

## Social Studies Standards Writing Team

June 8, 2016

**Location:** Iowa Bar Association

Topic	Notes
Group Feedback and Processing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each group provided two rounds of feedback on another group’s standards based on coherence, focus, and specificity.</li> <li>• Summary of feedback in tables below.</li> </ul>
Standards Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each group responds to feedback and refines standards based off feedback.</li> </ul>

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL					
	Elementary School	Overall Middle School	6 <sup>th</sup> – World Regions and Cultures	7 <sup>th</sup> – Contemporary Global Studies	8 <sup>th</sup> –U.S. History and Civic Ideals
<b>Coherence</b>	-Good connections to anchors -Good progression -What is a “cultural universal”? This is a problematic phrase from a scholarly standpoint and I’m struggling to see how its use is intended in this document -Too many standards in K-3?	-1 to 1 anchor standards ratio creates a loss of purpose for anchor standards in general -Some standards are repeated multiple times—reduce redundancy	-Evaluate human-environment interconnections -Revise standards to the grade-level theme	-Behavioral science standards need to go deeper to build on elementary -Many concepts within one standard—pairing down and focusing the concepts would be helpful	-Like how interdisciplinary these standards are. -How are the 8 <sup>th</sup> grade standards different from high school U.S. history (especially if a district teaches it again in 9 <sup>th</sup> grade?)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Focus is too narrow on some skills, e.g., exclusive focus on change rather than creating</li> <li>-Some standards don't follow a progression</li> <li>-Some standards seemed too sophisticated for elementary school teachers</li> </ul>				
<b>Focus</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good scope and content</li> <li>-Great set of concepts and skills but seems like a lofty set of standards</li> <li>-Grade 1 and 2 have an aggressive number of standards. Is this realistic?</li> <li>Are there too many standards to be assessed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Not every SS subject area needs to be covered in each class. The course title tells a great deal about what the focus of the class should be.</li> <li>-Select standards are not true to course descriptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Do you need "economic organizations" in the standard "analyze civic and political institutions"</li> <li>-Lacking sufficient content</li> <li>-Focus on this theme/course is not clear. Is it understanding ancient civilizations?</li> <li>Describing the modern-day world?</li> <li>Geography and climate of the modern world?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall the standards represent what is essential for students to learn, but they are not focused enough.</li> </ul>	Some standards are too broad
<b>Specificity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-At times the standards are too specific. Some identify a specific artifact or assignment like "make a map".</li> <li>- Artifact or assignment specific grain size is too small</li> <li>-Great examples provided</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Standards are too broad, lacking content</li> </ul>		Some standards are too broad

	-Some of the standards that are repeated at every grade level and seem too big				
<b>Usability</b>	-Structure is usable, sometimes wording is awkward and/or confusing -Multiple sentences in the same standard with different tasks make it difficult to use. -Use verb other than “tell”. Maybe explain, identify, describe? -Very accessible, solid examples and clear language. -Confusing that the anchor standards change from grade to grade.	Good	Good	Good	Good

HIGH SCHOOL						
	<b>U.S./ World History</b>	<b>Economics and Financial Literacy</b>	<b>High School Geography</b>	<b>Iowa History</b>	<b>Behavioral Science</b>	<b>Civics and Govt.</b>
<b>Coherence</b>	-Most standards appear to	-A couple of “exchange and markets” could fit	-Great connections to history, culture, govt. and econ.	-Make Iowa standards for each anchor -Tie to Iowa k-8 grade	-Psychology connection to anchors is not	-Some of the terms may need to be defined, i.e.,

	<p>connect to anchor about change, but not to other anchors.</p> <p>-Progression is not identifiable, and seems random/not clear</p>	<p>under “nat’l economy”</p> <p>-Good progression and connection to anchors</p>	<p>-Good connections to anchors</p>	<p>themes</p> <p>-Need to go deeper than an explanation of just famous people in Iowa.</p> <p>-Needs clearer connection to 7<sup>th</sup> grade</p> <p>-Progression is hard to see because of the change in themes</p>	<p>evident enough</p>	<p>institutions, civic values</p> <p>-Progression is good, especially if the course is offered to seniors</p> <p>- Many of the standards have multiple tasks or thought processes—feels like 4 standards in one.</p>
<p><b>Focus</b></p>	<p>-Concern that many standards repeat what students are asked to do in elementary and middle school grades rather than requiring more complexity</p> <p>-Not enough content to be meaningful to guide teachers</p>	<p>-Add standards that broaden focus from free market</p> <p>-Is there enough connection to global economy</p>	<p>-Does the terminology get in the way of teachers/students knowing what’s expected</p>	<p>-For a behavioral science connection need to change focus to social psych—larger group focus</p> <p>-2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> grade could be switched</p> <p>-Econ and govt will be hard to get into the course</p>	<p>-Good focus on sociology, but not psychology</p> <p>-Some standards are wordy—where it says “identify and analyze” just say “analyze”</p>	<p>-One standard references political socialization, but I wonder if the concept of developing political identity warrants more attention?</p> <p>-Same IA History standard is listed multiple times</p> <p>-This represents a lot of things to cover in 16 weeks.</p> <p>-Depth of some standards seems unwieldy</p> <p>-Are topics exhaustive? Do I have to teach them all? Can I substitute?</p>

<p><b>Specificity</b></p>	<p>-Consider diversifying verbs -Grain size to too broad for most of the standards</p>	<p>-Standards are appropriately specific -good balance between overall economic principles and personal application -Financial literacy may be too broad compared to econ standards</p>	<p>-Diversify verbs -Use verb "understand" -Add "suggested concepts and skills" to each standard for clarity</p>	<p>-IA standards connected to Geo standards 1 and 2 are too broad to be usable -Too broad in terms of specific Iowa examples</p>	<p>-Good specificity on sociology, but not psychology -6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> seem to specific -What is the meaning of <i>THEMES</i> in, "Utilize critical thinking skills to guide an in-depth study of <i>themes</i> within behavioral sciences"</p>	<p>-Listing specific vocab/concepts may provide too narrow of a focus</p>
<p><b>Usability</b></p>	<p>Each standards should measure one thing.</p>	<p>Structure will be easy for teachers to translate into a curriculum</p>	<p>-Could use more guidance on how to translate into curriculum -Very "employ" is used: what does this mean?</p>	<p>-8<sup>th</sup> grade standard is tough to read. -Easy to translate into curriculum -broadness helps with usability</p>	<p>-Good usability -Is the bottom section necessary? Research skills seem like a lot</p>	<p>-The listing of examples in nearly every standard may make using them problematic -The multiple tasks, thought processes, and concepts in each standard would make assessing student mastery difficult</p>