COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS: MATH

KAREN LAMOREAUX



INTRODUCTION

Controversial Constructivism is cognitively inappropriate and leaves our kids 1-2 years behind our international peers

"Functional" Algebra does not prepare for STEM

CCSS prepares for introductory community college, not 4 year university

NOT-SO-NEW MATH: IGNORING HISTORY

1920s NCTM

Enrollment in Algebra went from 56.9% in 1910 to 24.8% in 1954

The "New Math" curriculum of the 1960s during the Sputnik Crisis

Focal Points 1990-2006

Achieve Inc. did a crosswalk to Focal Points and Achieve notes, "The CCSS are similarly rigorous to NCTM's Focal Points. While some content occurs earlier in the CCSS, the two documents generally describe the same content."



WHERE DO CONSTRUCTIVIST MATH STANDARDS COME FROM?

 2006 NCTM Focal Points failed miserably under No Child Left Behind testing

2008 National Math Panel Report

- Not effective for young students
- · Scores did not improve
- <u>http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/mathpanel/report/</u> <u>final-report.pdf</u>
- CCSS embedded them and does the exact opposite of what the report recommends

CURRICULUM VS. STANDARDS

Standards DRIVE curriculum

Because the standards call for a certain approach, any textbook that is aligned to the CCSS will utilize those approaches.

Large market

All common core aligned texts will use constructivism

Some publishers offer two versions (Saxon)

Professor Jon Star from Harvard is studying the effect of constructivism in the Common Core now, along with Vanderbilt University and the National Science Foundation



WHAT IS CONSTRUCTIVISM?

Social- Emotional approach instead of algorithm Collaborative, lots of group work Based on Abstract thought (not concrete) No directions or examples/Self-Directed Method emphasized over correct answer Inefficient Time Consuming

WHERE IS IT NOTED IN THE CCSS?

It calls for "*abstract*" learning approaches, favoring them over standard algorithm and rote memorization. Common language found in the CCSS that point to Constructivism include asking students to construct, draw or illustrate, argue or explain math.

For example, standard 3 says, "construct a viable argument and critique the reasoning of others."

EXAMPLE IN CCSS

K-12 Standards for Mathematical Practice »

CCSS Mathematical Practices:

2. Reason abstractly and quantitatively

3. Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.



EXAMPLE OF CONSTRUCTIVISM

CCSS.MATH.CONTENT.4.NBT.B.5

Multiply a whole number of up to four digits by a one-digit whole number, and multiply two two-digit numbers, using strategies based on place value and the properties of operations. Illustrate and explain the calculation by using equations, rectangular arrays, and/or area models.

				T .
postructed R	esponse			
17+25= 17+25=	He cars and 25 green many cars did he see ree with a for the m n how the number see yern. D 1 9,07 + 0 10 MV 0,05 W? r + h	he antwe brain and at my bru	r by d I agn	all the

Dr. James Milgram

"...the reason I didn't sign off on them was that they did not match up to international expectations. They were at least **2 years behind** the practices in the high achieving countries **by the 7**th **grade,** and...only require a partial understanding of what would be the content of a normal, solid, course in Algebra I or Geometry."



R. James Milgram, Ph.D. Emeritus Professor Department of Mathematics Stanford University

ZE'EV WURMAN

Replaces the traditional foundations of Euclidean geometry with an experimental approach. This approach has never been successfully used in any sizable system; in fact, it failed even in the school for gifted and talented students in Moscow, where it was originally invented. Yet Common Core effectively imposes this experimental approach on the entire country, without any piloting."



Scholar at the Hoover Institution; former senior policy adviser at the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Planning, Development, and Policy Dev.; Electrical engineer and CAD software innovator

Not internationally benchmarked

CCSS APPENDIX A EXAMPLES

"For example, transformations are emphasized early in this course."

Reason abstractly and quantitatively. construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.

G.SRT.3 Use the properties of similarity transformations to establish the AA criterion for two triangles to be similar.

Unit 2, pg.31 Understand similarity in terms of similarity transformations.

COMMON CORE IS COLLEGE READY

•Two-year non-selective community college

Jason Zimba

•Functional Algebra Not for STEM/ Advanced Math

Arne Duncan 2010 speech

•Asia is NOT using this math!





WHY IS MY CHILD CRYING ABOUT IT?



Early Childhood

500 sign open letter

Dr. Thompson, Cognitive Child Abuse

Dr. Megan Koschnick Testimony

Educational Psychologist <u>Volume 41</u>, <u>Issue 2</u>, 2006. Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist, Discovery, Problem-Based, Experiential, and Inquiry-Based Teaching

OPPOSITION

The Pioneer Institute American Principles Project U of A Emeritus Dr. Sandra Stotsky Stanford and NASA's Dr. James Milgram

5 STEPS TO PROVEN SUCCESS IN MATH

- 1. Eliminate the failed constructivist approaches and restore standard algorithm and cognitively appropriate rote math for 7th grade and below.
- 2. Restore early proficiency for addition and subtraction proficiency (grade 3 instead of 4), multiplication (grades 3 & 4 instead of grade 5) and division (grade 5 instead of 6) according to higher state standards,
- 3. Restore prime factorization, least common denominators & greatest common factors; conversions among fractions, decimals, and percent according to higher state standards.
- 4. Keep CGI approaches as an option in grades K-3 but not after grade 3
- 5. Replace internationally failed transformational geometry with proven Euclidean geometry in K-12.

FURTHER READING

A Brief History of American K-12 Mathematics Education in the 20th Century by David Klein : <u>http://www.csun.edu/~vcmth00m/AHistory.html</u>

White Paper from Pioneer Institute: http://www.uaedreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2000/01/ Lowering the Bar.pdf

White Paper from American Principles Project & Ze'Ev Worman: <u>https://americanprinciplesproject.org/app-education/new-white-paper-why-students-need-strong-standards-and-not-common-core/</u>

PREVIOUS AR FRAMEWORKS

http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/ Learning_Services/Curriculum%20and%20Instruction/ Frameworks/Math/math_k_8_may05.pdf