state standards they replace. For example, in a recent analysis, the Fordham Institute found that the Common Core is an improvement over the Arizona's past standards.

**Truth #8:** Are there any federal standards better than another- NCLB vs. Common Core? Where are the international benchmarks to prove that Common Core is so much better than NCLB? Why aren't these "international standards" posted on the AZED website for AZ residents to review? As stated in **Truth #6 and #7**, these Common Core standards were not internationally benchmarked and they will not make our students more college ready! *When* is the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI) and the AZED going to stop lying that these Common Core Standards are Internationally Benchmarked?? Inquiring minds would like to know?!

The Common Core Standards are not "well received" by teachers and parents of AZ. **On March 7, 2013, the Maricopa County GOP Executive Guidance Council voted unanimously on a Resolution rejecting all of Common Core!** This Resolution also gave notice to the Arizona Legislature and the Education Community in Maricopa County that the entire philosophy and program of Common Core should be rejected!

On the second point made by AZED that Common Core "is an improvement over Arizona's past standards"- Jonathan Butcher, from the Goldwater Institute stated in his article, *Common Core Standards Drive States Off a Cliff* (<http://goldwaterinstitute.org/blog/common-core-standards-drive-schools-cliff>), "**Arizona's prior standards treated 'literary and non-literary texts distinctly and thoroughly and in more detail than the Common Core,' though there were other areas of Arizona's standards that did need improvement, according to the Thomas B. Fordham Institute.** California's standards, and those of some high-achieving nations, require more preparation for Algebra I; and the content of the Common Core for Geometry and Algebra II is weaker than the standards formerly in place in Massachusetts and California."

"This hodgepodge of adjustments and push towards homogenization creates a 'race to the middle,' according to Pioneer Institute experts Dr. Sandra Stotsky and Ze'ev Wurman. Ms. Stotsky served on the Common Core Validation Committee, but did not sign off on the standards; and Mr. Wurman served on the commission that evaluated the standards for implementation in California."

"The standards also won't prepare our students for competitive colleges and universities. Pioneer points out that in 2010, Common Core authors admitted before the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education that the focus on college readiness when they were developing the standards was 'minimal and focuses on non-selective colleges.'"



# Arizonans Against Common Core



**Myth:** The Common Core Standards are a curriculum that tells teachers what to teach.

**Fact:** The Standards are not a curriculum. Rather, they are a set of goals that outline what students should be able to know and do in each grade in English and math. Decisions about how to teach the standards (e.g. curriculum, tools, materials and textbooks) are left to local decision-makers who know their students best.

**Truth #9:** Curriculum is being developed by the major publishing companies- Pearson, McGraw Hill, Scholastic and Harcourt- to name a few, to implement the Common Core State Standards Initiative:

<http://corecommonstandards.com/blog/category/common-core-workbooks/>

<http://commoncore.pearsoned.com/>

<http://www.commoncoresolutions.com/>

<http://www.scholastic.com/commoncore/>

<http://www.hmhededucation.com/commoncore/index.php>

Common Core “Curriculum” is listed on these websites! Common Core State Standards dictate Curriculum changes. Most of our school districts use the Harcourt books in the classrooms, by the way.



**Myth:** Implementing the Common Core will not require any big changes in teaching or learning.

**Fact:** The Common Core will require new methods of teaching that lead students to become critical thinkers and problem solvers with higher levels of subject mastery. Arizona teachers will need additional training and time to adopt more innovative instructional methods and deepen their content knowledge.

**Truth #10:** Common Core will not make our students “critical thinkers” (see Truth #6 and #7).

New computer software, new textbooks and new instructional material, additional teacher training, new computer databases (State Longitudinal Database Systems- SLDS) and new assessment tests (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers- PARCC) will need to be taught to all of the school teachers to implement Common Core. This sounds like “big changes,” don’t you agree? **"AccountabilityWorks, in their study of Common Core, estimated that the total additional costs (one-time plus a 7-year time period for implementation) to state taxpayers will amount to \$15.8 billion across participating states. It does not include the cost of additional expenses or controversial reforms that are sometimes recommended to help students meet high standards, such as performance-based compensation or reduced class sizes.** This estimate includes the following new expenses for the states: \$1.2 billion for participation in the new assessments; \$5.3 billion for professional development; \$2.5 billion for textbooks and instructional materials; and \$6.9 billion for technology infrastructure and support." Read more from the ["National Cost of Aligning States Localities to the Common](#)





# Arizonans Against Common Core



[Core Standards" by AccountabilityWorks](#). Did the AZED perform a cost analysis before Common Core was adopted in June 2010? No!



**Myth: The Common Core does not have enough emphasis on fiction and literature.**

**Fact:** While there is a shift towards including informational text in the standards, literature is included. The Standards require certain critical content for all students, including: classic myths and stories from around the world, America's Founding Documents, foundational American literature, and Shakespeare. Appropriately, the remaining crucial decisions about what content should be taught are left to state and local determination. In addition to content coverage, the Standards require that students systematically acquire knowledge in literature and other disciplines through reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

**Truth #11:** As stated in **Truth #6**, by Dr. Sandra Stotsky, she said "**First, the Common Core standards require English teachers to emphasize skills, not literary or cultural knowledge. They do so because the Common Core 'college readiness' reading standards are empty skills, not academic standards.** Why do authentic academic standards matter? Only such standards can guide development of a coherent and progressively demanding literature/reading curriculum in K-12, and only such a curriculum can prepare students adequately for a high school diploma, never mind authentic college coursework. Skills, processes, and strategies by themselves cannot propel intellectual development or serve as an intellectual framework for any K-12 curriculum."

"**Second, the Common Core standards require English teachers to teach 'informational' texts for over 50% of their reading instructional time. This is not what English teachers are trained to teach.** But that isn't the most serious problem with this requirement. It eliminates authentic literary study as the focus of the secondary school English class, makes construction of a coherent literature curriculum impossible, and allows use of a large number of seeming 'informational' texts that are actually intended to promote attitude-formation."

"**Third, the Common Core college readiness standards are designed to lead to a uniform, federally controlled, and intellectually undemanding curriculum.** The two testing consortia that were funded by the [United States Department of Education] (USDE) to develop the common tests were also expected to develop curriculum guidelines or models. After all, tests must be based on the kinds of materials students are expected to have studied. **That is why Common Core's ELA standards' were not internationally benchmarked. Skills cannot be benchmarked.** "The current administration seeks to make all students college-ready, but the testing consortia have not indicated what readability level 'college readiness' means."



**Myth: The math standard does not address algebra until high school.**

**Fact:** There is a great deal of algebra in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade standards and a strong focus on the prerequisites for algebra in the elementary grades. If a student is ready to move on to algebra in 8<sup>th</sup> grade or before, the decision will be made with the student's parents, teacher and school district, as has always been.

**Truth #12:** As stated in **Truth #7**, by [Dr. James Milgram, a Common Core Validation Committee Member](#). [This is his testimony to Indiana's State Education Committee on the Math Standards:](#) "The Common Core standards claim to be 'benchmarking against the international



# Arizonans Against Common Core



standards' but this phrase is meaningless. **They are actually two or more years behind international expectations by eighth grade, and only fall further behind as they talk about grades 8-12. Indeed, they don't even fully cover the material in a solid geometry course, or in the second year algebra course.**"

"But- as someone who was at the middle of overseeing the writing process- my main duty on the [Council of Chief State School Officers] (CCSSO) Validation Committee- it became clear that the professional math community input to [Common Core State Standards Initiative] (CCSSI) was often ignored, which seemed not to be the case with the Indiana Standards. A particularly egregious example of this occurred in the sixth and seventh grade standards and commentary on ratios, rates, proportion and percents, where there are a number of serious errors and questionable examples. But the same issues are also present in the development of the basic algorithms for whole number arithmetic the most important topic in grades 1-5. **It was argued by some people on the Validation Committee that we should ignore such errors and misunderstandings as they will be cleared up in later versions, but I didn't buy into this argument, and currently there is no movement at all towards any revisions.**"

**How do they compare to the International standards? "As I indicated above, they are more than two years behind international expectations by eighth grade.** The top countries are starting algebra in seventh grade and geometry in eighth or ninth. By the end of ninth grade the students will have learned all of the material in a standard geometry course, all the material in a standard algebra I course, and some of the most important material in a standard algebra II course. This allows a huge percentage of them to finish calculus before graduating high school."



**Myth: Common Core was developed quickly and with little public comment.**

**Fact:** The standards were developed by a thoughtful and transparent process led by the National Governors Association and Council for Chief State School Officers. The process relied on teachers, experts from across the country (including Arizonans), and feedback from key stakeholders and the general public. NGA and CCSSO received nearly 10,000 comments in response to the draft standards, which were incorporated into the standards.

**Truth #13:** As stated in **Truth #6**, by Dr. Sandra Stotsky, "**Eventually responding to the many charges of a lack of transparency, the names of the 24 members of the 'Standards Development Work Group' were revealed in a July 1, 2009 news release. The vast majority, it appeared, work for testing companies.** Not only did [Common Core State Standards Initiative] (CCSSI) give no rationale for the composition of this Work Group, it gave no rationale for the people it put on the two three-member teams in charge of writing the grade-level standards."

"Another seemingly important committee, a Validation Committee, was set up with great fanfare on September 24, 2009. The 25 members of this group were described as a group of national and international experts who would ensure that Common Core's standards were internationally benchmarked and supported by a body of research evidence. **Even though several of us regularly asked to examine this supposed body of research evidence, it became clear why our requests were ignored. In December 2009, the Parent Teacher Association indicated**



# Arizonans Against Common Core



**the real role of this committee--more like that of a rubber stamp.** The PTA predicted that: "both sets of standards will be approved simultaneously in February 2010 by members of the Validation Committee." Why did it think so? Why did the Gates Foundation think so, too? **Vicki Phillips and Carina Wong published an article in the February 2010 issue of Phi Delta Kappan talking about Common Core's standards as if they had already been approved. The final version of these standards didn't come out until June 2010.** After submitting many detailed critiques from October 2009 to May 2010 in a futile effort to remedy the basic deficiencies of Common Core's English/reading standards, **I, along with four other members of the Validation Committee, declined to sign off on the final version.**"

**So the Common Core Validation Committee was asked to "approve" the CCSSI in February 2010 before the final version of the standards came out in June 2010?** The "international benchmarks" were also not revealed to the Common Core Validation Committee Members *and* they were *only* given a list of the 24 members on the 'Standards Development Working Group' which work for the Common Core Testing companies ([Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium {SBAC}](#) and [Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers {PARCC}](#)). **No conflict of interest there...really?! WOW!!**

**Again, where was the "public review" in this process? It is all Washington, D.C. bureaucrats in this process! The Common Core Validation Committee was asked to approve the standards before the final version came out in June 2010 as well!**



**Myth: Arizonans were not involved in the creation of the standards.**

**Fact:** Experts from Arizona were involved in the development of the standards. One example includes Dr. William McCallum, the University Distinguished Professor of Mathematics and Head of the Department of Mathematics at the University of Arizona, who was one of the lead writers of the math standard. Sarah Baird, the 2009 Arizona Teacher of the Year, served on the Common Core State Standards Validation Committee. Arizona teachers, superintendents, staff from the Arizona Department of Education, and others were also involved in reviewing and providing input to the standards.

**Truth #14:** Yes, AZ was involved in developing the Common Core Standards. However, as stated in **Truth #12** for Math by Dr. James Milgram, **these math standards would put our children more "than two years behind international expectation by eight grade."** He also stated, "- my main duty on the [Council of Chief State School Officers] (CCSSO) Validation Committee- it became clear that **the professional math community input to [Common Core State Standards Initiative] (CCSSI) was often ignored,** which seemed not to be the case with the Indiana Standards. A particularly egregious example of this occurred in the sixth and seventh grade standards and commentary on ratios, rates, proportion and percents, where there are a number of serious errors and questionable examples. But the same issues are also present in the development of the basic algorithms for whole number arithmetic the most important topic in grades 1-5. **It was argued by some people on the Validation Committee that we should ignore such errors and misunderstandings as they will be cleared up in later versions, but I didn't buy into this argument, and currently there is no movement at all towards any revisions."**



## Arizonans Against Common Core



Second point, of the AZED of AZ being involved in the “creation” of Common Core Standards- **Sarah Baird, teacher in the Kyrene School District and a member of Common Core Validation Committee, was only a “rubber stamp” member on the Committee.** As stated in **Truth #7** by Dr. Sandra Stotsky, "Another seemingly important committee, a Validation Committee, was set up with great fanfare on September 24, 2009. The 25 members of this group were described as a group of national and international experts who would ensure that Common Core's standards were internationally benchmarked and supported by a body of research evidence. **Even though several of us regularly asked to examine this supposed body of research evidence, it became clear why our requests were ignored. In December 2009, the Parent Teacher Association indicated the real role of this committee--more like that of a rubber stamp.** The PTA predicted that: "both sets of standards will be approved simultaneously in February 2010 by members of the Validation Committee." Why did it think so? Why did the Gates Foundation think so, too? **Vicki Phillips and Carina Wong published an article in the February 2010 issue of Phi Delta Kappan talking about Common Core's standards as if they had already been approved. The final version of these standards didn't come out until June 2010.** After submitting many detailed critiques from October 2009 to May 2010 in a futile effort to remedy the basic deficiencies of Common Core's English/reading standards, **I, along with four other members of the Validation Committee, declined to sign off on the final version.**"