

## 2. Do you think that the core curriculum reflects what needs to be taught? - Comments

1. The core doesn't specifically attach to all areas that are needed to be taught. Some say Industrial Tech. Doesn't need to be taught because it is an elective. But, it does it helps teach students life skills and career skills.
2. I feel that the core will help with schools that are in need of some sort of guidance. Remember it says this is the minimum you can add more.
3. to some degree education in this country needs a complete overhaul. our students are not benefiting from their (one size fits all) education
4. I think most Core items are relevant.
5. I teach in the arts. The Iowa Core does not include us even though research has proven that students involved in the arts do better in school than many of their peers along with the fact that the arts have always been conceptually based which the Iowa Core lends itself too. The arts need to be included in the core - I don't think it is inclusive to have us ride along on the coat-tails of employability skills.
6. From the math instructors I work with, this is by far the most disheartening. Social studies is also another frustrating area. Basically specific courses such as psychology and sociology are implied to have no relevance.
7. Have not studied it enough to know.
8. The range of things which are covered is good, but I question the way that some newer textbooks are approaching the way that things are taught, specifically some social studies text that leave out or sometimes have an "agenda" to push thinking towards one way or another. I do not personally work with these texts, but have heard comments from others who work in different districts.
9. There seems to be confusion on what the common core is asking us to teach.
10. I feel that the core is very narrow in scope. They exclude many areas.
11. The common core was written as a utopian idea. The members of the team who wrote it were told to write it as the "best case scenario" for every graduating senior. I was told this directly from a team member.
12. For the most part, the common core does reflect what needs to be taught. However, it is a general document, so any more specific information would dictate a curriculum
13. To a point. It cannot touch the intangibles like developing a passion for reading/writing.
14. Some things yes but we in Iowa should know what those things are. The other things are harmful. Does Iowa want what is best for the students or will Iowa let Washington dictate evil?
15. I have not looked at all the subjects' core curriculum standards.
16. As a special educator I focus more on my student's needs verses the core standards anyways. Yet now I'm being told my IEP goals have to align with CORE standards. It's hard to close the gap when we are making students robots who all have to learn the same thing when the grade level standards are way above them and what they individually need.
17. Yes, but in math there is too big of a jump and too many assumptions which could have consequences for students who can jump several levels.
18. I think the core curriculum reflects high educational expectations.
19. Yes, it reflects much, but not all, that needs to be taught.
20. In the basic language, math, science, social studies areas, yes. In the Arts and CTE classes, no. If we are going to implement a common core, then there also needs to be guidelines as to how to teach it. They can't just throw this at teachers and say, you figure it out!
21. This has been something that has needed to happen for awhile. While it's not perfect and should be a fluid document, I think its rigor and relevance really helps students think much deeper than in the past; it will definitely prepare them for the real world!
22. The kids who come to me are not ready for a lot of the stuff that the common core says I am to teach.
23. I think there is more in the Core than necessary for Math.
24. In my area of math, it is sufficient, not rigorous.
25. In principal OK
26. To much verbage that people do not understand.
27. Adding the Second Generation Science Standards will be an improvement.
28. For the most part I would say yes. However, the trouble with the common core standards is that they are not focused enough to give teachers an accurate view of what is actually required of the students. They are very broad.
29. In SPED Have had to find out by myself no direction given by admin
30. Too much fluff
31. Only some.
32. 1/2 the students are not going to college. The idea that 100% have to be college ready is moronic. We need trade, business, and consumer math brought back.
33. But we are spending more time analyzing data that we already know is true than spending time in the classroom strengthening those weak areas. ie: reading, math, creativity, and problem solving.
34. Most of the time. Sometimes there are skills that are of importance that are not part of the core.
35. Yes if we will grade to these standards. If we will not go to standards based grading, the it is a waste of time to

use them.

36. I answer both yes and no to this question. I am an elementary teacher and I believe the majority of the standards we teach are important for kids to learn. However, I have heard from secondary teachers that some of the standards are inappropriate for what needs to be taught. Since the Common Core was created by major foundations such as the Gates and Walton foundation, most of the standards focus on how to survive in a business world, which limits the focus at times.
37. Somewhat nothing replaces the teacher in the classroom
38. Again, not really an easy yes or no. Some aspects of the core I really like. Other aspects, not so much.
39. The area that I know best and am speaking about it math.
40. Doesn't even come close in the fine arts.
41. to a certain degree but are by no means comprehensive and relevant for all students
42. Part is what is needed, but it has too much in it to be taught well
43. In a broad sense.
44. It is great for some students. It is partially correct for some students. Every student is different (as in DNA) and they want to make it a one size fits all in too many ways
45. History is not being taught! We must learn from the past!
46. In my area, social studies, the standards are so broad you can do just about anything. They do, however, require that you teach sociology and psychology to every student as opposed to an elective. This will make certification a nightmare for the smaller schools
47. It makes no provision for what to do for those who are not successful at a skill. For example money is not taught in 3rd grade, yet many in 3rd grade cannot count money, figure change, etc. It is not taught from gr. 2 on!
48. We need to have a curriculum that is more focused on teaching students real skills.
49. It is crucial for Iowa's students to stay competitive in the world and students from other countries have much more rigorous standards and expectations!
50. As we go through the core, some of it is very good. Some is so out there and unrealistic. We need more of the basics and not more of everything else. Not every child is going to be able to achieve all levels. No matter how many times you say they can, the teachers know they can't. Not that the teachers aren't breaking their necks trying.
51. We do need to have higher level and rigorous learning; however, the comprehension levels of the Core are more difficult for students of today than 30 years ago.
52. Some of it seems too elementary for the indicated grade level, while some seems too advanced.
53. There needs to be more American History and the history should be about all the great things the American people have done for the world.
54. It does present more challenging thinking but does not seem developmentally appropriate for the age or grade level that they have put the standards in.
55. I feel the Core Curriculum is a politically driven agenda and does not meet the needs of students in individual districts in the state and country.
56. I feel there is too much content buried in common core to teach it well in the time given. I also disagree with some of the scope and sequence suggest by the common core. Why do some standards need to be taught at one grade level and not another? (science)
57. But needs more rigor
58. It leaves too much out as far as the arts are concerned.
59. Bluntly, all of this written material just talks about what we are already doing. A man who retired last year simply said, "Just leave me alone to teach!"
60. There are gaps in the content. Plants, human body, 5 kingdoms (Science)
61. Yes, for the most part. There are some skills that the students aren't developmentally ready for that they are expected to learn and demonstrate.
62. There are some pieces that do not need to be taught, these pieces over shadow some necessary skills. For example, there is a third grade math standard with a high rigor of classifying 2-d shapes, however the pieces left out (and are not standards in second grade) are the foundation skills--point, lines, angles ext. I work in a low-socioeconomic school and a large number are ELL students. It is taxing building those background skills to be successful and have them master the standard as well.
63. The common core is oftentimes ridiculously low level expectations for my subject area.
64. I am on the band wagon with this. Some of it is good, but I am concerned that we will be forced to teach unethical things.
65. I do not believe that the evolution theory should be taught as it contradicts what the Bible says.
66. Not necessarily for all students...
67. There is too much analysis by politicians and "educational professionals" who never spend a day in the classroom.
68. I think so. 21st century skills are very important and I think the emphasis on reading and writing are skills that are fading quickly from our kids.
69. In my opinion, it's very weak on grammar and writing in the early elementary years. I see this with my second

graders who struggle to capitalize and punctuate correctly, much less write a coherent sentence. My experience has been that literacy curriculum that is aligned to the Common Core is weak on writing instruction.

70. I am just beginning to explore the CC more closely, but some things seem ridiculous (i.e. students must be exposed to fables from other countries at the second grade level)
71. For the most part it does, but it leaves out some important things. Iowa added quite a bit to it.
72. Common core absolutely does not reflect what needs to be taught. Anytime we try to fit every student in every school into a cookie cutter mold we are going to fail miserably! That is what common core, like so many other national initiatives in education, attempt to do. Students learn so much differently from one another and they all have different backgrounds. It is dangerous to give the federal government the power to determine what will be taught! This is a republic NOT a dictatorship!!!
73. To some extent yes, but not inclusively of all that's needed
74. Generally yes, but I still think it emphasizes some content that doesn't need to be taught and leaves out other important information
75. The standards in place are sufficient. Teachers are still allowed to use whatever materials necessary or they feel work best to teach and meet the standards.
76. To an extent. Each local school and community also needs to teach things relative to their community and lifestyle (rural, urban etc.)
77. It is nice to know that schools are all on the same track, but gives no room to address what is going on in with students and the community.
78. isu2002erin@aol.com
79. For math, yes. Although I think it is impossible for all students to reach the high school math goals...the equivalent of Algebra 2 + statistics. This might change if our elementary program is beefed up. But I am seeing deficits in most of our transfer students, which take a long time to catch up. There is a conflict with the amount of topics listed in math and then the directive to cover less and more deeply. In English - goals are good, texts selected open door for moral issues Sc?
80. As long as teachers are given the freedom to design instruction around the standards, and not be forced to use textbooks and go page by page. Page by page does not go with standards-based instruction.
81. The core curriculum (and I haven't read it all) contains excellent goal-making materials, much like the standards and benchmarks that used to be a local level undertaking. It reflects what needs to be taught.
82. I have lower level kids in math and to get them to the core curriculum will be difficult.
83. If it is properly created by teachers
84. Students need to be taught how to learn and not what to learn. There are too many standards to teach so teachers are stuck teaching concept after concept without going in depth and letting students problem solve more.
85. It focuses on larger concepts and how the material applies to the students' lives and futures.
86. In many cases yes but not in all areas.
87. But there are sooooo many standards to be taught and we're still stuck in an archaic system of age alike grades with isolated classrooms having to teach such a broad range of skill levels. We need more supports in the classroom and smaller class sizes so we can properly meet every child's needs. And PLEASE lengthen the school day!
88. The Iowa Core is so vague that any individual teacher can cover just about anything that they believe is necessary.
89. Sometimes only
90. We exceed what needs to be taught
91. I might reflect what needs to be taught but it does not address what happens when some students "don't get it." Also, assessments such as standardized tests are not aligned with this. Finally, there is no way all areas of social studies can be covered at the middle school level.
92. Yes/no - there are many items in the core that are necessary, and others that seem small in the grand scheme of things.
93. By in large, it does.
94. So much needs to be spelled out for the new teachers. When it comes to writing, there are so many holes in the present curriculum that newcomers have no idea. Implementing financial literacy in the lower grades would be helpful. It's there, but it's not being implemented. Reading needs to be addressed in all content areas. It's ok to hold students back who are not reading on grade level.
95. For the most part.
96. Some things in the Elem were never taught such as science or history.
97. For upper levels 6-12 yes. For lower elementary PreK-3rd no!
98. Somewhat. We need to focus on life skills for a number of our students.
99. I think there should be guidelines, but everyone can abide by state mandated laws.
100. Somewhat
101. There are a few HS math Standards that do not seem to me to be important for all students to know and be able to do...If that is indeed the case they need to instruct districts to require Alg. II or its equivalent, to meet some of those.