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I. INTRODUCING: THE COMMON CORE
What are the Common Core State Standards (CCSS)?

- Common standards in English and Math, K-12
- Aligned with College and Career Readiness (CCR)
- State-led effort to develop content standards common across multiple states
- Initiative led by NGA (governors) and CCSSO (chiefs)

Key Concepts:
- Fewer (focused)
- Clearer (coherent progressions)
- Higher (rigorous)
Where did the CCSS begin?

- Built on work of Achieve, ACT, and College Board
- Began with the American Diploma Project (ADP)
  - State by state, K-12/postsecondary alignment
  - ACT defines cut scores for “college-readiness” benchmark
  - Convergence of expectations across states
- Achieve Publication, 2008: “Out of Many, One”
Why now?

- Uneven expectations across states = uneven preparation of students
  - High school achievement FLAT over last 20 years
  - Fifty sets of state expectations = unnecessary duplication of cost

- New world economy = working in context of global competition
  - International competition growing at fierce rate
  - New workforce demands higher level skills for success
How are the CCSS different?

- Focus on ends (standards), not means (instruction)
- Evidence-Based, Internationally Benchmarked, Addresses Higher Order Skills
- State-led, not Federal mandate: states choose whether to adopt (adoption is voluntary)
- Potential for common expectations across multiple states
Distinguishing Features

- **Clarity**: the standards are focused, coherent, and clear. Clearer standards help students, parents and teachers understand what is expected.

- **Consensus**: the standards are both college- and career-ready. They help prepare students with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in all of their post-high-school pursuits (college and the workforce).

- **Consistency**: common standards across states mean consistent expectations for all – not varying expectations dependent on zip code.
Common Core State Standards allow:

- **Collaboration:** The standards create a foundation to work collaboratively across states and districts, pooling resources and expertise, to create curricular tools, professional development, common assessments and other materials.

- **Competition:** Since the standards are internationally benchmarked, they ensure our students (the ones who meet the standards!) are globally competitive.
II. Standards Development
Process and Timeline

- February 2009
  - NGA and CCSSO announce CCSS initiative
- June 2009 to March 2010
  - Drafting of standards
- March 2010
  - Draft K-12 standards released for public comment
- April 2010
  - Standards revised based on comments
- May 2010
  - Final standards validated and released for adoption
Drafting the Standards

- Standards written by core writing teams in ELA and Math
  - Develop CCR Standards for HS Graduation
  - Back-map CCR into K-12 learning progressions
- Standards and progressions based on 3 types of evidence
  - Standards from high-performing countries and states
  - Nationally regarded curriculum frameworks
  - Research on literacy, math, and cognitive development
- Multiple rounds of feedback from states, K-12 and postsecondary faculty, national organizations, researchers, feedback group, and validation committee
Unique Features of ELA Standards

- Reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language
- Literature AND informational text across the disciplines
- Focus on text complexity, quality, and range (not just quantity)
- Analytical writing based on reasoning and evidence
- Informational text requirement allows elementary teachers to add science and social studies back into curriculum
Unique Features of Math Standards

- Builds core conceptual understandings first, then moves students into higher order skill development
  - K-5: whole numbers and their functions, fractions, decimals
  - 6-8: algebra, geometry, probability, statistics
  - 9-12: applications, real-world challenges, modeling
- Includes both concepts and skills
- Includes standards for mathematical practice
  - reasoning, problem solving, modeling, decision making
- Finishes with model (not required) math course pathways
III. ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION
Adoption – 44 states and DC have adopted

- 42 states and DC have fully adopted both the ELA and math standards; Minnesota has adopted only the ELA standards; Washington has “provisionally” adopted both ELA and math standards (waiting on legislative action)

- Voluntary adoption; varying processes in states

- 100% of standards adopted; another 15% add’l “leeway”

- Race to the Top as incentive/disincentive

- Adoption is “authorization by state body” – Adoption is NOT implementation!
Implementation will require:

- **Resources, tools, and time:** allowing K-12 and HE educators to understand the common core standards and change classroom practice to align with expectations.
- **Instructional Materials:** aligned to common standards.
- **Assessments:** aligned to common standards, and able to:
  - measure student progress
  - inform instructional improvement
  - address accountability requirements
- **Policies:** re-examined at Federal, state, and district levels to ensure support of CCSS implementation.
Assessment Development – PARCC and SBAC

- PARCC – Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers
  - Lead state and fiscal agent: Florida
  - Assessment Development Partner: Achieve
  - 25 States: 15 Governing, 10 Participating
  - Topic-focused tasks and comprehensive assessment

- SBAC – Smarter-Balanced Assessment Consortium
  - Lead state and fiscal agent: Washington
  - Assessment Development Partner: WestEd
  - 29 States: 17 Governing, 12 Participating
  - Integrative tasks and adaptive assessment
IV. POSTSECONDARY IMPLICATIONS
Implications for Higher Education

If the Common Core State Standards are implemented well, higher education could reap many benefits:

- Increased proportion of college-ready matriculants
  - Decreased remediation need
  - Increased first-year success rate
- Increased year to year retention rate
  - Decreased time to degree
  - Increased graduation rate
What will it take to realize these benefits?

Higher Education must be a full partner in implementation

- Expertise (ultimate!) about expectations for postsecondary
- ONLY constituency able to provide coherent definition of college-readiness
- Whether or not state has adopted Common Core, need consensus across sectors and clear messaging
  - If we don’t define college-ready, who will???
What can higher education do?

- Provide postsecondary voice in assessment development
- Adopt CCR assessments at postsecondary level, and use to guide placement and, possibly, admission decisions
- Examine entry-level courses to align with CCR expectations
- Align teacher preparation programs and professional development to expectations of standards
- Collaborate with K-12 at all levels (national, state, local)
Serving the Underserved: Can the Common Core help?

If the Common Core State Standards are implemented well, how might underserved students benefit?

What are some barriers to underserved student success?

Does the implementation of the Common Core reduce or exacerbate these barriers?

What must we do to ensure that underserved students are not excluded from the benefits of the Common Core?
What Can Access Programs Do to Help?

- Are there ways that access programs can take advantage of a state’s adoption of the Common Core State Standards?
  - What types of wraparound support services are most likely to help underserved students achieve college readiness?
  - Can resources be shifted such that certain services are discontinued (perhaps preparation assistance), while others are amplified (perhaps assistance in applying for financial aid)?
  - Is there a need for directed messaging – such as, “if you master the CCSS, you are likely to succeed in college” – to increase college-going rates among underserved students?

- What about states that haven’t adopted the CCSS?
V. SHEEO ENGAGEMENT
Continuing Engagement in College Readiness Initiatives

- SHEEO was engaged with the American Diploma Project, Gates Improving High Schools Initiative (2005)
- SHEEO Executive Committee - letter of support (July 2009)
- SHEEO staff served on advisory board for development of Common Core State Standards (2009-10)
- SHEEO staff currently serving on higher education advisory boards of both assessment consortia (PARCC and SBAC)
- Multifaceted approach to engaging postsecondary leaders
Increasing Awareness, Building Understanding

- Provide Background
  - ACE, Achieve: Paper on elements of HE Engagement

- Convene Regional Meetings
  - WICHE meeting; MHEC outreach; SREB advisors (Hunt)

- Connect to State Leaders Outside Postsecondary
  - Hunt Institute; CSG State Roundtables
Fostering Engagement in Implementation

- **Assessment**
  - Hewlett Grant: PARCC, SBAC, Hunt

- **Teacher Education**
  - Alliance states: NCATE, AACTE, CCSSO

- “Wraparound” Standards Implementation
  - AASCU, CCSSO; Lumina, Hewlett
MORE COMMON CORE INFO:

WWW.CORESTANDARDS.ORG
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