

**COMMON CORE "STATE" STANDARDS; Centralized, Non-Profit Controlled, Quasi-National & FEDERALLY Supported Via RTTT Grants' Selective Parameters & R & D \$s for Assessment Vehicles**

PROCESS & TIMELINE	2011-2013	2010	2009	1998-2008	1996
<p><b>FEDERAL GOV &amp; NON-PROFITS IN CONTROL OF EDUCATION</b></p> <p><b>N-P CENTRALIZED Stndrds &amp; R &amp; D</b></p> <p><b>FED's Selective Parameters for Higher \$-B Awards of RTTT Grants to CCSS Aligned States</b></p> <p><b>States &amp; Local Ed Boards</b></p> <p><b>Loss of Control in Stndrs Updates, Teaching &amp; Assessment Material</b></p> <p><b>Elected Ofcls Reduced \$B Accountability to Electorate</b></p> <p><b>Parents &amp; Teachers Disenfranchised Through Distant &amp; Mega Entities Controlling the \$-Business of education.</b></p>	<p>The "centralized", "quasi-national" control &amp; "copy right" nature of CCSS impacts flexibility &amp; many ancillary tools used by educators:</p> <p>1) Would approval from D.C.'s NGS/CCSSO HQ be required &amp; 100% consortium adoption for a State to update a standard?</p> <p>2) Will all educational matrl eventually require copy right approval?</p> <p>3) Does Fed's \$369M R&amp;D grant for assessment prdcts to PARCC &amp; SBAC bias the content of the mtr'l &amp;/or does it inhibit private-market competition?</p> <p>4) Electronic devices, equipment &amp; software to administer assessments -- under copy right rules?</p> <p>5) Did NGA/CCSSO forfeit copy rights for student/parental privacy to obtain Foundations Funding? Weakened FERPA?</p> <p>6) Will data-mining be the output goal of PARCC/SBAC? In-Bloom Database is a joint effort of Microsoft, The Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Fndtn, The Carnegie Fndtn &amp; Amplify Ed (a division of Rupert Murdoch's News Corp) - <b>A Massive Entity.</b></p>	<p><b>Acceleration of CCSS adoption by majority of States' DEPTs of Ed or Lgstrs to qualify for higher \$-levels of Race To The Top Federal Grants funded through 2009 Recovery Act Legislation (ARC 2009)</b></p> <p><b>5/24/2010 FI. MOU 2nd Phase SBOE application for RTTT Funds</b></p> <p><b>7/21/10 T.B. Fordham Inst. Reports comparison of 2006 SSS ELA &amp; 2009 Math (No Name Standards) to CCSS; finds SSS similar to CCSS . Why were not the ELA SSS 2009 or 2007 SSS standards used? It isn't apparent that TBFI, as an entity had any prior experience in reviewing &amp; comparing state standards against each other or Intr'nl ones. Why was only one entity used to validate such an extensive &amp; expensive National initiative?</b></p> <p><b>*7/27/2010 SBOE adopts CCSS</b></p> <p><b>9/24/2010 US DOE Award Letter to Florida - \$700 M RTTT Grant</b></p> <p><b>9/28/2010 US DOE Award Letters to PARCC* for \$170M &amp; to SBAC* for \$160M to develop assessment products - testing materials aligned w. CCSS. * Both splinter non-profit entities of NGA &amp; CCSSO, founded circa 2010. Feds are 99% funding source of SBAC.</b></p>	<p><b>Cncil of Chiefs of State Schools (Private Non-Profit Org. of School Officials not acting in State-Official elected capacity) recruited by NGA to partner in launching &amp; lobbying for adoption by States of COMMON CORE STATE STNDRS under ACHIEVE's banner.</b></p> <p><b>NGA/CCSSO/ACHIEVE hires Student Achvmnt Prtnrs (David Coleman's Non-Profit) to interface w. "intellectual" experts to authenticate/validate CCSS)</b></p> <p><b>"Basic model" used to "construct" CCSS is not specifically cited; suspect/assume NGSSS 11/08-7/09 review committees' preliminary work was utilized. The participant States, the States' expert designees &amp; their specific contributions not specified in CCSS literature.</b></p> <p><b>2/13/2009 Fed. Amer. Recovery Act of 2009 (more stimulus funding) Barack H. Obama's Presidency</b></p>	<p><b>ACHIEVE Eductn'l Arm of CEOs &amp; NGA Completed Several Initiatives to "Align" Education with College &amp; Work Demands</b></p> <p><b>2/13/2008 Fed. Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 George W. Bush Presidency</b></p>	<p><b>Nat'l Ed Summit Govs. &amp; IBM-Type CEOs Few Educators ACHIEVE conceptualized</b></p> <p><b>Nat'l Governor's Assoc. (Private Non-Profit Org. of Govs. not acting in State-Official elected capacity) ACHIEVE founded</b></p>

FL LGSTR & SDOE	FLORIDA'S ROLL IN ADVANCING COMMON CORE "STATE" STANDARDS: A CENTRALIZED, Quasi-National, Non-Profit Controlled & FED RTTT Grant-Promoted Educational System				
	2011-2013	2010	2009	2008	2002-2007
<b>Florida's Speed in Changing from SSS to NGSSS to CCSS plus Lack of Clarity in SDOE'S Primary Sources &amp; Loss of autonomy by State/ Local Brds, Parents, Teachers &amp; Elctd Ofcls to Central Control by FEDs/N-Ps is a real problem.</b>	<p>* FI's Statutes expected DOE to complete NGSSS by 12/2011; CCSS adopted 1 1/2 yrs. ahead.</p> <p>If 85% of FI. NGSSS preliminary material is in CCSS, why does NGA CCSSO own the copy rights?</p> <p>Given the "national" &amp; "copy right" nature of CCSS, the updating needs of each State could only be satisfied by the centralized approval of the copy right owners &amp; each update would need to be adoption by all NGA/CCSSO consortium members.</p> <p>10/2013 Why are 2007 SSS reflected as NGSSS on SDOE web site?</p>	<p>6/2010 final version of CCSS released by NGA/CCSSO/Achieve (non-profits) 7/27/2010 CCSS adopted by SBOE</p> <p>No citations of pilot-testing of CCSS in any of the States prior/after to NGAs', CCSSO, Achieve, Sap, ACT...etc. validation of the CCSS standards.</p> <p>If FI. had the lead in CCSS's construction &amp; if preliminary FI. NGSSS material was used:</p> <p>1) Given FI 2006 Math SSS superiority, should CCSS's "authors" have chosen inferior standards for CCSS? Note: Thomas B. Fordham Inst., tasked by NGA+ to authenticate the superiority of CCSS through a comparison of each State's standing standard, reported that FI.'s SSS were superior in Math (A vs. A-) &amp; similar in ELA (B vs. B+). Given NGA's+ national standards goal, why not create A+ ? Per TBF review Cal &amp; Ind had A/A stndrs.</p> <p>2) What was the rush? Fed \$?  7/2010 Florida Adopts CCSS  9/2010 Florida Awarded RTTT's \$700M  9/2010 PARCC/SBAC (splinters of NGA/CCSSO/Achieve) Awarded RTTT's \$330M</p>	<p>7/2009 SBOE NGSSS Review Committees are asked to suspend their 8 mo. work due to FI's "intention to join the beginning national effort to write and adopt a set of national Common Core Standards"....</p> <p>Where are the documents &amp; the public information gathered for the 8-month effort by FI tax-payer paid experts?</p>	<p>1003.41 2008 State Leg. Statute instructs SDOE to review, develop &amp; replace SSS with Next Generation SSS</p> <p>1003.41 2008 Statute also expands the definition of standards:"NGSSS establish the core content of the curricula to be taught in this state and specify the core content knowledge and skills that K-12 public school students are expected to acquire."</p> <p>If the 2006 Statutes already directed the cyclical SSS review &amp; update towards greater excellence, why would the Legislature enact a 2008 Statute that is redundant?</p> <p>11/2008 SDOE Committees Start NGSSS review, update &amp; public hearing process.</p>	<p>2002-07 1003.41 State Statutes refer to the Educational Standards as SSS only.</p> <p>FI. had 2006 ELA &amp; MATH SSS</p> <p>2006 Statutes direct SBOE to review &amp; update all standards in 6-year cycles.</p> <p>1/25/2007 Reading SSS Standards approved -- 2007 SSS</p> <p>9/18/2007 Math SSS Standards approved - 2007 SSS</p>

A "TOO BIG TO FAIL INITIATIVE": COMMON CORE "STATE STANDARDS" -- AT THE VERY LEAST A NATIONALLY CENTRALIZED EDUCATIONAL WEB

AT THE WORST AN INFLEXIBLE, UNACCOUNTABLE/MANIPULATIVE/INTRUSIVE SYSTEM FOR

ALL STATE/LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS, UNIONS, LOCAL ED BOARDS, TEACHERS, STUDENTS AND PARENTS

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN CONTROL OF PURSE STRINGS -- INCLUDING BY-PASSING ELECTED OFFICIALS IN FAVOR OF  
NON-PROFITS THAT ARE NOT ACCOUNTABLE TO THE ELECTORATE

PRIVATE DATA IN THE HANDS OF A BENEVOLENT CENTRAL GOVERNMENT IS TOLERABLE, IN THE HANDS OF A TOTALITARIAN ONE IT INDICTS YOU

COLLEGE BOARDS/SPRINGBOARD -- NATIONAL CONTROL OF HIGHER STANDARDS & CURRICULUM

TRICKLE DOWN EFFECT TO K-12

David Coleman, a lead in CCSS validation process was appointed in 2012 to head the College Boards (a private membership for-profit corporation).

DATA MINING: LINKING BIOLOGICAL/CHEMICAL RESPONSES TO STIMULI DERIVED FROM ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS  
SEARCHING FOR COMMONALITIES AMONG SUBJECTS BASED ON RESPONSES TO ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS  
ATTEMPT TO TRACK OUTCOME (RESPONSE) BASED ON STRUCTURE/WORDING CHANGES IN ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

ELECTRONIC DEVICES & EQUIPMENT

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL (all access via electronic/web; textbooks & supplemental materials)

ASSESSMENTS (future plans include all electronic testing -- on-line for grading  
at a centralized/quasi-national location?)

Marketing  
or R & D  
Tool

Political  
Identity &  
Control

PARCC

ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

SMARTER BALANCE

CCSS ALLIGNED EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

CCSS ALLIGNED TEXT BOOKS

COMMON CORE "STATE" STANDARDS

ARE "COPY RIGHTED" TO

National Governors Assoc &

Council of Chiefs of State Schools Org:

corestandards.org is NGA/CCSSO

Web Site: Achieve & PARCC are

also part of the Network

Could be  
Linked to  
Curriculum  
Selection

Research  
& Dev.  
  
Student/  
Parent  
Privacy  
Violations

Research  
& Dev.

Curriculum  
Selection

Historial  
of Rcrds  
Pre-K-20  
for each  
US  
Student

TEACHER-TRAINING  
VIDEOS

ColBrd/Springboard  
PEARSON/PENGUINE

ASSESSMENT UPDATES

ELECTRONIC BIOLOGICAL SENSING DEVICES  
TO MEASURE BIOLOGICAL/SENSORY/CHEMICAL  
REACTIONS TO ASSESSMENT STIMULI

(Refer to U.S. Dept. of Ed Office of Technology - Promoting Grit, Tenacity & Perseverance)

**In-Bloom Database** is a joint effort of Microsoft, The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, The Carnegie Foundation &  
**Amplify Ed** (a division of Rupert Murdoch's News Corp). This Database will be massive upon recording all students' responses to  
the CCSS based National K-20 Assessment -- eventually a life-time of information will exist for every person in the the US.