

Appendix C:

State responses

On November 25, 2002, almost three months before a draft report was first published, an initial draft of each state (or district) review was sent to the corresponding superintendents and deputy superintendents. This was done both as a check for accuracy and as a courtesy to those states whose documents were reviewed. The officials were asked to identify any inaccuracies in the report and to furnish us with any additional information and/or materials that might alter its findings, so that we could make the necessary corrections. We also offered to publish their responses in our report.

Twenty-eight states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense educational authority sent responses that are published in this section. (Several more states responded, with the request that their responses not be published.)

Notations or brackets in the margins of these pages show which of the states' comments or concerns led to changes in the report. This is done to minimize confusion, in that passages in these documents may refer to text in the review that has been deleted or modified, or to previous omissions that already have been added.

Alabama

Enclosed is Alabama's response to The Albert Shanker Institute's review of content standards for social studies. Overall, the review of content standards is accurate; however, some concerns and/or corrections have been noted. Please find on the enclosed pages comments that we would like to have included in this report.

Thank you for the opportunity to address the findings in your report. We appreciate your efforts concerning the educational opportunities offered to the students of the United States.

—Ed Richardson, State Superintendent of Education

Comments/Concerns

Summary

Dr. Gagnon: Criterion #2 *"The required topics must be teachable, in imaginative ways, within*

the limits of time teachers have, usually no more than 160 days each year, and in many districts as few as 40 minutes a day..."

"As in most state documents built on specific topics, teachers could not thoughtfully present the over many items for World and U.S. history in the school time available."

Response: According to the *Alabama Administrative Code*, Alabama requires secondary schools to schedule each student for 140 clock hours of instruction per subject—Rule 290 3 1.09(a). Additionally, 175 days of instruction are mandated **by law** in the state of Alabama (*Code of Alabama 1975*, §16 13 231). This legal protection of instructional time allows teachers the opportunity to probe and explore subject matter with students. Alabama's Course of Study Committee, composed of teachers, college professors, administrators, and business and professional persons, chose to present both World History and U.S. History as two-year courses. This provides a minimum of 350 days of instruction (280 clock hours) so that each course could be adequately and thoughtfully developed.

Particulars

Paragraph 2

Dr. Gagnon: "...dividing at 1500 leaves too little time for ideas and events of the early modern and modern eras that Americans must study to understand their place in the world and their legacy from Western civilization."

Response: Alabama's Course of Study Committee chose to present World History by dividing the course at 1500 A.D., which has been traditionally recognized as an approximate date for the beginning of the Renaissance. The early modern eras and modern eras of World History are taught in Grade 9 in anticipation of the future reinforcement of these pivotal points in history occurring in both the Grade 10 and Grade 11 United States History courses, which must be taken consecutively.

Dr. Gagnon: "...too many required topics cut chances to treat engaging political ideas and turning points in depth."

Response: Dr. Gagnon's second point discusses the number of topics to be taught. The Alabama Course of Study for Social Studies very clearly emphasizes the importance of teaching the "...critical issues and events that encompass historic, geographic, economic, and political literacy" (*Alabama Course of Study: Social Studies*, p. 98). The Course of Study Committee made a deliberate decision to strengthen both high school courses by presenting World History and U.S. History as two year course sequences. Of particular importance was extending the period of time spent in the instruction of post 1980 U.S. History so that students could become more aware of their world.

Paragraph 4

Dr. Gagnon: "...the Grades 10 and 11 courses obviously need to review and elaborate upon significant content from Grades 5 and 6, but active collaboration between middle and high school teachers could do much to cut needless repetition, provide more efficient reviews, and allow time for chosen studies in depth in all four courses."

Response: Concepts related to World and Alabama History as well as geography and civics are included in the chronological study of United States History in order to broaden the information presented to students in the lower grades. This allows the teacher to approach and discuss topics introduced earlier in greater detail. While this may appear to be repetitious, it encourages the study of social studies in an age-appropriate manner. For example, students

may be aware of a person or of an event, but would not have examined either in great detail because of the constraints of their maturity in the lower grades.

Paragraph 5

Dr. Gagnon: "...a teacher's guide on how to select and work out vital themes and questions on the adventures of democracy, and how to enliven them in a dramatic narrative, with insights from the social sciences and humanities."

Response: Dr. Gagnon's suggested teacher's guide that would assist teachers has been addressed by a second document produced in March 1999 and is titled *Pathways for Learning: Social Studies*. This document can be accessed on line with the address <http://www.al.sde.edu/html/home.asp>. Constructed by ten classroom teachers from around the state, these activities and strategies were developed to assist teachers in addressing the mandated standards and objectives of the *Alabama Course of Study: Social Studies*. In addition to numerous workshops held across the state for the purpose of professional development, this document enhances the successful methods already being employed by social studies teachers across the state.

Dr. Gagnon: "A focus on political education would also allow Alabama's grade 12 courses in American Government and Economics to be taught at markedly higher levels."

Response: The Alabama Course of Study Committee considered civic responsibility to be a vital portion of each student's education. For this reason, civics and political literacy are interwoven throughout the elementary and secondary school years and allow teachers in Alabama's Grade 12 courses in American Government the ability to teach "... a detailed study of the United States Constitution..." and "...the structure and workings of government at all levels in the state and nation." (*Alabama Course of Study: Social Studies*, p. 118)

California

Thank you for the advance copy of Paul Gagnon's *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*. I am glad that Mr. Gagnon has a positive view of California's history-social science.

His views reflect my own sentiments in many ways, and I am grateful to have such a distinguished teacher and scholar share my point of view. I do recognize that Mr. Gagnon's assessment is not completely positive, and in some ways, I do sympathize with his criticisms. Most notably, I share his view that clear and detailed standards are essential but that California's standards may be too ambitious within the current number of school days. But, as I said at the time, the standards were approved by the State Board of Education, "[d]on't let the perfect be the enemy of the good." While the standards may be less than perfect, they are proving to be sound guideposts for improving student achievement.

As you know, I am leaving my post as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Jack O'Connell, my successor, will be taking office on January 5, 2003, and he will also take seri-

ously the charge of improving public education and turning our children into active citizens.

If you have more questions about the involvement of the California Department of Education on this project, please direct such inquiries to Jack O'Connell. If you have questions about California's history-social science standards, please contact Thomas Adams, Administrator, Curriculum Frameworks, at (916) 319-0663.

—*Delaine Eastin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction*

Connecticut

At Commissioner Sergi's request I am attaching a response to your evaluation of our Social Studies Curriculum Framework produced in May, 1998. We would ask that our response be published in your report.

—*Dr. Betty J. Sternberg, Associate Commissioner, Division of Teaching and Learning*

Response to the Albert Shanker Institute's Evaluation of Connecticut's Social Studies Curriculum Framework

Connecticut's social studies framework is a true framework, rather than a curriculum. This is why the framework "fares badly" on a set of five criteria that are really designed for judging curriculum, not for judging standards. A true framework provides the basis for developing comprehensive local curriculum, without dictating details that are better left to district curriculum teams.

Connecticut does not "claim" local control—as a matter of policy, it empowers and supports local school districts. Connecticut has invested in the quality of its educators and educational leaders over a period of years, precisely for the purpose of enabling those individuals to make appropriate decisions. We believe that it is not necessary for a state education agency to adopt a paternalistic role by dictating every detail of content to local educators. As an organization devoted to raising the professional status of teachers, the AFT should be particularly appreciative of an approach that treats local educators as expert professionals.

Keeping in mind that most states provide frameworks, not prescriptive curricula, we believe that the following are 5 more appropriate "criteria for judging the worth of state standards" than those you have used:

- 1) Comprehensive: The framework outlines the scope of what students should know and be able to do in the subject area;
- 2) Balanced: The framework promotes an appropriate balance among key subdisciplines within a particular subject area (in the case of social studies, fields such as civics, history, and geography);
- 3) Foundational: The framework provides a level of detail—in Connecticut's case, through

performance standards—that provides local curriculum teams with the basis for writing more specific, grade-by-grade or course objectives;

4) Flexible: The framework leaves details of specific content—such as which specific historical dates and events should be memorized — to local curriculum writers, who appropriately translate standards into performance objectives based on local priorities and needs; and

5) Supported: The framework is supplemented by model documents and resources designed to assist local curriculum teams in carrying out the vision of the standards.

We are proud that Connecticut's social studies standards meet the above criteria, and have, according to local professionals who use the document, provided a solid basis for teachers to develop local curriculum. Expert local educators helped write these standards. Those same expert educators have enabled Connecticut to consistently score among the nation's highest on the tests that the authors of this report seem to value so highly. We owe our success to a policy of balanced collaboration between state education agency leadership and local professionalism.

Delaware

Thank you for the opportunity to review and respond to the excerpted pages about Delaware from the forthcoming Albert Shanker institute study, *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*. While we respect your evaluation of the Delaware Social Studies Curriculum Framework (1995) and the updated K-5, 6-8, 9-12 Social Studies Standards, End of Cluster Benchmarks, and Performance Indicators (2001) we do have some concerns that I would like to share with you about the review.

We do not think the documents should be separated and evaluated individually as they were in the Summary statement. They should be viewed as a whole. If this approach is taken, then our Standards, End of Grade Cluster Benchmarks, and Performance Indicators clearly meet Criterion #3 and #4 as indicated by your statements.

We also question your appraisal of our updated standards and benchmarks as "...vague and general as the originals..." In fact, the standards and benchmarks were not changed as a result of the review/revision we completed in 2001, but the Performance Indicators were changed significantly. The Standards are the overarching concepts we want students to know in civics, economics, geography, and history. The End of Cluster Benchmarks are the knowledge and skills we want students to demonstrate at the end of each designated grade cluster and the Performance Indicators are the content pathways to the standards. The updated Performance Indicators provide teachers with examples of content that can be used to help students achieve the End of Cluster Benchmarks. If these documents are evaluated as a whole then we believe we also meet Criterion #1.

You suggested that our Performance Indicators provide specificity for the four disciplines in the social studies standards, but fail Criterion # 2 because they are unteachable in the school time available. Yet later in the report you state, "From Performance Indicators, teachers

could find a common core of learning for citizenship, but only a) if they have local authority to choose and b) state tests are aligned with indicators, and offer a choice of questions." Does his statement indicate that we get partial credit for Criterion #2? The school districts in Delaware do have the local authority to choose which indicators they will use to develop curriculum or include in a specific course.

We are somewhat confused by your statements in the Particulars section of the report concerning the relationship between the state test and the indicators. Is this document a review of our Social Studies Standards or the Delaware Student Testing Program? None of the criteria refer to testing, yet several of the evaluative statements are based on the implied relationship between the standards and the state test.

In summary, we feel that the Delaware Social Studies Standards, End of Cluster Benchmarks, and Performance Indicators accurately reflect the complexity of a content area which incorporates four major social studies disciplines. The Standards provide a conceptual framework for the local districts to use when developing their curriculum guides. The End of Cluster Benchmarks identify what students should know and be able to do at the end of each grade cluster (K-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12), and the Performance Indicators provide specific examples of the content teachers may use without mandating a state curriculum.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review and respond to the study prior to its publication. I hope you will take our comments into consideration as you prepare the final report.

—Valerie A. Woodruff, Secretary of Education

Department of Defense Education Activity

At the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) we are always seeking ways to improve our instructional programs and are open to the benefits that accrue from objective, constructive criticism. We welcome the critical eye and expertise of serious scholars, and, we regularly invite the media to visit our schools and present their impressions of how successfully we are addressing the instructional needs of our students to the public. (e.g. 60 Minutes, CNN, The Wall Street Journal.) Given our consistent openness to observation and professional dialogue, we were quite disappointed in the superficial approach to assessing our curricular standards in Social Studies produced by Professor Gagnon for the Albert Shanker Institute.

We take serious exception to the findings of this report, based exclusively upon a Draft Standards document from the year 2000, which does not reflect our curricular standards as applied, or our comprehensive instructional approach to the teaching of that critical content area. We regret that, rather than initiating scholarly dialogue, or setting the groundwork for a peer review, the author chose to write rather than research. Had he inquired, he would have found that in Social Studies, as in all other content areas, we have performance tasks, student

work samples and written commentaries at every grade level. They are not posted on our Web site, because our teachers and administrators are involved in the continual refinement and adjustment of these critical features of a standards-based curriculum

Our objective is to maintain a dynamic approach to instruction that identifies those standards and tasks that truly assist a student's conceptual development and ability to apply knowledge. And, as stimulating an exercise as it might be, we are not interested in a political litmus test that evaluates teaching standards on their use of specific words, structures or items. We are only interested in standards that make the teaching and learning process more meaningful and successful for students. While the author may not respond positively to our approach, our students definitely do. On both the NAEP and the CTB TerraNova standardized tests, our students at all grade levels have scored above the national average in every subject area (including Social Studies) since DoDEA adopted a standards-based method that is highly responsive to students' needs and draws upon the expertise of our very talented teachers

Standards, as prescriptively written as they may be, have value only within a comprehensive system that includes regular collaborative work, materials and assessment review and adoption, continual professional development in content knowledge and best practices, and program monitoring. We regret that we were not given the opportunity to demonstrate to the author that a successful standards-based curriculum, or even the standards themselves, cannot be validly or reliably judged on paper.

—Yvonne L. Bolling, Chief, Social Studies/Policy Branch

District of Columbia

Requested Responses to “Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core”

I have shared your summary of the District of Columbia (DCPS) history/civics/social studies standards with Mrs. Roceal N. Duke, our social studies content specialist. I am using her written response in large part as the DCPS response to the Shanker Institute's summary.

The DCPS social studies, history and geography standards and benchmarks were developed through a grant in 1996. The seven strands were selected and designed in order to prepare well-informed and analytical readers of history who are intelligent judges of ideas, events and institutions past and present. The writer-researchers of the DCPS standards consulted the latest research on effective history and social sciences instruction. They examined the documents of other state, federal and independent projects on content standards. In our view, therefore, the DCPS standards document identifies the most vital aspects of United States and World history, and of the related social sciences, to be offered to all D.C. Public School students.

The DCPS social studies standards document has the same format as all of the other subject area standards documents. The design of these three columns—*performance standards, essential skills and technology integration*—was agreed upon by all of the content specialists and the Chief Academic Officer at the beginning of the standards revisions in 1998, and we intend to retain this design in our continued use and dissemination of the standards.

The D.C. Standards for Teaching and Learning have been under continuous review and revision since 1998. Additions and deletions have been made to all of the standards, including the social studies standards document, since they were first published. Writer-researchers have added unit plans, lesson plans, rubrics, performance descriptors and pacing charts that have made the standards documents more user friendly. Additional work on curriculum pacing charts is underway this month (December 2002) in order to strengthen and reorganize the content area. Performance standards and essential skills are also being reviewed for revision.

The D.C. Board of Education has mandated that all students complete 3½ Carnegie Units in social studies in order to graduate. These courses include 9th-grade D.C. History and Government and World Geography (½ Carnegie Unit each), 10th-grade World History (1 Carnegie Unit), 11th-grade American History (1900 to the present) (1 Carnegie Unit), 12th-grade American Government (½ Carnegie Unit). Additionally, Eastern and Western hemisphere geography are required in grades 6 and 7, respectively, in order to provide students instruction to strengthen their knowledge of the world and world events, past and present. These classes include the history, culture and resources of the continents and countries of the world and their physical and human likenesses and differences. Map skills are also emphasized in these classes. These classes have been designed to build a bridge from one subject to the other.

DCPS views its standards documents as drafts that will be subject to continued revision and improvement during the coming years. At the same time, we believe we are not significantly out of line with the quality and content of social studies standards to be found in other states. For example, in the National Alliance for Civic Education-Civic Requirements and Guidelines Report it is stated that *"Nearly every state and the District of Columbia have also instituted standards that in some way incorporate civics content. Twenty-three states and the District of Columbia present their civics standards as explicit standards within their social studies standards and three states (Arkansas, Colorado and Vermont) have separate civics standards. Another 18 states integrate civics topics into their social studies or other subject standards."* In addition, DCPS has been awarded a 3-year grant from the Department of Education—Teaching American History Grant—for 2002 (\$997,959.00). We were one of 114 school districts in the United States to receive this grant to provide professional development to teachers through a partnership with The American University. *This grant was written using the current DCPS Social Studies Standards for Teaching and Learning.*

The Office of Academic Services of the District of Columbia Public Schools appreciates the opportunity to provide a response to the Shanker Institute's summary. The comments and suggestions for improving our social studies standards document will be taken into consideration as we continue to make revisions.

If you have further questions or need clarification to any of the points in this response, please contact either Roceal N. Duke at roceal.duke@k12.dc.us (e-mail) or 202/442-5646 (phone) or Nevin Brown at nevin.brown@k12.dc.us (e-mail) or 202/442-5148.

—Nevin Brown, Administrative Officer, Office of Academic Services

Georgia

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback to the Albert Shanker Institute for their study, *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*. Two documents are attached, one responding to the Report on Georgia, and the other an overview of our current curriculum revision process that began in the spring of 2002.

—Robynn Holland, Social Studies Program Specialist

Thank you for the information concerning, *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*. We are currently in the process of revising the social studies standards for Georgia. This work began in the spring and summer of 2002. Three important factors provided the impetus for revising not only the social studies standards, but also the standards for mathematics, science, and language arts. These factors were:

- In September of 2000, the State Board of Education called for an independent audit of the QCC. This audit was conducted in September of 2001 by a team from Phi Delta Kappa;
- In the February of 2002, the Education Coordinating Council cited the need to improve student performance in the area of mathematics; and,
- In January of 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act was passed.

A detailed description of the *Georgia Curriculum Revision Plan* is attached so you will have an understanding of our current work.

In the area of social studies, many of the conclusions drawn by the Albert Shanker Institute were stated in the 2001 Phi Delta Kappa curriculum audit. Members of the social studies curriculum revision committee, after careful research, also drew several of the same conclusions.

A few comments and questions concerning statements made on the page for Georgia:

- In the summary, you state “these pages” partly satisfy Criterion #1. Could you please clarify which pages you are referencing?
- If this report is for secondary schools, why then are Grades 4 and 5 mentioned in the report?
- The social studies educators on the revision committee concurred with the PDK audit that the standards for social studies were generally not clear or specific.
- I think everyone agreed with the PDK audit, from the revision committee to the classroom teachers, that the social studies standards are “too many or too broad”
- 3 units of social studies credit are required for graduation in Georgia. These units are 1 unit of U. S. History, 1 Unit of either World History or World Geography, ½ unit of Economics, and ½ unit of United States Government/Civics.
- All items for the standardized tests in Georgia must be linked to the QCC.
- The social studies curriculum revision committee also found that many of the standards for

social studies were vague, repetitive, and no guidance was given as to how these standards could be taught during the school year.

- Concerns have been cited by classroom teachers and the social studies curriculum revision committee as to the limited amount of history content currently included for grades 6 and 7.
- In the last sentence of the last paragraph on the Georgia page, it is suggested that veteran subject matter teachers and scholars should be asked to revise World history and Western civilization offerings, and change the U. S. history sequence to avoid the one-year high school survey. The scope and sequence of social studies courses are in fact being revised by veteran subject matter teachers and scholars, not only for World history but, for all content areas in social studies.

I appreciate your research and interest in this timely subject. I would be very interested in specific suggestions or insights you might have as to how to improve the social studies curriculum. Although the revision committee has completed much research, another voice is always appreciated.

Georgia's Content Standards

Georgia educators are developing broad-based content standards that will guide what students should know and be able to do from pre-kindergarten through the second year of post secondary studies in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Subsequent to the development of the broad-based content standards, Georgia's Quality Core Curriculum (QCC) standards in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies will be revised. The following paragraphs explain the history of the QCC, the factors that have precipitated its revision, and the plan and timeline for its revision.

Development and Previous Revisions

In 1985, the passage of the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) in Georgia mandated the creation of a state curriculum guide, the Quality Core Curriculum, as well as the establishment of 76 student competencies. In 1995, the establishment of a state School Improvement Panel brought about a wholesale revision of the QCC, which was completed in 1997 and implemented in 1998. The decision was made at that point to align future revisions of the QCC to precede the textbook adoption process for each specific content area. A six-year cycle was established to accomplish this rotation. Since 1997, both mathematics and science QCC standards have been revised. Mathematics QCC standards were revised during the summer of 1999, January of 2000, and July of 2000. The State Board approved these changes in December of 2000. Science QCC standards were revised during the summers of 1999 and 2000. However, the revisions in science QCC standards have not been presented to the State Board of Education for approval.

Recent Factors Impacting the QCC

Three important factors provided the impetus for revising Georgia's Quality Core Curriculum.

- In September of 2000, the State Board of Education called for an independent audit of the QCC. That audit was conducted in September of 2001 by a team from Phi Delta Kappa. The audit report, received by the State Board in December of 2001, indicated several areas

in which the QCC could be made stronger and become more effective in guiding instruction for teachers in Georgia. Among other findings, the audit cited lack of rigor and clarity in QCC standards. Further it reported gaps and redundancies in the standards in some content areas. The Curriculum Division of the State Department of Education developed a plan for the revision of the QCC based on two phases of development. The first phase involved research and data analysis; the second phase involved revision of grade level and course curriculum standards. This plan was presented to the State Board in March of 2002.

- In the February of 2002, the Education Coordinating Council cited the need to improve student performance in the area of mathematics. The Board of Regents agreed to lead such an initiative, and began work on a National Science Foundation grant application (PRISM) focusing on both mathematics and science instruction that included revision of the QCC in these content areas. The PRISM grant called for two phases of standards revision. The first phase involved the development of broad-based content standards at intermittent grade levels; the second phase focused on the revision of specific grade level and course curriculum standards.
- In January of 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act was passed. This legislation called for challenging academic content standards that would be applied to all children in the state. These standards were to:
 - Specify what children are expected to know and be able to do;
 - Contain coherent and rigorous content; and
 - Encourage the teaching of advanced skills.

This P-14 standards development and curriculum revision process involves the Department of Education, Board of Regents, Department of Technical and Adult Education, Office of School Readiness, and Professional Standards Commission. In June of 2002, the State Board contracted with the Professional Standards Commission for the services of Dr. Pam Adamson to coordinate the efforts of these state agencies to revise Georgia's QCC. Dr. Judy Monsaas from the Board of Regents is working with Dr. Adamson to make this a seamless P-14 process.

The Revision Process

A Curriculum Revision Leadership Team, comprised of representatives of the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, the Board of Regents, the Department of Technical and Adult Education, the Office of School Readiness, the Georgia Public Policy Foundation, the Southern Regional Education Board, the Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision, the Office of Planning and Budget, and local school systems, guides the revision process.

Phase I of the curriculum revision process, which will occur during the fall of 2002, will focus on three tasks:

1. The development of broad-based content standards for levels K, 3, 5, 8, 12, and 14. These content standards will provide the framework for specific grade level and course content standards development. This is the *Who Do We Want to Be?* step in the process.
2. The analysis of data regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the QCC (K-12). The data will include, but are not limited to, student performance data, including Criterion

Referenced Competency Tests, Georgia High School Graduation Tests, End-of-Course Tests (pilot data), National Assessment of Educational Progress, Scholastic Assessment Test, etc.; national reports on state curricula such as the Fordham Foundation, the American Federation of Teachers, *Education Week*, etc.; curriculum standards from other states that have demonstrated high performance or been recognized for strong standards; national content standards; and the curriculum audit. This is the *Who Are We?* step in the process.

3. The development of a blueprint for the revision of specific content standards for each grade level and course in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies (P-12). This is the *How Do We Get There?* step in the process. This step will include a discussion of high school course offerings in each of the content areas.

Over 70 curriculum experts from Georgia school districts, Regional Educational Service Agencies, University System of Georgia schools, Department of Technical and Adult Education schools, and the Office of School Readiness will work on the first phase of curriculum revision. They will represent 30 school districts, three technical colleges, eight University System of Georgia schools, and five Regional Education Service Agencies.

Phase II of the curriculum revision process, which will occur during the summer of 2003, will focus on revising specific content standards for all grades and all courses from pre-kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Phase II work will be accomplished through the combined efforts of Georgia teachers and curriculum experts. The standards will be written to incorporate the following:

- Clear and understandable language that will be teacher-friendly and effectively guide instruction;
- Advanced skills and higher level thinking;
- Horizontal alignment to maximize learning opportunities, and
- Vertical alignment to eliminate gaps and redundancies.

Throughout the process, the progress of the committees will be shared across Georgia. Regular updates on the curriculum revision process will be available online at this site.

Input will be sought from all of Georgia's educators and community members. When the State Board has approved the revised QCC, additional teaching resources will be developed, and state mandated student assessments will be adjusted to reflect the changes. Fall of 2004 is the projected date of implementation of the revisions.

Timeline

Phase I	Fall 2002
Phase II	Summer 2003
Professional Development	2003-2004 School Year 2004-2005 School Year
Resource Development	Fall 2003
Implementation	2004-2005 School Year

Idaho

Thank you for the opportunity to review your forthcoming study, *Educating; Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core* with particular attention to the pages referencing the Idaho Achievement Standards.

In clarification, the study views the Idaho Achievement Standards for Social Studies through three lenses: the Standards, the suggested K-12 social studies scope and sequence, and a reference to the Department's courses-of-study.

As a service to Idaho's 114 school districts, the Idaho Department of Education drew upon the expertise of current social studies practitioners to draft 10 integrated guides and/or courses-of-study corresponding to the suggested social studies courses for grades 4-12. Each guide/course-of-study demonstrates the possible integration through suggested activities and resources that support instruction defined by the Standards. The courses showcase a framework from which curriculum and instruction can be developed. Additionally, the courses have added specificity to the content knowledge and skills.

Though Idaho Code specifies the graduation requirements of two (2) credits in U.S. History, two (2) credits in American Government and one (1) credit in Economics, Idaho Code also specifies that:

"The standards set forth in Sections 250 through 954, inclusive, are state achievement standards that shall be the minimum standards used by every school district in the state in order to establish a level of academic achievement necessary to graduate from Idaho's public schools. Each school district may set standards more rigorous than these state achievement standards but no district shall use any standards less rigorous than those set forth in these Thoroughness rules. The implementation time and effective date for these Achievement Standards rules is the graduating senior class of 2005."

Consequently, as outlined in the "suggested" scope and sequence, districts are adding a requirement for World History so that all students will receive instruction according to the Standards for the History of Human Civilization and the Humanities Standards for World History.

The course, World History [Humanities], includes four specific instructional blocks:

1. Origins: 3000 B.C.-500 A.D.
2. Developing Societies: 400-1500
3. Conflict and Change: 1400-1917
4. Relationship: Post-World War I to Present

Within each instructional block, learning objectives and suggested activities are specified to add further definition to the content knowledge and skills identified.

The study references that "Grades 6 and 7 Geography and Cultures course lifts are wholly empty of specifics." This statement does not indicate what was reviewed in the study the Standards or the instructional guides. We have to assume that the reference is to the Idaho Achievement Standards for Social Studies: Middle School Geography since the guides were not posted online until November 26, 2002. Identified as Grade 6: Geography and Cultures Western Hemisphere and Grade 7: Geography and Cultures Eastern Hemisphere, the guides specify events, ideas, countries and regions.

Once more, thank you for the opportunity the preview the study.

—Dr. Dan Prinzing, Coordinator, Social Studies and Curricular Materials

Illinois

I am responding to your request for assistance regarding the study, *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*. It is unfortunate that Paul Gagnon has missed a substantial body of evidence that reinforces the Illinois Learning Standards.

Please look at the Performance Descriptors and Classroom Assessments that are available on our web-site at www.isbe.net. They can be found in the blue box in the middle of the home page. These descriptors are written to show the growth of knowledge, skills and reasoning throughout the K-12 grades. The descriptors are written for each standard and are set in 10 stages that could be used as grade-level or grade-cluster statements. These statements help educators to establish curriculum aligned to the standards and provide an avenue to teach to the standards at the classroom level.

The Illinois Learning Standards are actually established as a hierarchy of statements starting at the broader goal level and becoming more specific as they move through the benchmarks and performance descriptors. This helps to get into a middle ground between what your criteria describes as "an endless encyclopedia of specific topics and an array of vast headings, "themes" or "concepts." The Performance Descriptors were written by teams of teachers from all grade levels, university faculty, and members of organizations such as the National Geographic Alliance and the National Council of Economic Education. Please see the documents in the web-site that explain this in detail. They can be found with the Performance Descriptors.

The Illinois Learning Standards, Benchmarks and Performance Descriptors for social science have been rated 5th in the nation by the AFT in their last review. Our standards overall have been rated as 2nd in the nation by the same organization.

State-wide staff development has been established to help teachers in Illinois to implement the standards at the classroom level. The Standards Aligned Classroom initiative, for example, teaches a method of deconstructing the standards by using the descriptors to identify classroom level learning targets, which are teachable and assessable. Our data on this initiative has shown tremendous growth in the confidence of teachers to teach to the standards regardless of years of experience.

I hope the Shanker Institute will take the time to review the resources that have been developed to help teachers in Illinois teach to the Illinois Learning Standards.

—Richard Carlson, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Standards-Aligned Learning

Indiana

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your findings in regard to Indiana's Academic Standards in Social Studies.

I am happy to see that the Shanker Institute recognizes the work and care that was put into the development of the Standards, which I believe are very good. The social studies consultant and teachers from schools across the state used their knowledge, experience, research, and expert assistance to produce the standards. I do agree with the assertion that two of the high school courses may suffer from the challenge of topic overload. This is especially true for the course World History and Civilization.

As we begin to develop the test specifications for the Core 40 end-of-course assessments for World History and Civilizations, the committee has indicated that the number of indicators and topics are too numerous to be handled easily in a two-semester course. I have heard similar concerns expressed about the U.S. Government course. We were advised by numerous independent entities, including the Fordham Foundation, the National Council for History Education, and the National Council on Economic Education, that all of the indicators were relevant to the courses, and should be included.

We expect that these courses could benefit from some refinement and paring down as suggested by the report. This is made especially true as we continue to develop the Core 40 end-of-course assessments and must develop a "test map" to the standards.

We do assert that the amount of material in the U.S. History sequence in Grades 5, 8, and 11 is appropriate. Many of the social studies professional organizations, like the Geography Educators Network and the Indiana Council for Economic Education, are providing inservice training to teachers demonstrating how to integrate content within the social studies, as well as across content areas. For these reasons, I disagree with the report's assertion that there is too much content in the K-8 Academic Standards for the Social Studies.

—Dr. Suellen Reed, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Kentucky

In Kentucky, we believe the experts on what students need to know and be able to do are the ones who are in our classrooms every day working with our students—the teachers. Kentucky educators from across the state were involved in the writing of Kentucky's social studies standards. The social studies program, primary through high school, includes essential content from five areas of social studies: government and civics, culture and society, economics, historical perspective, and geography. In addition to specifying social studies content, the bulleted items provide connections to Kentucky's Learning Goal 5 (Think and Solve Problems) and

Goal 6 (Connect and Integrate Knowledge). These connections provide a more comprehensive link between essential content and the skills and abilities important to learning.

At the primary level, the essential content descriptions for the five social studies areas are not course or grade-level descriptions. Rather, they describe a comprehensive and integrated social studies program to be completed during the primary school experience. Although the social studies program for the primary grades is divided into five areas, each area is designed to interact with the others in an integrated fashion. Because of this integration, students develop broad concepts of social studies. This style of learning reflects the developmental nature of children.

The intermediate and middle school required content is devised so that districts/schools can arrange the content in a way that best meets their curricular needs. For example, the content may be provided in a chronological manner (e.g., United States history, colonization to modern times), in a thematic way (e.g., Kentucky studies through a geographic perspective), or another configuration the district/school may choose.

The high school social studies program is designed to provide an integrated and comprehensive course of study. Each discipline description contains connections to other areas of the social studies. Because of this design, students will experience the richness and complexity of the social studies. The essential content descriptions for the five social studies disciplines are not course descriptions. Rather, they are descriptions of the essential content to be found in each of the five specified areas of the social studies. Bulleted points denote the required content.

In addition, each content description includes connections to other social studies areas to create an integrated focus. Lists in parentheses (designated with an "e.g.") are suggestions for instruction and are not meant to be comprehensive.

Criterion #1: Standards

In Kentucky, we believe that students should be able to use what they learn in school to function at a high level in real world situations. The broad statements you refer to are all tied to our academic expectations that state clearly for teachers what students should know and be able to do in the real world when they leave our schools. There is nothing implied in those expectations. Teachers, along with many other stakeholder groups, were represented in writing our standards. The people who work most directly with children in Kentucky classrooms have been the most influential in writing our standards.

Criterion #2: Time

The issue of time that you mentioned further makes the point for why our standards are written the way they are. Teachers teach big ideas and concepts and use supporting information that best helps students apply this information to their lives. The big ideas and concepts are common across the standards' documents such as democracy, justice, equity, etc. However, the illustrative examples a teacher uses in his or her classroom is driven by the needs of students. Therefore, the time that teachers spend on various concepts will be differentiated depending on the needs of their students. Schools in Kentucky make curriculum decisions through school based decision making councils. Teachers, parents, and administrators who serve on school councils preside over curriculum issues. Therefore, school councils may decide to look at alternative scheduling models in order to best meet the needs of the students of that school.

Criterion #3: Scope and Sequence

Experienced Kentucky teachers and university faculty developed the scope and sequence of the social studies standards. Developmental appropriateness was considered as the standards were developed. This review insinuates that participants were not carefully selected for the important task of writing these standards. That suggestion is definitely incorrect.

Criterion #4: Requirements

The Program of Studies outlines the content that all Kentucky students must be taught in order to graduate from a Kentucky school. All content is required for all students. According to Kentucky's Program of Studies for social studies, "Three credits in social studies are required for high school graduation. These credits must incorporate the five social studies disciplines of U.S. history, economics, government, world geography, and world civilization. Districts and schools can arrange the essential content within the three credit requirement to best meet their needs. A local board of education may substitute an integrated, applied, interdisciplinary, or higher level course for a required course if the alternative course provides rigorous content and addresses the same academic expectations." Therefore, study of the disciplines listed above is not optional at all, as stated in your review.

Criterion #5: Integration

Kentucky standards support exactly what you are referring to in this section of your report. You state that, "Vital ideas and topics of civics, economics, and geography (and humanities wherever possible) must be pulled into the historical narrative of people in real times and places." That is exactly what Kentucky's standards in social studies require. When history is viewed through a political, economic, geographic and cultural lens, context is established for students. In Kentucky, each strand is required to be taught in an integrated fashion at each grade level. Therefore, from the beginning of their school experience, Kentucky students develop an integrated perspective on the world and the issues confronting our world, not just a collection of unlinked and unrelated facts.

—Gene Wilhoit, Commissioner of Education

Louisiana

We have received your correspondence informing us of the Albert Shanker Institute study *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core* that will be released in 2003. After having read through the criteria used in this study and the evaluation of the Louisiana Social Studies Content Standards, we would like to address some of the critical issues contained in the report.

The Louisiana Social Studies Content Standards document was developed in 1996 by a committee of experienced educators representing kindergarten through twelfth grade. These

educators were charged with developing content standards that would serve as a framework for the subsequent development of local curricula. The committee used national models, such as the revised National History Standards, as guides in the development process. The intent of the committee was that the strands identified in the state document would be integrated into the enacted social studies curricula at the district level.

To assist with the implementation of the content standards at the local level, the *Teachers' Guide to Statewide Assessment for Social Studies* was developed as a companion piece to the content standards document. This guide identifies the essential concepts, events, and historical figures that students need to know and comprehend in order to demonstrate mastery of the standards and benchmarks. The guide also includes 116 pages of sample assessment items that serve as models for teachers in developing standards-based instructional practices. Louisiana classroom teachers have cited the *Teachers' Guide to Statewide Assessment for Social Studies* as an excellent tool for implementation of the state social studies content standards.

Realizing that standards-based education is a dynamic process, the Louisiana Department of Education continues to explore and implement research-based initiatives that promote focused teaching and learning at the classroom level. A draft of grade-level expectations that identify key social studies concepts recommended at each grade-level from PreK through twelfth grade has been developed. This draft will be used as reference for the development of a final Social Studies Grade-Level Expectations document.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the evaluation of our Social Studies Content Standards and hope that our comments have clarified some of the issues. While we do not fully concur with the findings of your analysis, we recognize that this study is a worthwhile endeavor.

—Scott Norton, Ph.D., Director, Division Student Standards and Assessments

Massachusetts

The Massachusetts Department of Education received a request to review for accuracy your evaluation of our history and social science standards for the Institute's forthcoming publication, *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*.

The Commissioner and I are distressed to find that the wrong document—the 1997 document—was reviewed. Please do one of two things: either remove the evaluation of the 1997 document that is now being edited for the forthcoming study and replace it with the following information, or add this information to the evaluation:

“The Massachusetts Board of Education approved at its October 2002 meeting a complete revision of the Massachusetts History and Social Science Curriculum Framework. This document contains for each grade level, K-7, a single set of standards, concepts, and skills for history, civics/government, economics, and geography. It addresses the criticisms of the 1997 document that the Department received from history teachers and provides clear direction to

them on what will be covered on statewide assessments in grades 5 and 7. It also suggests a variety of curricular sequences for grades 8 to 12 that high schools may follow to address the July 2001 vote by the Board of Education requiring an end-of-course competency determination in United States history, from the founding period to the present, at the end of either grade 10 or 11. The Board-approved version of the new Massachusetts History and Social Science Curriculum Framework may be found on the Department's web site: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/updates.html>."

We appreciate your taking care of this problem immediately so that readers of this valuable study can read the correct information about our framework.

—David P. Driscoll, Commissioner of Education

[NOTE: The final draft does indeed concern the 2002 framework. See page 75.]

Michigan

Your recent letter to Superintendent Watkins has been forwarded to our office for response. Michigan has done a lot of work since your last review. While it is true that the content standards and benchmarks for social studies have not changed, we have done considerable work to clarify them.

The first project, The Michigan History Themes Project, was undertaken in consultation with a group of historians currently living and working in Michigan. The purpose of the project was to identify a set of important historic themes that all teachers should be using in the teaching of history. Additionally, the project identified at each grade level where history is the focus, 33 examples of important people or events that we believed best exemplified the themes. These examples were given to our item writers and are the basis for testing in Michigan. The examples are available through a link from our web site at the Michigan Department of Education to the Michigan EPIC web site, our original contractor for the Michigan History Themes Project.

The Michigan History Themes project has as its important and fundamental goal the linking of important historical information in ways that in your own words require students to be "armed with knowledge that makes democracy comprehensible, especially the complexity of its debates and human consequences of its choices."

Michigan, like most states, leaves decisions about curriculum to local school districts. However there exists a very consistent de facto sequence of instruction for all social studies disciplines in Michigan. The strength and clarity of our Social Studies MEAP test at grades 5, 8 and 11 has identified the "essential content" for all social studies disciplines. School districts throughout the state have responded by implementing the appropriate coursework. It is because of this consistency that we were able to write grade level content expectations for each grade Kindergarten to grade 8. This document is also available on our Michigan Department of Education web site.

Another effort to assist Michigan teachers is the newly completed Grade Level Content Expectations for Social Studies. The grade level content expectations documents provide three pieces of information to teachers. The first is grade appropriate benchmarks to focus class-

room instruction at each grade. Each benchmark is age appropriate and consistent with Michigan's de facto social studies curriculum. Next teachers are provided with specific performance indicators we have defined as acceptable evidence of students' understanding. Finally the document provides assessment examples that incorporate skills and processes reflected in the inquiry benchmarks.

And finally, MI CLiMB (Clarifying Language in Michigan Benchmarks) has been produced and distributed to every teacher in Michigan. The MI CLiMB project has been lauded around the state as a much needed tool that explains the benchmarks in English language arts, science, social studies, mathematics, and the fine arts in three ways. First a restatement of the benchmark is provided with an explanation of all technical terms, secondly an example of a classroom activity is provided and finally teachers are provided with an appropriate classroom assessment. Glossaries are included as well as cross subject search capabilities.

We thank you for the opportunity to read your comments and respond. I hope the more recent work referenced here helps you in your efforts.

—Elizabeth C. Haller, Acting Supervision, Curriculum Leadership Unit

Missouri

Thank you for inviting the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to review the text pertaining to Missouri in *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your evaluation of Missouri's standards for social studies.

I am enclosing our response with this letter. If you have questions or need further details, please contact Randy Rook, our Department's social studies consultant (573/751-3468; rrook@mail.dese.state.mo.us), or Bill Gerling, assistant director in the Department's assessment section (573/751-3545; bgerling@mail.dese.state.mo.us). We respectfully request that you publish our response in your report.

Thank you for your work on this important project.

—D. Kent King, Commissioner of Education

Missouri's Response

[Missouri's response to the Study on Education for Democracy is in **bold** print under the relevant sections. Please contact us for any further clarification.]

(Sources: Framework for Curriculum Development in Social Studies, K-12, 1996; and Content Specifications for Statewide Assessment by Standard: Social Studies Grades 4, 8, and 11, 1999, *Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*.)

Summary:

The second document "is designed to give social studies item writers and teachers direction with regard to what is 'fair game' for assessment in social studies." It supersedes the 1996 framework, which it says "offers constructive advice" on the purposes of social studies, on "guiding questions," skills, and activities. As the operative "standards" document, the second document partly meets Criterion #1 on clearly-stated, though general topics, from which teachers may draw a common core of learning for citizenship. But on Criterion #2, the large number of general topics under seven "standards" (Constitutional Democracy; American/World History; Governance Systems; Economic Concepts; Geography; Relationships of Individual and Groups to Institutions and Traditions; and Tools of Social Science Inquiry) overflow the bounds of time.

The teachers who developed the Content Specifications for Statewide Assessment by Standard: Social Studies Grades 4, 8, and 11 assumed that the items listed in the Grade 4 benchmark are not to be viewed as content standards or objectives for Grade 4, but as content standards for Grade K through Grade 4. Similarly, the Grade 8 and Grade 11 benchmarks are to be viewed as content standards for Grades 5 through 8 and Grades 9 through 11 respectively. The teachers felt the items listed were doable based on their local curricula.

On Criteria #3 and #4, it lists benchmarks in three columns, Grades 4, 8, and 11, dividing U.S. history between middle and high school at c. 1880 and world history at c. 1450. Statewide assessment implies that content is required of all students. Criterion #5 on integration is unmet.

Missouri does not have a tradition of state-determined curriculum. In fact, Missouri's Outstanding Schools Act of 1993 indicated that the Frameworks for Curriculum Development in Social Studies, K-12 should be developed to serve as a resource for school districts, not as a compulsory curriculum. The teachers who worked on both the Frameworks and the Content Specifications documents took the position that local school districts would build the standards into integrated units, most often in the field of history. Regional workshops were held that also proposed using the standards in integrated ways in locally-developed courses and units.

Only the civics standards have some links to the U.S. and world history eras being taught.

The teachers working on the Content Specifications believed that content in economics and geography could be addressed in history courses. Such content could be addressed nicely in units dealing with the Industrial Revolution and the New Deal, to give two such examples. Whether such links are actually made will depend, however, upon the resources of local Missouri educators in integrating the content in their local curricula, and the fact is that some districts have more resources in that area than do other districts.

Particulars:

Missouri deserves credit for admitting that its 253-page framework of 1996 is unteachable and untestable, very much overstuffed with abstractions, as in others shaped by the 1994 national Social Studies standards.

The Frameworks document was designed as a resource to help educators in local districts in developing their own units. The main aim of the publication was to help teachers engage students in social studies content in ways that would engage them intellectually. It was not intended to serve as the basis for testing. In fact, Missouri's Outstanding Schools Act of 1993 indicated that that document was to serve only as a resource for districts to use

in constructing their local curricula. It was not to be used for state testing purposes. We do not agree that the framework is unteachable and untestable if used as intended. This assumption may have been drawn from the sentence on page 2 of the Content Specifications which states: "Social Studies item writers and teachers also need to know what knowledge and skills should be expected of students for each of their benchmark levels to be assessed in social studies. The problem is that Missouri's Frameworks for Curriculum Development in Social Studies does not lend itself to such concise annotations, as was the case in communication arts, mathematics, and science." The frameworks should be used to help districts construct units that would incorporate locally developed performance-based activities and assessments. For example, consider the activities listed in the third column. Many of them could be used as performance activities and assessments, for which teachers would need to develop scoring rubrics to determine the quality of student work.

It is extremely complex, without priorities. Its "perspectives," "strands," "Guiding Questions," diagrams of goals and objectives, and sample learning activities may at times help teachers, but only after they choose essential content on which to apply them.

The Frameworks document was designed to help teachers develop their units after they chose the essential content. For example, if a teacher is teaching a unit on the Holocaust, the teacher could turn to page 13 in the publication, determine which cells of the matrix he or she wants to emphasize in the unit, and then turn to the pages in the frameworks pertinent to the cells. On those pages, the teacher would find guiding questions, skills, and activities to help the teacher in planning his or her unit. The committee of teachers who worked on the publication also assumed that the teachers would have to tailor the guiding questions, skills, and activities to the content of the specific unit. The book was designed to be used in such thoughtful planning, and as Dr. Gagnon notes, constructive use of the book would require the teacher to first determine what content he or she is teaching: namely, the unit topic.

Missouri's "fair game" is a good start but unevenly done. Each standard's topic list seems written by different authors not in touch with each other, relying too much on the national standards of each discipline, and ignoring the limited time and classroom conditions teachers must work under.

Actually, a single committee did the work at each benchmark level. The committees were organized by grade-level span, not by content. Thus, it was the same group of teachers who worked on "fair game" for all seven standards for each grade-level span.

As elsewhere, this is obvious in the economics and geography standards. The Grade 4 economics benchmarks are wholly unrealistic; the Grade 8 items resemble a typical senior elective in high school; and the Grade 11 items are pitched at college level.

The teachers working on the Content Specifications Committee did believe the content in the publication was at the proper grade level for Missouri students. Teachers were used as benchmark writers to validate what should be "fair game" for testing.

Geography follows suit. Its items take two full pages, more than any other standard, and impose academic concepts and vocabulary of national geography standards as early as K-4. Its detailed demands under Grades 8 and 11 are all but identical, the authors making no effort to help teachers and test writers decide when to teach or test what. Seasoned classroom teachers apparently had no influence on these two subjects.

It was, in fact, seasoned teachers who did make all such decisions, but strong seasoned

teachers have in the past set very high standards, which they felt were appropriate.

For standards #6 and #7, Relationships of the Individual and Groups to Institutions and Traditions, and Tools of Social Science Inquiry, the column headings for Grades 4, 8, and 11 make plain that the items listed are to be tested "within the context of assessment modules that deal with history, geography, government, and economics."

Missouri sets a good example with this statement. Items under standard #6 are indeed best taught by study of history, biography, the social sciences, and literature. And social studies skills are best honed when applied to specific subject matter content. The problem of selecting what is important, however, is only partly solved by the benchmarks/topics under the five other standards. The two civics standards, Constitutional Democracy and Governance Systems (largely comparative government), if taught in relation to U.S. and world history, may be conveyed in the school time available. The Grade 8 benchmarks for the former assume that students have a course in U.S. history heavy on the founding era. And the Grade 11 benchmarks ask for study of sources such as the Magna Carta, Mayflower Compact, Enlightenment ideas (Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu), as well as the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution, the Federalist papers, and the Bill of Rights. The English Revolution is left out of both the civics and history standards.

The U.S. and world history benchmarks remain general, covering the usual textbook chapters and sections. The next step, selecting specifics needed to teach benchmarks, could be taken without serious overloading of the U.S. history courses, presumably in Grades 8 and 11. Grade 8 has 22 benchmarks, averaging 7 days for each in a year of 160 instructional days. Grade 11 has 25 benchmarks (the first five reviewing the pre-1877 period), for an average of 6 teaching days each. With these numbers, teachers could choose some benchmarks to do in depth, and have time for others done more briefly. Grade 4's 11 benchmarks are reasonable; all could be done in age-appropriate ways.

By its nature, world history poses more problems. Grade 4's column has no benchmarks for it. The Grades 5-8 column has 26 major topics/benchmarks, more sweeping than those for U.S. history, from the river civilizations to c. 1450. These can be made more specific and teachable, but only if both Grades 6 and 7 are devoted to integrated history/geography studies, giving about half of the benchmarks to each. Vital topics need to be added here and could be, without overloading. Now there is no mention of world religions. "Greek civilization and Roman empire" are a single topic. The "origins of democracy" benchmark stands alone. The ideas and fate of Athenian democracy, the overthrow of the Roman Republic and the fall of Imperial Rome are left out. "Feudalism" is listed twice, in Japan and Europe, but with no word on its significance for limited, constitutional government.

High school world history, presumably a single year, cannot be taught from 1450 to the present in serious, engaging ways, especially as the Grade 11 benchmarks begin with a review of the ancient and medieval world. Benchmarks are general and vast. Teachers get less guidance than from a textbook's table of contents. This is the most serious flaw in the Missouri document, all but guaranteeing that teachers would never reach close to the present day. The obvious steps are to move the starting date to no earlier than 1750 and to add the essential specifics of political history American citizens need.

Many high-school world history courses begin with ancient civilizations and end with the present time. Admittedly, it is a bit of a stretch to give much depth to 7000 years of history in one year. Standard 2b only asks for coverage of the last 550 years and is fairly specific with the 10 topics. For example, Grade 11 2b.8 states "Total wars of the twentieth century"

ry (i.e., World Wars I and II) causes, consequences, peace efforts, and other reactions of the United States and other powers in their wake." This is very similar to what Dr. Gagnon suggests himself in *Identifying Good Standards: Five Criteria* when he states: "In history, an essential (standard) may ask students to grasp the causes of World War II, with an eye to Axis aggression, to its leaders, and to the political, economic, and ideological forces bringing them to power, together with causes of Western passivity, the memories and conditions behind it." Dr. Gagnon is looking at causes, consequences, and reactions with his proposed standard. Ours is a bit more general, in that it pertains to both wars, but essentially aims at some of the same concepts.

In sum, Missouri has made progress since 1996, but much still needs to be slimmed and clarified.

Missouri is presently writing content expectations by grade level for the social studies standards and benchmarks. Local districts should be able to better incorporate the standards and benchmarks into their curriculum as the result.

Nebraska

Nebraska would like to offer the following response to the comments made by the Albert Shanker Institute on Nebraska standards in the upcoming publication *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*.

The standards reviewed for your document were adopted by our State Board of Education in June of 1998. Since that time Nebraska's standards have been reviewed and clarified by practicing classroom teachers and social studies curriculum specialists in March of 2001 with further work taking place in July of 2002. The number of standards has been reduced from 166 to 98. Items identified as "student demonstrations" in the original document have been designated as "example indicators" now serving as ideas for classroom teachers without mandating curriculum at the local level. Many of the original standards, particularly in 5-8 grade span, have been eliminated or changed to example indicators thus reducing the "overload of topics" and allowing for more in-depth coverage based on local curriculum decisions. Attention was also paid to standards that repeated themselves from grade span to grade span and those standards were either eliminated or expanded depending upon their relevance at the next level.

Nebraska's standards do not, nor will they, "recommend or imply a course order." Nebraska has a long-standing tradition of local control and our standards and assessment system, while unique to the rest of the country, will remain steadfast in that path. The grade spans of K-1, 2-4, 5-8, and 9-12 allow local school districts to determine when to teach specific content. And when and where content will be integrated. Nebraska had utilized State and Federal

resources to provide time and money for districts to carry on the essential conversations that must take place among professionals to make those decisions. It has been the most powerful professional development on the part of classroom teachers in Nebraska in recent history.

Nebraska does allow for local districts to develop their own standards and to submit them to the Nebraska State Department of Education for review to be approved as “equal to or more rigorous than” those adopted by the Nebraska State Board of Education. This process is not taken lightly. Each set of local standards undergoes a peer review by a panel of classroom teachers, curriculum development experts, and Nebraska Department of Education curriculum specialists prior to approval.

—Doug Christensen, Commissioner of Education, Nebraska Department of Education

New Jersey

Commissioner Librera asked me to respond to your recent request for assistance in reviewing the Albert Shanker Institute study of New Jersey’s social studies standards. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond to this report. It is not clear whether Paul Gagnon’s evaluation is a critique of the 1996 social studies standards or the current revised draft of the social studies standards. Dr. Gagnon references both documents, as well as the social studies framework. My sense is that he is commenting on the 1996 standards, but that should be clear in his review.

I believe that many of the issues that have been raised by Dr. Gagnon are addressed in our current revision of the social studies standards. These standards are clear statements of essential content, although we are still in the revision process and they will likely be clearer when finally adopted by the State Board of Education.

New Jersey also does not mandate an orderly sequence of courses in their standards because that would limit the local control of curriculum development and local interpretation of the state’s standards. Our focus was to identify the essential content for world and U.S. history and to leave the sequencing of courses to local districts.

Dr. Gagnon also espouses relating civics, geography and economics to history. Making these interdisciplinary connections is a good idea and we will continue to work on this as we revise our 2002 edition of the standards. Our focus, however, was getting each discipline content correct. Is Dr. Gagnon saying that geography and economics can only be taught in relation to historical content? We believe that there is a need for the content of the disciplines of the social studies to be accurate and complete. Then, interdisciplinary connections can be made.

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to comment on these findings. Please contact me if you require further clarification.

—Jay Doolan, Director, Office of Academic and Career Standards

New Mexico

The New Mexico Department of Education was pleased to receive the correspondence from the Albert Shanker Institute dated November 27, 2002 and staff have reviewed our New Mexico report to be included in the Institute's study, *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of the information and to provide the following comments to accompany the report. The Department found the information accurate and provides the following comments:

- The decisions related to addressing standards in comparative government, the political implications of major world religions, and ethical systems were driven by a need to focus on those essential elements that were most teachable within the constraints of school time and resources.
- While the 9-12 Performance Standards are not specified by grade level, all students, in order to meet graduation requirements, must have within their program of study: U.S. History/Geography, World History/Geography; Government; and Economics. In addition, the decision not to specify by grade level at 9-12 provides local districts with the flexibility to meet requirements with interesting and stimulating course options for students.
- The Department is setting priorities as we develop standards and technical assistance to implement a standards-based system. These comments support our priorities to address the need for professional development of teachers and the availability of supportive resources to ensure our students are able to achieve the standards we have in place.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and discuss these findings and are particularly impressed with the rigorous criteria used to identify good standards. If you have any other questions, please feel free to contact Steven A. Sánchez at (505) 827-3644 or via email at ssanchez@sde.state.nm.us, or Pat Concannon (505) 827-6525 or via email pconcannon@sde.state.nm.us.

—Michael J. Davis, *State Superintendent of Public Instruction*

New York

After reviewing your criteria and summary, I offer the following additional information related to criterion #2. These two items respond to your concern about the number of topics included in the core curriculum guide.

When the State Education Department issued the sample tests for social studies grades 5, 7&8, 9&10, and 11, we included in the test sample booklets multiple choice test specification grids for each test. These grids provide classroom teachers with the range of multiple choice questions derived from the various units in the respective content outlines. These grids help teachers plan instruction based on the number of questions asked about any particular unit and the topics within that unit. Teachers can make decisions about instructional time based on the number of questions asked since they know that the multiple choice section of the test is weighted 50-55%. 2. The social studies core curriculum guide includes a list of themes and concepts that are used to develop thematic and document-based essay questions on State examinations for grades 7&8, 9&10 and 11. These essays comprise 45% of the high school State examinations. These themes and concepts help teachers plan instruction by providing a way to organize topics. For example, "political systems" and "movement of peoples" were used as organizing themes for essays on recent Global History and Geography Regents examinations. "Civic values" and "foreign policy" were tested as themes on recent United States History and Government Regents examinations.

I believe that this information should be included in your final report. I will fax copies of the Test Specification Grid as documentation for #1 above. If you have other questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for your continued interest in improving academic standards in history and the social sciences.

—George Gregory

North Carolina

Dr. Mike Ward, North Carolina's state superintendent has ask me to respond to the forthcoming Albert Shaker Institute study. See the comment below:

Response to *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure A Civic Core* By Paul Gagnon for the Albert Shanker Institute

In reviewing Paul Gagnon's critique by of the North Carolina Social Studies Standard

Course of Study (SCOS) one will note that the basis for the evaluation and the basis for the development of the SCOS document are not congruent.

In the introduction to the "Identifying good standards: Five criteria" document, Gagnon states that "On reflection, then, it was probably a mistake for the standards movement to call for the adoption of 'standards' instead of 'essentials.'" He goes on to elaborate on the idea of essentials: "...it is something specific."

The North Carolina Social Studies Standard Course of Study is designed to provide a broad framework to guide instruction. The guidelines provide a required common core of concepts that students can achieve in a variety of ways. In addition, the strands included in the SCOS and mentioned in Gagnon's critique, provide a continuum through the K-12 sequence of courses. When displayed in a strands matrix with the goals and objectives, they clearly illustrate that no discipline in the social studies is totally distinct from any other discipline.

It is also important to note that, in North Carolina, local school systems have a certain amount of autonomy and hence responsibility for daily instructional materials to support the Social Studies Standard Course of Study. Support documents at the state and local levels provide the specifics to which Gagnon alludes.

In addition, the disconnect that is noted between the ninth grade Economic, Legal and Political Systems End-of-Course Test and the tenth grade Civics and Economics courses is an issue of transition. The tests for the new curriculum which is to go into effect on a transitional schedule have not yet been developed. The new SCOS involves not only a content change but also a sequence change. The transition plan that accompanies the SCOS recognizes the disconnect between content and testing and accommodates for it in the development and implementation of a new tenth grade end-of-course test that will replace the current ninth grade test.

—Dr. June S. Atkinson, Director, Instructional Services

Ohio

Thank you for the opportunity to react to Ohio's page in the draft study, *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*. The release of your report early in 2003 will come at a critical time in this state's efforts to implement standards-based education.

It is unfortunate that Dr. Gagnon based his conclusions on the two sources cited in the report. *Social Studies: Ohio's Model Competency-Based Program* is being replaced with academic content standards for social studies. These standards were approved by the State Board of Education on December 10, 2002. "Common Expectations for Ohio's High School Graduates: Social Studies" was a proposal that informed the development of the academic

content standards. It never served as a mandate to direct curriculum development or testing in Ohio's school districts.

It is our understanding that Dr. Gagnon has had an opportunity to review Ohio's draft academic standards for social studies and that he has made some favorable observations about them. Had the academic standards been the basis for his study, we believe Ohio would have been cited as meeting the criteria outlined in the report. The paragraphs below illustrate the differences between the documents reviewed and Ohio's new social studies standards with respect to the criteria used in the report.

[NOTE: The final review does concern the 2002 draft standards. See page 103.]

Criteria 1

The committee that drafted Ohio's academic content standards for social studies was instructed to make them clear and specific. The standards provide detailed directions as to the content and skills that should be addressed at every grade level. U.S. and world history, civics, geography, and economics are directly addressed in these standards.

Criteria 2

The amount of content in the standards is teachable. The writing team was directed to draft standards that students would be able to achieve within the time constraints at each grade level. The teachers on the writing team suggested revisions to the draft standards based upon reasonable time estimates. The number of grade-level indicators was reduced following public input in the fall of 2001 and the spring of 2002.

Criteria 3

While Ohio law does not require that local districts implement the standards exactly as they are written, the standards certainly "suggest an orderly sequence of courses that articulate essential content across the grades" as spelled out in the report's criteria. The writing team was composed of teachers from every grade level as well as representatives of higher education to help identify this articulation. Needless repetition is avoided, but content and skills learned in earlier grades serve as a foundation for later learning.

Criteria 4

Once again, while Ohio law does not require local districts to implement the course sequence exactly as written, the standards are one component of an educational system that fosters "equal educational opportunity". The social studies are a required component of school district curricula. Three units of social studies are required for graduation from high school. Ohio's testing program includes assessments for social studies in grades 3 - 8 and as part of the graduation tests. School districts must provide social studies instruction for all students.

Criteria 5

Ohio's standards incorporate "vital ideas and topics" of other social studies disciplines within a historical narrative. While the Ohio standards represent the different disciplines in the social studies, historical content is referenced in the other standards and geography, economics and government content is referenced in the history standard. (Note that the word "standard" replaces the word "strand" used in the reviewed documents to describe the organizing frame-

work of the document.) The standards help to organize the content of the document, but they do not limit the ability of educators to integrate them for meaningful instruction. Ohio will also be preparing a curriculum model that will contain examples of effective instruction to help teachers address these issues.

It would be best if a review of Ohio's newly adopted academic content standards for social studies could be the basis for Dr. Gagnon's report. If that is not possible, our response to be included in the summary for Ohio should note that new academic content standards for social studies have been adopted by the State Board of Education in December, 2002, and that the report is based on documents that do not serve as a basis for curriculum development in Ohio.

—Susan Tave Zelman, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

Oregon

We received survey preview of the Oregon Social Science Standards that you have prepared for the Albert Shanker Institute. We would like to share some information that we hope you will consider as you finish your survey findings, or when you review Oregon standards in the future. We believe that there has been some misinterpretation of Oregon's curriculum and assessment programs and would like you to be aware of the state statutes, rules, and activities that govern and inform our work.

Oregon Social Science Standards in Oregon Law and Administrative Rules

ORS 329.025 (The public school system shall have the following characteristics:) (6) Provides for rigorous academic content standards and instruction in mathematics, science, history, geography, economics, civics and English. (7) Provides students an educational background to the end that they will function successfully in a constitutional republic, a participatory democracy and a multicultural nation and world.

ORS 329.045 Revision of Common Curriculum Goals including Essential Learning Skills and academic content standards instruction in academic content areas. (1) In order to achieve the goals contained in ORS 329.025 and ORS 329.035, the State Board of Education shall regularly and periodically review and revise its Common Curriculum Goals. This includes Essential Learning Skills and rigorous academic content standards in mathematics, science, history, geography, economics, civics, English and physical education. School districts and public charter schools shall maintain control over course content, format, materials, and teaching methods but shall ensure that students receive instruction in the academic content areas. The rigorous academic content standards shall reflect the knowledge and skills necessary for achieving Certificates of Mastery and diplomas pursuant to ORS 329.025 and as described in ORS 329.447. The regular review shall involve teachers and other educators, parents of students and other citizens and shall provide sample opportunity for public comment.

OAR 58-022-1130 Diploma Requirements Each district school board with jurisdiction over high school programs shall award diplomas to all students who fulfill all schools district requirements and all state requirements as described in the following sections and in district school board policies. A school district may award an alternative document to a student who has met some but not all of the graduation requirements: (1) Unit of Credit Requirements: (a) Each student shall earn a minimum of 22 units of credit to include at least...(D) Social Sciences 3—including history, civics, geography and economics [including personal finance]);

OAR 58-022-1210 District Curriculum (1) Each school district shall provide a planned K-12 instructional program. (2) The planned K-12 instructional program shall include the following: (a) Common Curriculum Goals and academic content standards to include: . . . (D) Social Science (including history, geography, economics and civics);

Development of Oregon's Current Social Science Standards

In 1995, the Oregon State Legislature mandated creation of rigorous academic standards and assessments in the core areas of English, mathematics, science, and the social sciences (history, geography, civics and economics). HB 2991 (1995) stated that the assessment system was to include content assessments, performance assessments, and work samples. During the development of the standards and assessments, a number of issues surfaced and on May 20, 1999 the State Board of Education delayed the implementation of the CIM in the Social Sciences until the year 2003-2004 and issued a directive to create a Strategic Plan for the Social Sciences. The Strategic Plan Committee consisted of 15 members representing all parts of the state, grade levels, and school stakeholder groups. The committee identified issues and designed a process to facilitate future work. The State Board approved the Social Science Strategic Plan on April 20, 2000.

With the Strategic Plan in place, the standards review and revision process began. A benchmarking was facilitated by a national panel and the Council of Chief State School Officers. Forty-five Oregon educators, again representing all parts of the state and all grade levels, met to conduct a "match/gap analysis" of the Oregon standards to the NAEP Frameworks in U.S. History, Geography, and Civics, and the national standards in Economics and World History. The recommendations of these educators then went for review by the 35-member Social Science Content and Assessment Panel. These reviewed recommendations became the draft revised Social Science standards.

Using the ODE web site, feedback was collected electronically and review focus groups were held in Medford, Portland, Bend, Redmond, Pendleton, Vale, Beaverton, Hillsboro, Eugene, and Salem. Another opportunity for comment was added for Portland-Metro area teachers, facilitated by James Sager, then President of OEA, and included Stan Bunn, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and several other ODE deputy and associate superintendents. The final document, adopted by the Oregon State Board of Education in April 2001, reflects the specific written or spoken feedback of parents, other stakeholders, and over 500 individual Oregon teachers.

Response to Survey Evaluation Criteria

Criterion #1: Standards—that is, essential topics—must be *clear and specific*, not general or merely implied by broad headings. They must be rooted in the content of U.S. and World history, civics, geography, and economics that is most vital to the good sense of citizens. Only then do they form a common core of learning for all students, to meet the first Mr. Gagnon's

aim of standards-based reform: equal opportunity to learn. Writers must decide what is most important for citizens of all backgrounds to know and think about. And say it in clear English. This is step one, an "input" without which no useful "output" can occur.

Oregon Response: Evaluation of Oregon's Social Science standards was conducted using only the Standards framework document. Supporting documents, such as the Grade-Level Mapping, the Possible Organizing Structures, and other materials were not considered, even though they provide the specificity that Gagnon's criteria requires.

Criterion #2: The required topics must be teachable, in imaginative ways, within the limits of time teachers have, usually no more than 160 days each year, and in many districts as few as 40 minutes a day, of which the first and last five are often useless. Here, state standards fail in one of two ways. One is an endless encyclopedia of specific topics, unselected, without priorities. The other, arrays of vast headings, "themes" or "concepts," that are unteachable without a similarly endless list of (unmentioned) topics. Both reveal the writers' weakness with the subject at hand or their refusal to do the hard work of selection.

Oregon Response: Oregon agrees that the standards must be kept to a manageable set. When choosing a framework to evaluate the former Oregon standards during the benchmarking activity conducted by the Council of Chief State School Officers, it was decided to use the NAEP Frameworks in Geography, United States History, and Civics, and the national standards in Economics and World History, rather than use the McRel Social Science frameworks because of McRel's extreme length and specificity.

Criterion #3: The standards document must mandate or suggest an orderly sequence of courses that articulate essential content across the grades, to avoid needless repetition but also to make time for needed review of vital earlier learning. Such articulation can be done effectively only by carefully chosen and well prepared K-12 teachers of the subject and scholars wise in the ways of schools, working as equals across the K12 spectrum.

Oregon Response: State statute precludes Oregon from meeting this criterion. ORS 329.045 makes it clear that the Oregon Department of Education does not require particular courses for students. Course design and course content, format, materials, and teaching methods decisions are held by individual school districts. Oregon Department of Education will offer a Grade-Level Mapping (currently under public review) as one possible organization for district curriculum. This model was not considered during the survey evaluation.

Criterion #4: Courses on essential content must be required of all. If critical courses are treated as optional, the principle of equal educational opportunity is betrayed. It invites a retreat to our old habit of giving substance to the few and seat time to the rest, as though schooling for citizenship could be "separate but equal." It cruelly disarms those who are left without the knowledge they need to debate public issues on an equal footing with others.

Oregon Response: Again, ORS 329.045 makes it clear that particular courses cannot be required by the State of Oregon. Because Oregon does not have required courses, the standards cannot meet this criterion. However, all Oregon students are to receive the opportunity to meet the state's standards and benchmarks. This was not considered in the survey evaluation.

Criterion #5: Vital ideas and topics of civics, economics, and geography (and humanities wherever possible) must be pulled into the historical narrative of people in real times and places. Students must be armed with knowledge that makes democracy comprehensible, especially the complexity of its debates and human consequences of its choices. They need to probe the causes behind war, revolution, and oppression-and the necessary conditions for

peace, stability, and freedom-by grasping the forces that flow from the several spheres of human life and history: scientific, technological, economic, social, cultural, religious and philosophical, geographical, political. Unlinked facts are not enough. Standards often fail here, isolating subjects in "strands" as though the others did not exist. Civics, economics, and geography strands very often lack topics linked to historical events taught in the same grade. In many states, strand teams work apart, not consulting each other either to relate content or add up the time their topics would consume. Unrelated standards fail to bring to life the drama and dimensions of democracy's political debates.

Oregon Response: State statute requires that standards be written for history, geography, economics and civics. To meet this legislated requirement, Oregon Social Science Standards are written in separate strands. However, schools and districts are encouraged to integrate the strands as they develop their courses to give the topics context and more clear meaning for students. Since only the standards framework document was used in the analysis, this was not recognized in the survey results.

General responses to Gagnon's evaluation

1) All states are wrestling with the question of "what is most important to teach?" The answer to the question varies from state to state, district to district, and even teacher to teacher. Gagnon conducts the study using his own opinion, not that of the state in question. Oregon teachers chose not to repeat topics within the standards document, understanding that, for example, most teachers teach from a U.S.-centric point of view, it might be better to put some topics under World History, suggesting that the world implications should be included as well.

2) Gagnon wants states to require specific courses for students. In the past, Oregon required specific courses. Simply naming a course does not insure that students are more likely to study the "important" topics. For example, Oregon used to require that students take a course called "Global Studies." Some districts taught it as place geography, some as world history, and some as world cultures. The use of Oregon's standards requires that students study all three aspects. The content, not the course title, is specified.

3) The standards document was the only document considered in the study. The supporting documents, which include the Grade-level Mapping, the Possible Organizing

4) Structures, and other materials, were not considered, even though they provide the information Gagnon says is lacking.

5) Gagnon does not allow for integration of standards during instruction. History, economics, civics, and geography are addressed separately, and he seems to want ideas, events, and people mentioned repeatedly in each content area.

Specifically to Gagnon's critique:

1) The Social Sciences Content and Assessment Panel and other teacher groups continue to struggle with the question of how specific the standards should be written. Oregon teachers do not want a "laundry list" of names, dates, and places. Instead they want instruction to be aimed at broader concepts. Gagnon's descriptions of acceptable study of the Constitution and of Athenian democracy are much more specific than what Oregon teachers recommended.

2) Oregon includes too much content, according to Gagnon's evaluation on Criterion 2, yet his description of study on the Constitution includes much more specificity than the

Oregon document. Interdisciplinary connections are not recognized by Gagnon. He identifies certain topics (e.g. "the post-Civil War plight of African-Americans, industrial expansion, the Gilded Age, Populism, and imperialism") as missing, since they are not listed in U.S. History. He does not recognize them when they appear in the context of World History or Civics. He claims that "the writers seem uninterested in U.S. history." He wants topics listed only in the U.S. History context, when several (World War I and II, imperialism) also have a world context. He believes that "technological change" and "globalization" are also missing, but does not see that they are included within the Geography standards. Because the links to other disciplines are not specifically articulated in terms of History, Gagnon believes that there can be no integration of ideas.

3) Oregon's Social Science standards cannot meet his Criterion 3 or 4 because Oregon does not require particular courses of study.

4) The Oregon Social Sciences Standards, adopted by the Oregon State Board of Education in April 2001, reflects the specific written or spoken feedback of parents, other stakeholders, and **over 500** individual Oregon teachers. They address the needs identified during the benchmarking work conducted by the Council of Chief State School Officers in Portland in 2000. *Sadly, Mr. Gagnon finds this "difficult to believe."*

If there is other information that you need, please do not hesitate to let me know.

—Robert Siewert, Associate Superintendent, Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Field Services

Pennsylvania

(Source: Academic Standards for Civics and Government, Economics, Geography, and History [four separate documents], Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2001)

Summary:

"These do not meet Criteria #1 and #2 on specific history topics and the implied content of general headings would overflow teaching time. On Criterion #3, Pennsylvania has no grade-by-grade course sequence, but U.S. history to 1824 is in grade span 4-6, from 1787 to 1914 in 7-9, and 1890 to now in 10-12. World history is skimmed in 4-6, from origins to 1500 in 7-9, and 1450 to now in 10-12. On Criterion #4, Pennsylvania does not test in science or social studies, and the content here is too general to be turned into a common core of learning required of all. Except for the usual links teachers can make between civics and U.S. history, the four strands are not integrated."

Response:

Many school district personnel have asked for exactly the same information. "Tell us what you want us to teach" has been a frequent sentiment from curriculum developers and supervisors. A grade-by-grade scope and sequence would be far easier for them to manage. The

Pennsylvania State Board of Education and the Department of Education desired to continue the mantra of "local control" and as such standard development teams had to focus on grade levels, not standards for specific grades.

Criterion #1—The above rationale does not change the lack of clear and specific standards as stated, however; the approach is there for local districts to develop planned instruction based on the standards. This step has an enormous impact on what is taught and when. Previously, did all students at grade level 1-3, 4-6, 7-9 and 10-12 take history? The answer was no! Students in some Pennsylvania schools could graduate without ever having a high school history course. These "standards" will change that.

Criterion #2—is a biased opinion that is without merit. Teachers will find imaginative ways to teach the content. After all, History standard 8.1 sets the stage for developing skills as students and teachers tackle the content of 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4. If by criterion #2 the reviewer wishes to see pedagogy, it will not be found in these content standards. The topics cited are important, not critical, to remove the impression of rote memorization and are extremely teachable.

Criterion #3—The reviewer is absolutely correct in the statement, but does omit any reference to history, et. al., being taught at grade levels 1-3. A move to infuse content into the primary grades is much in keeping with the Bradley Commission Report when staffed by Dr. Gagnon.

Criterion #4—The reviewer is again quite right. Pennsylvania does not have a statewide test for social studies. The four strands are not integrated *because they are four separate strands*. Local schools will best determine how to link the standard categories. Perhaps Art and Humanities may be aligned with History and Environment Ecology with Geography. This is a task reserved for local education agencies, not a state entity.

Particulars:

"The history document is spoiled by an over-complex approach to content. In the columns under grade spans K-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12, content is scattered (and only as examples) under 20 categories: Inhabitants; Political Leaders; Military Leaders; Cultural and Commercial Leaders; Innovators, Reformers; Documents, Writings, Oral Traditions; Artifacts, Architecture, Historic Places; Belief Systems and Religions; Commerce and Industry; Innovations; Politics; Transportation, Settlement Patterns and Expansion; Social Organization; Women's Movement; Domestic Instability; Ethnic and Race Relations; Immigration and Migration; Labor Relations; and Military Conflicts."

Response:

The reviewer needs to be more realistic. Pennsylvania does not have an over-complex approach to content. It is very manageable! There are four standard statements within Pennsylvania, United States and World History:

- Political and Cultural Contributions of Individuals and Groups
- Primary Documents, Material Artifacts and Historical Places
- How Continuity and Change have Influenced History
- Conflict and Cooperation Among social Groups and Organizations

It is true that each of those statements have additional descriptors that attempt to tell a more complete story. Although the reviewer may not view this as content, it is not scattered;

it is very consistent.

"Under each are three or four disparate examples, many not fitting the category or imprisoned in it (e.g., Washington is a Military Leader, not Political; Jane Addams is a Cultural/Commercial Leader, not Reformer, etc.). No example is mentioned twice, so the Declaration of Independence, U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights are in span K-3 and nowhere thereafter, except in the Civics pages, which include basic documents back to Magna Carta as required topics, not examples. This odd approach eliminates narrative, multiple causes, and the dramatic interplay of forces, ideas, and people. Moreover, many history examples are chosen less for importance than to demonstrate inclusiveness."

Response:

The commendation that the examples demonstrate inclusiveness is appreciated.

One must agree that it is difficult to pigeonhole a person or event as an example. Of course this is overly simplistic, but designed to give examples, and they are only examples. Is the label military leader for George Washington incorrect? Three distinct examples of Washington serving as a military leader in Pennsylvania during three different decades can be easily cited.

Please make it clear that although mentioned as examples in the history standards, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are required in various degrees at all levels throughout the Civics and Government Standards. If a school cannot ignore their existence why would the reviewer choose to ignore them?

"World history examples are far emptier than U.S. history's. At all levels, the Belief Systems and Religions category disappears into a single topic: "Analyze [or Identify or Evaluate] how continuity and change throughout history has impacted belief systems and religion, commerce, industry, innovations, settlement patterns, social organizations, transportation and roles of women before 1500 C.E. [or since 1450]" in Africa, Asia, the Americas, Europe. No examples cite Greece, Rome, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, English Revolution, Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, 19th-century ideologies, nationalism, imperialism, Fascism, Nazism, or the Cold War."

Response:

There is no argument that the examples do not cite the litany described; however, it must be stated that schools may choose any or all of these. After all, did they not take place in Africa, Asia, the Americas, or Europe?

To fulfill the introduction's promise to "give students throughout Pennsylvania a common cultural literacy," not to speak of civic/political literacy, the history standards would have to be completely revised in both form and content.

Response:

The goal to meet a common cultural literacy was not met by the history standards. However as stated earlier, Pennsylvania is now closer to that goal than it had been. Using the four standard statement to analyze a historic event will do a far better job of meeting the "new history" as stated by Dr. Gagnon. Pennsylvania's schools may elect to become a history-based program or perhaps some will choose to become a geography-based program. It remains, through the wishes of the State Board of Education, a local decision. The Pennsylvania History Standards provide a guide from which a curriculum will be developed.

The criteria used to review the Pennsylvania standards would be very helpful to schools when developing scope and sequences. The schools have the flexibility to study and implement them if they choose. The criteria do not coincide with the directions to the standard development teams provided by the Pennsylvania State Board of Education.

Note:

The standard documents involved in the approval process are dated July 18, 2002, therefore, minor changes and corrections could differ from the 2001 citation used for the review.

—Dr. James J. Wetzler, *Social Studies Education Advisor II, Pennsylvania Department of Education*

South Carolina

A writing team composed of college and university professors and K-12 teachers developed the South Carolina Social Studies Curriculum Standards. These educators worked to combine national standards written in the four disciplines into a coherent program for the students of South Carolina. After the work of this group of educators, two national panels reviewed the South Carolina Social Studies Curriculum Standards and recommended revisions. The State Board of Education and the Education Oversight Committee adopted these standards in March of 2000.

As with any document, revisions are necessary, and the Education Accountability Act provided for this revision. In 2004 the South Carolina Social Studies Curriculum Standards will undergo a review and revision to ascertain if they are meeting the needs of our state. We appreciate the review of the Albert Shanker Institute of our state's social studies standards, as it will provide additional constructive criticism for our revision team.

With any document created in a democratic society, such as ours, compromise is an essential key. South Carolina has eighty-five school districts, strong professional organizations in social studies, and many varied political views that united to create the South Carolina Social Studies Curriculum Standards. We feel that our state social studies standards have many excellent points that meet the needs of the districts and students in our state. Again, let me thank you for your report and this chance to respond. I look forward to receiving a finished copy of *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*.

—James A. Bryan, *Education Associate/Social Studies, Office of Curriculum and Standards*

South Dakota

Greetings from South Dakota. Thank you for your recent letter and for the pre-publication copy of our upcoming report. We appreciate the opportunity to review it.

The comment we want to share with you is this: The South Dakota Board of education has scheduled a full review/revision of the South Dakota Social Studies Content Standards in 2005. }

Again thank you for contacting us.

—Karon L. Schaack, Deputy Secretary, Department of Education and Cultural Affairs

Utah

Superintendent Laing has asked that I respond to the report issued on Utah's secondary social studies core curriculum.

The Institute's concern for the preparation of an informed citizenry is shared by the social studies educators in Utah. So much so, that an additional course was added to the secondary social studies core when it was revised. This required course is entitled "US Government and Citizenship" and is recommended for high school seniors. Information about this course and the rest of the revised secondary core can be found at:

<http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/curr/soc.st/secondary/government.html>.

In addition to this new course, all standards and objectives were revised to ensure greater specificity and to answer concerns about too many standards and too much fragmentation. The core revision process includes social studies teachers, social scientists, and university faculty members. It begins with a comprehensive look at other states' standards and current research. It is a lengthy process that is informed by public hearings.

If you have additional questions or concerns, please let me know.

—Vicky L. Dahn, Ph.D., Director of Curriculum and Educational Technology

Washington

On behalf of Dr. Terry Bergeson, I am responding to your recent letter, dated November 22, regarding the inclusion of an evaluation of Washington State's Essential Academic Learning Requirements into your forthcoming study, *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*.

I appreciate having an opportunity to respond to your evaluation of our state standards, especially given that you have based your evaluation on partial information. It is unfortunate that after your "consultation with each state's Department of Education," you were provided with only the essential academic learning requirements (EALRs) for Washington. The EALRs were purposely developed as broad organizers for the work to follow. Frameworks have since been developed in History, Civics, Economics, and Geography, with the specific purpose of further defining the learning and, therefore, guiding teacher decision making in the development of units and lessons. Furthermore, our long range plan for social studies is to develop grade level content expectations linked to assessment items, sample lessons, instructional resources and professional development opportunities. This work will further support teachers in designing or presenting their course.

The first paragraph of your summary makes reference to Washington's state-wide testing. "Yet Washington is planning statewide testing of social studies, linked to high school graduation, by 2006." The statement is erroneous on two counts. First, statewide testing in social studies is planned for 2008. Second, it is not linked to high school graduation. At this time, we are developing a variety of classroom-based assessments and scoring guides to assist teachers in using classroom based assessment to inform instruction.

Finally, we do believe in the importance of an external examination of our state standards. It is our intention that the Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements in history and social studies will be reviewed by an organization that will compare our standards to nationally recognized research documents and exemplary state standards by a team of experts. At that time, the evaluators will have the opportunity to review the documents which provide the complete picture of our Essential Academic Learning Requirements.

—Debbi Hardy, Curriculum Director

Wisconsin

I am responding to your email from Karen Kneeland directed to Superintendent Burmaster. All comments may be published in the final report.

Inaccurate statements made in Paul Gagnon's text of *Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core*:

1. The Wisconsin Student Assessment System now uses an off-the-shelf test that has been enhanced with customized items that test Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Social Studies to a greater extent.

2. Wisconsin does not test social studies at Grade 11, only in Grades 4, 8, and 10.

3. The High School Graduation Test, 2000, a list of eligible and ineligible assessment items for assessment, is no longer in use since there is no state high school graduation assessment at this time. Wisconsin has always expected all of Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Social Studies to be taught.

Gagnon's report uses "one size fits all" criteria based on a philosophy that leads to a national core curriculum for democracy education. No allowance is made for states like Wisconsin that promote development of an educated citizenry through local control.

The summary statement that "Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Social Studies do not meet any of the five criteria for the political education of citizens" is not true for the following reasons:

Criterion #1

Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Social Studies are very specific. The most important understandings have already been selected and agreed upon by a large number of people. The kind of "clear" standards indicated in criterion #1 would be lists without a suggestion of how to put together deeper understandings.

Criterion #2

Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Social Studies do not list themes or concepts, but the Guide to Curriculum Planning in Social Studies, 2000, a separate document published by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does help teachers identify the concepts that are inherent in the standards. (A copy of this guide was sent directly to Paul Gagnon's home on 12/4/02 and a CD ROM of the guide to the Albert Shanker Institute.)

Criterion #3

In Wisconsin, a local control state, school districts bring the social studies teachers together who will be teaching the curriculum and who can bring knowledge to elaborate the scope and sequence. The standards document is not considered the place to suggest an orderly sequence of courses; this is done at the school district level and in other state documents.

Criterion #4

Although Wisconsin is a local control state, high school students are required to take 3 credits of social studies. Most districts require all students to take history and civics by course name. With the advent of standards, high schools now must ensure that all students develop knowl-

edge and skills in all of the strands of social studies including geography, history, economics, political science and citizenship, and the behavioral sciences.

Criterion #5

Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Social Studies pull vital ideas and topics together better than do most state standards. The performance standards push teachers and students to link together facts and ideas and build connections between disciplines and from grade level to grade level.

Additional Comments

Wisconsin's Model Academic Performance Standards for Social Studies assume that students graduating from our high schools must be able to do more than "know" what was and is; they must be able to analyze past and future peoples, ideas, and events. The Wisconsin people who designed and approved Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Social Studies were extremely concerned that the teachers using these standards would not see them as a series of ideas, events, places, people, or institutions, or as "input" lists. To achieve this, the performance standards are written so that teachers may construct lessons to develop deep understandings and habits of mind and heart that students need to apply to the world in which they live.

The examples, cited by Gagnon, to negatively illustrate the broad topics in our standards were the same examples chosen by the Wisconsin writers as excellent examples of student outputs. It is difficult to produce student "outputs" using lists of events, ideas, institutions, turning-points, and leaders.

History Standard B.12.14. is an example of a performance standard that leads to a student output: "Identify a historical or contemporary event in which a person was forced to take an ethical position, such as a decision to go to war, the impeachment of a president, or a presidential pardon, and explain the issues involved." In Wisconsin, teachers might take every one of the suggested situations during the course of a semester or year of study and at the end of the course assess whether students could identify such a historic event or contemporary event and explain the issues involved. That is teaching human stories that people can remember and hopefully apply the rest of their lives!

*—Jack Kean, Assistant State Superintendent,
Division for Academic Excellence, Department of Public Instruction*