



English Language Arts (ELA) Survey Comments
Section 5: Please enter comments you would like to make concerning the revised English Language Arts (ELA) standards.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Great standards
MANY of the standard are not developmental appropriate for the age of the children.
Teachers are being worn out by yearly changes in the standards. It is difficult to plan to purchase resources when the requirements change and items that were recently purchased at great expense are no longer usable.
I believe that students should learn to write in cursive handwriting. This standard should be enforced. Also, phonics and handwriting standards should be enforced in the primary grades.
No actually changes were made in my honest opinion. Simple verbiage changes were made, not the actual standards. I know many, many teachers wanted to see actual changes and not simply word changes. The only standard that had a small change was ELACC6W6: you took out the keyboarding skill. If your going to take the time to do surveys and make "changes," then you should actually make changes. Some of these standards are simply too broad and vague. If any study of child development had been done, modifiers to the standards would have seen that children at the middle school level and below are not thinking abstractly yet these standards are asking them to do so before they are cognitively ready. Any person who has studied child development or developmental psychology would have known that. Just because these standards are "good" for the "nation" does not mean they are "good" for Georgia and her students!
Kindergarten standards are to rigorous for most students. They are stressed and act out because most 5 year olds are not ready to write 2 sentences. The age limit should be moved to June or July if we are asking this much of them. Children still in the 4 1/2 age stage are very frustrated and get upset because they can't do the work.
Too many topics to cover in one year to ensure depth of knowledge. The material needs to be practiced for a length of time that is difficult to obtain with all of the standards.
In my opinion, ALL ELA standards need to revised. All are too broad and need to be more specific in detail.
The ELA standards have become increasingly confusing for students, parents as well as to some teachers as my husband is an educator and he states that it's just simply confusing all the way around. Some serious revamping of the standards are very necessary.
Where do the students actually learn how to write in cursive?
The standards are simply too vague. I am never sure if I am covering content in enough depth, as well as spending enough time on various skills.
The 2 standards that were revised per grade level are fine. The majority of the standards do not include concepts that are applicable to workplace environments. Students should have the opportunity to learn information that will make them better employees rather than useless concepts developed just for the sake of increasing rigor.
I hope people did not get paid to revise these standards. They read as if someone simply used a thesaurus to change a few words.

Richard Woods, Georgia's School Superintendent

"Educating Georgia's Future"

January 12, 2015 • Page 1 of 82

All Rights Reserved

Question 5 Comments - ELA
<p>As a veteran teacher with 30+ years in educating some of Georgia's finest students, I am very concerned with what's going on in our educational system in Georgia. While I do agree with some of the changes being made within Georgia's educational system, I do have many concerns. I feel that all students should be challenged and encouraged to do their very best, but I am not sure that all of the approaches we are using through Common Core are appropriate for all students. As an ELA teacher, I truly love the novels that are being implemented in our units. However, I do feel that ELA teachers are challenged when it comes to having the resources needed to effectively implement our 42 required standards. The amount of personal money I have spent in the last few years shocks even me! But, if this what I have to do to be sure my students are able to succeed, then I will continue to do so. My students are treated just as I treat my own children. There is no other occupation I would want...teaching is my life. In making sure my students are prepared for not only the present, but also the future, I will always go above and beyond what is required of me by my superiors. However, when it comes to these 42 ELA standards, I feel that they are so broad and encompass so much, it sometimes is mind-boggling. While ELA has 42 standards, within each standard there are many skills, making it seem that in reality there are many more than 42. I do appreciate that these standards have been looked at and revised, but after reading the revisions, it seemed as if all that had been done was simply a rewording of 3 of the 42 standards. Again, I appreciate those that spent their time working on this process, but I'm not sure their hard work was worth the return. Georgia's children deserve for their teachers to be able to have the time and tools needed to prepare and carry out their lessons in a manner that all students (and parents) are able to understand and master the standards/skills that are required of them. After all, their future, as well as the future of our great state and country depend on it.</p>
<p>A standard for the study and development of vocabulary needs to be included at the high school level. Students in high school classes need to have a standard that SPECIFICALLY addresses writing about literature and literary analysis.</p>
<p>Our ELA standards are too lengthy, difficult to understand, redundant and MUCH TOO DIFFICULT for the level of high school students, on average, that we are teaching on a daily basis. ELA teachers cover several different areas in one class period/block, so selecting which standards are covered daily is a time-consuming process, as we may do lessons on literature, writing, conventions, and vocabulary all at once. We need simple, concise (less wordy), clear, unambiguous standards that are clear to educators, students, and parents.</p>
<p>The revisions were grammatical for the most part. There was little development of the standards themselves. Some standards are still very vague and some are still a bit confusing (ELACC9-10RL7 is not about literature; it's about art).</p>
<p>For reading, students will HAVE to be able to comprehend texts; however, no individual will need to, for example, discuss the theme and how it relates to plot, or discuss how dialogue influences other literary elements. We should be focusing more on vocabulary meaning, summarizing skills in response to reading both fiction and non-fiction texts, and basic comprehension. As a current graduate student, I can validate that I have NEVER had to perform what we are asking students to do, except to teach it to my current students. However, I do have to be able to locate main ideas, comprehend/ summarize texts, and determine vocabulary meanings based on context clues.</p>
<p>Not sure if mechanics was spelled out in lower grades.</p>
<p>The changes to the 7th and 8th ELA standards were very minor. These changes will not affect how we are currently teaching the CCGPS.</p>
<p>The focus for middle grades is off center. The state standards should be applicable to the age group not to secondary students. The state is not listening nor paying attention to the middle school clientele.</p>
<p>There seems to be very little changed in terms of how the standards are worded. I would rather the CCGPS be left the way they are.</p>
<p>Revisions that simplify the language in the standards are imperative. The need for more planning time is still in the fore-front, but with simplified standards we can better meet the needs of all of our students.</p>
<p>Standards need an example for the actual skill to be tested and a performance task to go with it. If the state/country is going to mandate common core instruction, units and materials should</p>

Question 5 Comments - ELA
be provided from the state.
Standards are overall too broad and generalized. They should pin point specific skills, abilities, and applications. Furthermore, the amount of standards in each grade level should be balanced and fair. No single grade should have more or less than the others.
Standards need to take in English Language Learners and their diverse needs. Students coming into our county from countries such as El Salvador and Guatemala often have low or interrupted learning, and don't have the prior knowledge needed to master grade level material. They are often reading at very low Lexile levels and the standards do not provide any leeway for teachers or students for non-English native speakers. The standards need to include what all students are capable of not just a select few.
The focus on non fiction SHOULD not be viewed as the primary responsibility of the ELA department or class. It is across the subjects. This has not been emphasized enough.
I would change this one ... ELACC1RL5: "Explain major difference between texts that tell stories and texts that give information" CHANGE TO: "Explain major difference between fiction and nonfiction texts" since those are the terms they are to know.
I don't use these state standards so I am not able to answer these questions.
The revisions were very minor. For secondary, they are broad enough for teachers to use creativity and discretion in methodology; yet are rigorous enough to prepare our students to be CCR.
In 9-10.RL.2 the word "closely" does nothing but add an extra word. The word "analyze" implies a close examination. Under what conditions would a student not analyze "closely"? Are the standards suggesting that it is possible to analyze glibly? If so, that is not analysis; it's something else.
At what grade level will cursive writing begin? I didn't see a standard for this.
The revisions in grades 6, 7, & 8 were not necessary.
Nice to see an attempt to get back to the "grass roots" of education.
I am one of the middle grades teachers who reviewed the standards last school year. All of the standards that I commented on that needed to be revised were not. I know I was not the only person doing this, but I expected a few of the ones I wrote comments on and changed would have been revised. I am very disappointed.
My only concern is the wording "with guidance and support". While I totally support the language, it is hard to guarantee that each teacher will use the same degree of guidance and support. This makes it impossible to compare results from classroom to classroom, school to school, and from district to district. I have had this concern since the standards were first introduced, but I do not know how to remedy the issue.
I feel some of the standards are much too difficult for my 4th graders. For example, the correct usage of 'who' versus 'whom' is difficult for most adults, much less 9 year olds. I also feel the common core standards don't put enough emphasis on English conventions in the 4th grade. Students still need instruction on simple nouns, verbs, pronouns, etc.
3RF3 part d moving to 3RF4. Would like to have a list of grade appropriate words for 3rd graders.
Due to the sheer number of standards, educators will not be able to address all standards in depth and insure competency of all students.
The revised English Language Arts Standards should help educators to improve current reading, fluency, and overall comprehension of literature and grammar mechanics.
The language in the revised standards is much clearer than before. These changes would be very agreeable.
Samples of the standards should be included. Examples of how the standard in each grade level should be shown.
I strongly support the addition of cursive writing back into the standards
The revisions to grades 6-8 were minimal. More specificity needs to be given within the standards. Many of them are too vague, leaving the interpretation to each individual teacher. If we are participating in Common Core, then teachers shouldn't be left to interpret what should be taught. For example, propaganda is not listed, yet it expected to be taught. A new teacher might not recognize that as "different forms of media." I am uncertain why a survey would be given for such little change as an addition of "and/or" in RI.2 & RI.2, and for taking off the short keyboarding assignment of three pages in W.6.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
I see few differences in the standards. I did notice the removal of a phrase in the Sixth grade standard. However, I do not see how these changes make any difference.
I am concerned with all of the current K-5 Common Core Standards and feel that rigor is taking precedence over developmentally appropriate practices.
Clear Yes, the intent is to get better standardized test scores, regardless of the need to educate our children. How does pushing off reading at a 4th grade level to middle school help the kids? This is a sad attempt to assure passing a "worthless" test. What will these kids do when they have to compete for a job...
While the CCGPS ELA standards encourage rigor and prepare students for college, there are students who have no intention of going to college and need basic workplace English and grammar skills (i.e. for letters, memos, applications, etc). These students also need more focus on reading manuals and instructions; they need less of an emphasis on literary on more focus on informational and practical usage of English/Language Arts.
The problem I have is when students have forgotten the standards they were taught in the previous grade, and there is really no time in the frameworks to go back and reteach.
The standards are too vague to adequately align with assessment. As a result, curriculum (designed by teachers) and assessment (designed at the district and state levels) can both align with standards, but not align with each other. For example, ELACCL11-12RL10: By the end of grade 11, read and comprehend literature, including stories, dramas, and poems, in the grades 11-CCR text complexity band proficiently, with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range. The standard specifies text complexity, but does not adequately indicate the level of comprehension. Comprehension of any text covers a range of understanding, from basic, literal comprehension to high levels of inference. What is the expectation and what will be assessed? Also, ELACCL11-12L1: Demonstrate conventions of Standard English grammar usage when writing or speaking. This standard covers every grammar rule in existence. A classroom teacher in grade 11 cannot cover this amount of material in one school year and has no idea of which rules are expected to be mastered by the end of the 11th grade. Again, the vague standard makes alignment of curriculum and assessment highly unlikely.
The standards are outlines. I do think that specifying what exactly the standard expects of the student is logical, but placing too much description can limit an educator's professional knowledge. It is beneficial to have all standards align, but the implementation of some of these will still probably supply the high school with students that are not capable of doing what is expected of them. Without professional learning occurring in all grades to define the standards together, students as readers and writers will not flourish as they should.
If we can separate the discussion of standards from that of instruction it would be less murky. The standards are helpful as I make instructional decisions; they do not dictate those decisions. As our nation becomes less provincial and its members more mobile, it is incumbent that we have a national approach to expectations.
Reading and Language Arts classes need to CONTINUE to be taught separately at the middle school level. These all-important skills are being shoved together into a single course, and no teacher, no matter how wonderful, can do all that needs to be done in the middle school years with literacy and writing instruction. BOTH courses must be funded and taught separately at the middle school level so that those students will be ready for high school and post-secondary education/careers.
Revision of standards adds clarity (especially at the 11-12 level with the addition of British Literature, World Literature, and Multi-cultural Literature).
The changes to 9-10 and 11-12 in RI and RL are acceptable with the addition of British, World, and Multicultural literature. However, the fact that there is not a delineation between the skills of 9th and 10th graders or 11th and 12th graders is problematic. Vertical alignment of skills necessary should not be clumped into a two year window. Also, the removal of certain terminology within the area of writing weakens the need for students to be able to write for different genres, for different purposes. This is a real world skill that students will need in college and in business. For instance, you do not write the same in a creative letter to friends as you would a report to a client. The grammar structure, the syntax, etc. changes. The language that address the standard skill was removed.
None of the standards truly prepare students for the workplace. Students who are not going to college need to be able to take an ELA class which prepares them for a job. The students

Question 5 Comments - ELA
need to be given a choice of occupational training or college readiness training because not all students are going to go to college. They need to have the opportunity to learn how to build an engine or a brick wall. They need to learn plumbing or electrical skills. By trying to prepare every child to go to college, we are denying many children the education they really need to be able to survive in the world and provide for their families.
The standards are rigorous, but appropriate for students. They are comprehensive, and will ensure success for students when implemented with thoughtfulness and focus in the classroom.
The vocabulary level required for reading and understanding the standards are beyond the comprehension levels of most students and some teachers. The standards themselves are wordy and confusing at least. Short concise standards are much more logical.
The only changes I see in the proposed ELA is the verbiage. The requirements have remained the same. We are spending so much time testing our students that they are not in the classroom to learn what they are being tested over. The CCGPS will prepare our students for college/workplace if they are able to meet the requirements you have placed on them through CCGPS. We, as teachers, know the needs of our students and could teach them what they need if the state would stop making so many changes in such short periods of time and expect us to implement the changes immediately.
This streamlined series of editions is a breath of fresh air!! Few would argue against needing standards; however, the blanket of overwhelming standards to which we have been subjected the last few years has been an unrealistic undertaking. Those who attempted to do all that was expected, found themselves either feeling defeated or at best inefficient. Those who knew it was too much to ask, simply didn't try to cover all the standards. They just did what this proposal suggests: selected the most over-arching standards to teach that were most relevant to students' college and career readiness.
I feel these standards do not address students with disabilities and the technical students
I'm not sure how the "broadness" of the new standards would be interpreted by individual teachers in each classroom of each school. Concerned about for all of our students and the possibility for wide interpretation of the broad standards is a little scary . . . especially when there will be a standardized test of performance and expected CCRPI score.
This survey is incredibly biased so there is no way this data is reliable. Using "revised" standard alienates Georgia from accessing collective resources across the country. The slight changes that were made point to the fact the core is fine the way it is written and being implemented across the county.
I commend the hard work of the committees that worked to provide clarification of the standards.
The ELA standards leave way too much to teacher discretion. Also there are way too many things to cover in a year. Some of the language standards are ridiculous for 10 year olds to learn - they used to be taught in 9-10th grade.
More input is needed from academic institutions (universities) as we often hear how under prepared students are for college. For example, there should be a standard related APA, MLA, or other critical writing formats (which there is not).
The rigor needs to be present in the 8th grade to prepare students for 9th grade.
While I agree that the standards are a cut above what we have ever had before in Georgia, we have run so far away from content standards in ELA that the standards are almost impossible to use appropriately when planning. The DOE should consider creating skill progression charts for the standards that help teachers understand how to develop these skills rather than just providing the end product (the standard itself). Perhaps most importantly, the state's exemplar units should continue to be revised to reflect the variety of approaches a teacher might employ in order to move students toward competency of the standard.
I think focus standards should be identified for each grade level - especially within the two bands (9-10 & 11-12) - so as to differentiate the focus of each course.
The standards that have been revised seem to be more clearly stated.
These revisions are not drastic enough to make a difference.
I feel very strongly that the current CCGPS for 8th grade in particular are too many and too wordy. They need to be simplified and the amount needs to be lessened. The learning targets for each standard should be clear and obvious.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
We need to write standards in a clear and understandable language that STUDENTS understand; standards are verbose. They are not applicable to college or career because we should be more focused on nonfiction instead of fiction. Colleges are telling us this. There may be one literary analysis in college; otherwise, most writing seems to lean to nonfiction. I only remember one lit analysis paper. It's been awhile, so maybe a college professor could give better guidance here.
These are children!!!!!! Too much too soon!
It is fantastic for teachers to condense the 41 standards to a manageable number. The other standards were too discreet, and aligning plans to standards was tedious soul crushing.
The majority of the changes in ELA K-8 address clarity of language and intent, and represent an improvement. The strengthening of the range of literature, cultural group, and document references at HS is especially appreciated.
Middle school students do not need standards that apply to post-secondary educational goals or career readiness. They are middle school students!
I feel that there are big gaps between the first grade standards and the second grade standards. For instance: second grade grammar says they need to know plural nouns and irregular nouns, however they do not know common and proper nouns enough when they come to us. Second grade needs to repeat skills taught in first because they just don't retain a lot in first grade. We need clear standards for nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs that overlap with first grade.
Some of the standards are very broad. For instance, the standard states the students should read words with inflectional endings. With teaching first grade, I am never sure if I am fully teaching this standard, due to the amount of suffixes and prefixes. Most of the language standards start with the verb..."uses".. My colleagues and I are often confused about what a mastery level would look like with these standards.
The revision made to the RL11-12.9 was appropriate.
Kindergarten standards are very vague and are not developmentally appropriate - especially writing. They are too rigorous and ask way TOO much of the babies we get! Some kids come in as 4 year olds and have to repeat due to the demands. Kinder is not even required!!!
I marked "Don't know" to the six statements of the survey because the revisions are so minor that they do not make a difference or improvement to the original standards. I do not believe the costs of rewriting and editing materials that have been developed over the last two years are worth the effort over such minor changes (changes made only for political reasons)
There are too many for students at this level to master. The students are being rushed to learn new things before they are ready. I don't mind rigor but I do mind rushing students to learn too many things at one time.
The only thing revised in 7th grade standards were the inclusion of and/or in one and switching two words around in another. It seemed kind of pointless to even bother revising if that's all that was going to happen.
The revisions to the high school ELA standards were more editing than changing, except with reference to multicultural literature comparisons in American and British Literature in eleventh and twelfth grade levels.
the changes were needed to clear up misconceptions between grade levels
The standards are too open ended and leave too much room for guessing what should be done.
The ELA standards are vague and do not provide a precise road map for educators to follow.
After reviewing, I could see no real changes that were significantly different. As a middle school teacher, I know there are gaps in each grade level, and no true time for mastery over any concepts. Many other states have adopted versions that are more specific to what they want their students to learn. Our version is still vague.
I feel some standards are not age appropriate. Example conjunctions in first grade. We need to focus more on teaching our kids how to read. Our students are being asked to do too much and we can't focus on the foundation of reading. What's going to happen when our kids get to high school and can't read?
There should be more emphasis on narrative writing.
Some of the requirements are still quite rigorous for Kindergarten students.
Please include cursive writing at the appropriate grade levels. I am tired of high school students

Question 5 Comments - ELA
who can neither read nor write in cursive!
I think we are asking our younger students to do much more than their brains are developed for. I strongly believe that our students should be held to higher expectations, but the rate in which we are asking them to mature is too fast.
It looks like the person writing these standards has actually spent time with children and not just sat in an office!
I'm please with the 1st grade revisions.
If you revise the CCGPS now, you are not considering the exhaustive and exhausting work teachers have done for years to adopt and use and master the CCGPS. Please slow down, think about what you are doing! SLOW DOWN. Assess CAREFULLY. GET MORE TEACHER STAKEHOLDERS involved!
As a gifted teacher who sees grades 1-5 daily, I sometimes wonder if all of the writing perspectives (narrative, etc.) reduces the comprehension factor for students. Even my "smart" ones have problems understanding and retaining what they have read on occasion and I believe I would be confused if I was in their position. Just a thought....
We do not need changes at this time. We have just know got a firm grasp of the current standards. Can we please not try to reinvent the wheel at every turn. Thank you!
I have been teaching LA for 12 years. There has never been a textbook or resources for the students to refer to reinforce their learning. I understand that we are in an age of technology, but some families do not have the money for iPads, or computers, or internet services at home. Even in 5th grade, I believe that the 8 parts of speech are covered in depth.
I would like to know why you decided to remove the term "formal" from the writing assignment expectations, replacing with the term "appropriate." I'm not sure that this change give the precision of language that the newer, more rigorous standards expect.
I approve of the 6th grade changes to the ELA standards.
There needs to be clear expectations for the type of texts in which students show mastery of grade level standards. For example, 5th grade students should be able to independently track events in novels and short stories within grade level lexile band to determine themes.
If gray delineates every change made, including standards being deleted, how are we to know what changes have been made at all?
Because of the lack of specificity in the standards, it is not possible to determine whether or not the standards are rigorous enough for college and career readiness , include concepts applicable to post-secondary and workplace environments, or provide vertical alignment from gone grade level to the next. The way these standards are worded, every school or school district would have to choose (guess at) exactly what skills/concepts should be mastered at each grade level. The same thing could be said for their level of rigor and whether or not their concepts are applicable to post-secondary and workplace environments.
Thank you for not changing the 8th grade ELA standards significantly. They are fine the way they are.
Most schools do not have the technology resources to accommodate the students with keyboarding skills for testing.
I am not a strong proponent of Common Core. I wish we could just teach! We are pushing our children before most of them are ready. Why? Why do we have a law on the books that allows students to enter kindergarten if they turn five by Sept. 1 when all our schools start the first week of August if not sooner? Why are all children supposed to be developmentally ready at age 5? Why is it my fault if they are not? Where is the parent component in all this? We have missed the mark terribly in my opinion. We should be focusing on helping to strengthen our families by making sure that we have enough jobs to get people off of welfare and give back to society. We should be strengthening our families by teaching our youth how important it is to choose their mates wisely and that marriage is hard and it takes commitment, but it is so much better for our children to have families that stay together. I have been an early childhood teacher for a long time and I love it! It is so disheartening to see our children suffering. They long to be in families that are not split up. They long to know where they are going to be the next week. If you want the U.S. to be a strong nation once again and to be competitive, then we need to work on strengthening our families. A nation is only as strong as their families.
For ELACC1RL5, the revised element reads "Explain major difference between texts that tell stories and texts that give information." Should there be either a definite or indefinite article

Question 5 Comments - ELA
preceding "difference" such as "a" or "the"? If more than one difference is possible, then the wording of the element should include the plural version of "differences". Also for ELACC4L1; Element B, I find the revised wording awkward. I would respectfully recommend b. Form and use the appropriate progressive tense. You would still include the parenthetical citation that indicates the examples of the past, present and future progressive tense. Essentially, replace "verb aspects" with "appropriate progressive tense."
Too advanced
Rigor is important, however developmental appropriateness is necessary. When establishing rigorous standards, we need to remind ourselves that middle school students have only been writing and reading for 5-6 years.
Changes for ELA in grades 9-12 were few, but I appreciate that they are no longer limiting a particular content to a specific grade level.
I think handwriting needs to be incorporated into the Kindergarten Standard. It is very important to carve out time in the curriculum for our students to learn proper techniques for holding a pencil and to form their letters correctly from the first day of school. I think if handwriting were a larger standard (instead of prints many upper and lower case letters) we would have time to focus on their fine motor skills and handwriting.
I agree with all of the above.
No changes made to standards in 5th grade.
Subjunctive and conditional moods are concepts that are disappearing from modern English usage, and I find little reason to include it in the standards. For high level students, they are concepts that add very little to the style and voice of these student writers, and for students who struggle, the concepts are confusing and actually get in the way of actual comprehension of language structures. In my opinion, the only reason to include these concepts in a regular education curriculum is to show off the "intelligence" of the person who is writing the standards. They are of little to no use for the modern American student.
The revisions are well written.
The revisions were nothing major. A few words were changed in two of the standards and the third revision took out part of the standard that really shouldn't have been there to begin with. So, good work!
I think the paring down of the ELA standards is extremely effective. There is so much repetition in the current standards, and the revisions draw attention to the most important elements students must know and be able to do.
Some of the Language standards are opaque, including ELACC8L1.a: "Explain the function of verbals (gerunds, participles, infinitives) in general and their function in particular sentences." It seems that having a student effectively use verbals in their writing should be sufficient for meeting the standard. The wording of this standard makes it difficult to know how a student should be assessed on the standard. The way it is worded makes this unclear.
I would like some concrete examples given for each standard.
I read the "new" high school ELA standards and I didn't see much difference from the current standards. The revised standards were merely tweaked by deleting or adding a few phrases or words such as "fallacious" and "multicultural". I do not believe that these revised standards are a vast difference, or even a slight difference, over the old ones. The standards are still written in educational jargon that students and some teachers have a difficult time defining. The standards are also too wordy. I do not believe the standards take into account the non-collegiate careers that a majority of our students enter into after high school.
I am appalled that in the age of technology, cursive handwriting is being considered as a standard. We are being asked to produce and publish writing using digital tools in as early as Kindergarten, yet proposing to spend precious learning time to teach an antiquated method of communication. We boast these standards are preparing students for college and career readiness in the 21st century, yet propose to teach an "art" valued in 1940. Justification of this addition is necessary as I cannot think of one career in which cursive is used or valued. Can you?
There weren't any revisions made to the ELA 5th grade standards.
I had to search word by word to find the 2 differences in the 7th ELA standards. I was expecting a major overhaul.
Nothing has been changed. It is still not developmentally appropriate. Simply rearranging words

Question 5 Comments - ELA
does not revise a curriculum.
I like that many of the standards are short and sweet. Many districts/schools require teachers to post the standards and may require teachers to include the standards on student assignments. When they are too wordy, it takes away from their impact in my opinion. Keep it simple! Also, it would be most helpful if the standards could be printed for classroom use via the website. Since they're in PDF form, they have to be individually copied or retyped presently. I teach three grade levels and this is quite labor intensive!
As a department chair, I know that multiple teachers, from across the county, in the ELA department, made numerous recommendations for removing and revising standards, but it seems little to no revisions were made, which is extremely frustrating.
Many of our students are not college bound, so more real life standards would be helpful. I feel that more grammar and English would be more beneficial than comparing texts to books, themes of books, etc.
Fluency needs a range of words per minute
Concerned about the students that are not on level and being able to graduate from High School.
When teaching for mastery, I feel fewer standards and more time to focus on "Power Standards" would benefit our students. There are so many standards to master, yet time for true depth of knowledge is difficult to provide for most students.
There is not enough emphasis on literature.
There are not enough significant differences to even call these "revised" standards.
The revisions as planned seem to only clarify the expectations for the standards, rather than change the content.
I feel they are clear and understandable for teachers, administrators, and others familiar with educational/business jargon. I feel many parents not familiar with that type of vocabulary will find them wordy and difficult to understand.
No 5th grade standards were revised-- and they should have been!
Standards, however clearly stated, are always inconsistently implemented because of uncontrollable variables occurring in diverse systems, communities, schools, and classrooms. The outcome of seeking to establish standardized objectives can never be accurately forecast; unintended consequences will always appear. Teaching is more of an art than a science, and teacher preparation programs are severely lacking in academic rigor. Effectiveness of instruction based on standardized objectives is always dependent on the classroom teacher.
This is my 18th year teaching and I think the addition of the Milestones, new standards, new grading system (giving grades of 1,2,3,4 instead of percents) in a one year period is way to much change all at once. If you want teachers to be successful then change should be gradual.
For some of the standards I did not recognize any change
The standards are very vague and need to be more precise.
As an educator, I am fine with the CCGPS standards as they were already written for third graders. The changes made do not vary much from what we are already teaching.
Some grade levels skip items that the next grade level is to have mastered which does not correlate.
I really feel when you are talking about workplace readiness you are missing the boat. This may prepare college bound students for college but students on other paths are being asked to do things that do not create readiness for workplace or workplace skills.
The changes were slightly different from what they currently are. I also think we need to have some type of keyboarding class in our school therefore our students can type proficiently on the current state test.
We need to take a look at some of the other standards and continue to condense and reword to...teacher friendly. I do applaud the effort that has been made thus far.
I love the standards just the way they are!
Each of the standards still needs to be written with clear and descriptive examples of what is to be expected.
Words cannot describe how disappointed I was when I read the revisions. They seem to be touted as a grand re-write for which we should be eternally grateful. For my grade, all it

Question 5 Comments - ELA
included was an "and" changed to an "and/or"... and later an adverb was moved. Seriously? How long did it take for people to decide to do those? More importantly... were they paid for that? Math, SS, and Science standards are very concrete, whereas LA standards are slightly abstract. For SS, they must know where a country is, for example. That's easy to show mastery. Yes. I know where it is. Deciding mastery in LA is a lot more subjective than that. Also, if you want students to be able to take ownership of their learning, how about putting the standards into terms that they can understand?
There are too many standards for kindergarten when we have to assess on an individual basis. The standards are not clearly measureable with the state assessment (GKIDS).
The "Career" readiness piece needs to be explicit and include expectations that implement rigor for students outside of the "College" track.
As a Kindergarten teacher, I really appreciate the changes made in ELACCKRF3. They are appropriate and make more sense. I assume changes would apply to GKIDS as well.
Too difficult and too many standards.
I think that kindergarten is being pushed too hard and research does not support this. Children this age should have opportunity to play and many schools are limiting the play time of five year olds in order to push them to do what children just a few years ago had until 1st grade to master. Research suggest that this trend will not be good for our children.
I feel there is a lack of grammar instruction that is necessary to specific feedback.
Appropriate
They look great.
Update is clear.
I don't know about the standards and I get to have an opinion? Common core is a bunch of junk. Kids are different in different parts of the country. We can't teach them the same way.
Why can I take this survey when I know nothing on the topic? Local teachers should decide what their kids need.
There are gaps that have to be closed.
The standards seem to make it difficult for students struggling in reading to catch up. Furthermore, as TKEYS uses student achievement as a large portion of the evaluation, it is imperative for teachers to have the flexibility to meet the needs of the students and excel them appropriately.
Third grade should begin with cursive writing.
I am curious to know if this survey for teachers concerning the revised ELA standards is the same survey non-educators respond to.
I am glad to see that the revised standards are more in tune to focusing on fewer skills so that time for mastery can be achieved.
As a S/PID teacher, my students have access to the standards through accommodations and modifications. My students will never attend college or enter the work force.
I would like more clarification on the types of figurative languages K-5 should know. Also, what prefixes and suffixes do each grade level need to focus in on.
The entire document makes no sense. For standards grayed out, there are 5 possibilities of what is happening to that standard. Which one is it? Was it deleted or deemed to be suitable to stay. In your chart of standards, do those numbers mean the number of standards total to be used or the number that were reviewed and revised. There is no explanation. In the standards that did have revisions, there were no changes in the actual skills or lessons, but merely wording or phrase changes. That is a not a true revision. If you moving standards to a Teacher Guidance document, where is that for our review?
There are gaps between grade levels. If we just teach the standards there is background that also needs to be taught. We are playing catch up. Some standards are not developmentally appropriate
My teachers still want specifics in regard to consonant digraphs, blends, vowel teams, etc. that MUST be taught at each grade level. They are understand they can go beyond the minimum but the feeling is the minimum should be clear so that ALL teachers know the ones they MUST teach. For fluency, they would like an acceptable range (per grade) for the speed because we use the national norms for our universal screeners but this is different on our informal reading inventories. A basic range would bring consistency in what "on target" looks like for children.
I like that the revised standards for kindergarten include "With prompting".

Question 5 Comments - ELA
What are the reasons for revising them?
I teach many culturally and language diverse students. Over 23 out of 25 of my students speak another language at home. I feel that many of these standards are too rigorous and are setting my students up for failure.
I don't feel this survey is asking the really important questions and I hope this data is not being collected to indicate that CCGPS standards are loved and accepted by parents and educators. I don't feel that the revisions were all that helpful regardless of their clarity and rigor. I don't really see that anything that changed significantly. I question if this is a smoke and mirrors attempt at saying that we are listening to detractors and making changes in the curriculum while we are not really doing anything much at all. I'm sure that's not the type of comment you were asking for, but it is my opinion regarding these changes.
It is my experience, as a first grade teacher, that leads me to believe that the narrative writing standard should stay in place. We are expecting students to know too many grammar skills. Then, they are not expected to utilize these skills in their writings.
There continues to be excessive verbiage within the standards. A great deal of repetitiveness is used within the standards that does not necessarily promote vertical alignment. More dissection of the standards is recommended.
The changes are minimal at best. Basically just the slightest change in wording. Changes do not appear to help.
I like that the prompts of adult guidance has been added.
The kindergarten standards are difficult to assess due to the language of the standard. The standards are not clearly written and can be interpreted in different ways. There are also too many standards to be taught in depth so the students do not get a strong grasp of the foundations of reading and writing.
What exactly are "Grade Level Appropriate Words"?
Standards are not all age appropriate. When considering all the subject matter to be taught in a year, it is impossible to teach it all in a timely manner. Students need more time to spend on standards in order to both master and have a deeper level of understanding.
Please check L1c. The standard says singular and plural nouns with matching verbs but the example uses pronouns.
Standards need to be precise and or provide examples of what students are expected to learn with each standard
In a Kindergarten EIP classroom with no full time Paraprofessional where students have never attended a Pre-K program or daycare it is impossible for them to master any of these standards. They come in not even knowing their name and by December they are still working on letters and sounds. Developmentally these students are not ready for this rigorous teaching that needs to take place. Before they master how to write their name and know their letters and sounds we are asking them to do an informative writing and in the second nine weeks an informational writing. How can they write when they don't even know how to write their name or their letters and sounds.
I think they will be easily implemented.
Teachers' interpretation, translation and application of the Standards vary from school to school.
Most changes seemed like rewording rather than changing the meaning.
I am looking forward to making our students the center of the focus on education. I am excited by the CCGPS rigor and see improvement in our schools.
The standards have NEVER been the problem; they are, in fact, very clear and relevant. The issue is that they were rolled out too fast and educators (including those in administration) were not adequately trained/prepared to teach/support the standards in the classroom environment.
The grammar standards in English Language Arts seem to have a very small role in the preparation of the student for the next grade level. While I realize the importance of teaching grammar, I believe it has become almost extinct in many classrooms or what is taught is not grade level relevant due to a lack of knowledge from the students' previous learning experiences. I would propose a revision to the emphasis of this specific area of Language Arts.
More direct Phonics instruction should be added to the standards
We have gone from a microscope to a telescope when looking at the standards. The old standards had far too much detail and requirements to be accomplished in a school year.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
These standards are too simplistic. Unless examples and specific subject matter is to be recommended, we will again be facing the "local option" for material taught, with no consistency from system to system. Please find a good middle ground.
There are clear gaps between grade levels. The expectations of third and fourth grade are completely unrealistic, especially when students have had the pleasure of doing age appropriate work in kindergarten through second grade. This isn't to say there aren't any gaps between first and second grade. How are we expected to teach predicates and combining predicates when knowing what a verb is has never been a part of the curriculum?
The revisions were minor and did not change the standard.
I teach kindergarten, a lot of the common core standards we are currently teaching can be overwhelming for most students and parents. I feel that by changing the standards to "with guidance and support" more students will meet the required standards. So thank you!
I think it was a great idea to change "modal auxiliaries" to helping/linking verbs. That is a nightmare to teach with that terminology to 4th grades. I do feel that their needs to be a clearer expectation on Reading Literary 4.6 Point of View. Do the students only need to know the difference in 1st and 3rd person in identification, or do they need to know the characters point of view on certain topics based off of dialogue, actions, and thoughts. I read the standard to be that students only need to understand how to identify which point of view the author is writing in. Also, is there a need to put "Greek Mythology" allusion in standard RL 4.4. That is a whole mini-unit that I teach but if it is not going to be referred to in standardized testing is there a need?
Now that we are implementing phonics back into the standards, I think it would be helpful to promote how one learns vocabulary words versus "sight" words.
These common core standards for absurd. Essentially we are trying to teach young children the curriculum that was formerly taught to them in a grade or two higher and these young children are NOT ready!! Kindergarteners are being taught informative writing styles when they haven't even learned their alphabet, sounds or even how to fully write their name. As I stated earlier, the common core curriculum has moved down what use to be taught in higher grades without even thinking about the maturity and readiness level of the children. If common core was going to be implemented correctly...Pre-K ages should have changed to 5 year olds, kindergarten 6 years olds, first grade 7 years old, etc. K-12 students, parents and teachers hopefully will stand up and let their voices be heard on this matter. Currently no teachers want to stay in education and if college students are smart they won't enter the field of education until changes are made!
There are still too many standards for students to learn. There should be only about five to ten standards.
CCGPS is not specific at all; too much is left up to teacher discretion (i.e.: "with prompting and support"); what one teacher may feel a student can do, another may not. Needs to be MORE SPECIFIC.
The change in middle grades is minimal at best. It does nothing to fix the impracticality and ridiculousness of these standards, nor do these changes make them any more teachable.
The standards were not clarified. They are still too vague and broad. There are too many standards at each grade level. It is very difficult to focus instruction with these standards as our guide.
It is imperative that students come to the high school setting with the skills to successfully decode unfamiliar words phonetically, write in cursive script for pacing and retention, and use a computer for word processing by having ingrained the typing skills necessary for the 21st century.
The standards are well-written in terms of being broad enough to admit a variety of instructional methods and texts; however, they are far too numerous for effective implementation. I would like to see the standards streamlined more, eliminating those that are redundant (i.e., we do not need separate standards for informational texts, we just need more bullet points under RL to cover exceptions). I remain disturbed by the Common Core focus on informational texts, which waters down and deemphasizes the rigorous examination of difficult literature that will expand student horizons and fashion them into well-rounded students and readers, as well as citizens of the world. The standards are useful tools, but they have become bloated and unwieldy. It is time to reduce them down to a smaller, manageable number so that teachers-- especially new

Question 5 Comments - ELA
teachers-- do not feel overwhelmed and defeated before they start. Good teachers incorporate many of these simultaneously; being forced to list more than five standards on one lesson is just a ridiculous waste of time and effort and shows how bloated they have become. Thank you for your consideration.
Extremely open to interpretation. There needs to be state wide reference materials including a glossary.
The grammar standards are lacking. The standards assume that middle schools students do not need to be taught more than 2 comma rules, how to use apostrophes, how to identify the parts of speech, how to identify sentence parts, or how to use irregular verbs correctly. These standards will produce adults who are weak in writing since the skills are not repeated over time. These skills will also be ignored since literature and language arts are being forced into one class. It's a shame for this generation.
These standards are too rigorous for some of our students. Some are not developmentally appropriate and difficult for some students to attain. Differentiated instruction should include differentiated assessments and standards.
As a Kindergarten teacher, I am please at the addition of money back in the standards.
I don't understand the need to revise them yet again. They are rigorous and fine the way they are. We have spent hours making posters with the standard and essential questions to display in our rooms and that will now need to be revised yet again.
Spelling and handwriting need to be a separate standard. Receive a grade on the report card in their own section.
No comments at this time.
The changes in ELA 9-12 are so minor that I question the reason in even changing them. For instance, in 9-10RL7, the only change is the placement of the example. How does that change affect our students?
I understand the need to review standards for appropriate and clear language
There was very little revision except in the semantics. I hope that there was not a lot of money spent in the "revision process" because it seems like a waste of time for the amount of revisions.
Overall organization of the standards can be confusing.
Some of them are IDENTICAL. I don't know why it seems that they showing they are different. I wish that we could just make a decision and stop all these changes. There is no way for us to do our jobs if we keep changing wording, and ideas. Please, just let us do our job and teach our classes.
The standards are still too vague. If teachers are expected to cover the standards in order to have students prepared to pass standardized tests, then we need to know exactly what is to be taught.
Vocabulary development and keyboarding skills are key. My students (inner city - high poverty) have very low schema and have a very difficult time relating to and comprehending the level of rigor required.
Students are not given time to learn the basic concepts of reading and writing in each grade level. There is too much information and little time to master the concepts.
While there are no objections to the revisions, WHY were such small adjustments necessary? Keeping the existing Common Core standards and the availability of such a wealth of resources and shared alignment seems far more beneficial.
Standards are fine, but the standardized testing is so flawed, we end up with a net loss. The standardized testing gives a false certainty. I teach special education and English (certified in both), and the testing is so problematic, we'd be better off throwing the standards baby out with the standardized testing bathwater. I teach struggling readers, and I resent the data I am supposed to use for instructional planning, because a test can't measure reading level and subject knowledge at the same time. From my perspective, the standards are reasonable overall, but using the standardized testing for either a student graduation requirement or teacher evaluation is irresponsible. Oh, and a question on a test that asks a student to pretend they are listening to a speech does not cover a "listening and speaking" standard. It covers a reading standard.
Teachers will need instructional assistance with helping students meet these standards particularly teachers with ELL populations and students below grade level.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Too vague and are not developmentally age appropriate.
Shame on you.
I comply with the standards.
I dislike how technology is removed from early grades...use of "digital tools" seems to be moved away from mandatory to optional. If we are going to test students on the computer as well as get students ready for college and career, we need technology standards embedded in all the grade levels, not just higher elementary.
Should have a bit more detail in technical writing
The revised standards clarify student expectations
The ELA standards look pretty good. I'm glad you have specific standards to address grammar. I would like to see a set of specific standards added to teach proper handwriting techniques (manuscript as well as cursive) and the correct formation of letters. I can not begin to count the number of students I've seen who have poor penmanship due to the fact that they were never taught the correct way to form a letter or word. Unfortunately, if it's not written in the standards, then it's not going to happen in the classroom. That is the simple truth of the education system the government has created. Guidance and Professional Learning documents are not a substitute for required, state-mandated standards. Throughout all of our standards, we need to get back to basics, build a foundation, and give the children a chance to succeed when they are introduced to more complex ideas and more "rigorous standards".
I agree with your proposed changes since they adapt for Georgia and improve wording of standards.
Do not revise.
I feel as if some of the standards are too rigorous and developmentally inappropriate for my grade level. I don't really see much of a change in the standards, except moving a few words around or adding a few words.
There is a standard for commas at the opening and closing of a letter, but no letter writing.
While the standards are clear, aligned, rigorous and reflect student outcomes, the changes are not significant enough to warrant the tremendous work that the changes will impact. The current standards are also clear, aligned, rigorous and reflect intended student outcomes. Realignment pacing guides, assessments, report cards and teacher resources requires great effort and time. The changes really need to be more compelling to justify all of the impact and consequences of the change.
The ELA standards, particularly the reading and language standards, are vague and lack real world application. There are no sub-standards for the reading standards, and the language standards cover very little grammar.
How do they apply to SPED students who still cannot read?
ELACCL11-12RI9 For British Literature, World Literature, and Multicultural Literature.....("American " here is redundant.)
I do not believe that cursive writing should be included in the curriculum because it takes time away from the true subjects and items that we should be using in our instruction time.
Kindergarten - sight words Could the state provide a list of sight words for K, 1, and 2 grades. This always comes up in discussion among teachers. With a common list from the state it would provide the same expectation from ALL Georgia students
Rigorous enough to ensure college and career readiness? In kindergarten? This is appalling and so grossly lacking in commonsense it makes me sick. I teach children who are FIVE YEARS OLD. Our work is our play. It makes me sick how our kindergarteners are having concepts that they can't grasp shoved down their throats and we are expected to go along with it, knowing that it is wrong. I am a veteran teacher and over the years I have watched as kindergarten has turned into a convoluted mess. It makes me sick that the people who make up all of this mess for us to do have no idea how five year olds think or what motivates them. I cannot wait to retire and I hope for the benefit of all educators and students that this "common core", which so lacks in "commonsense", goes away and stays gone.
It is unclear what is meant by "grade appropriate words" in several standards. "Grade appropriate words" is very subjective wording.
For grades K-5, the standards are not developmentally age appropriate. They are too tough. They can not grasp some of the concepts.
You didn't change anything that matters. I notice no child development professionals were part

Question 5 Comments - ELA
of this this time, either.
It is important to continue handwriting in all K-5 classes because although we have technology, there are times when everyone must be able to write legibly.
In regard to the kindergarten ELA revised standards I feel like adding "with prompting and support" makes the following reading standards more developmentally appropriate: - ask/answer questions about texts -illustrations should match words
They are clearer and more specific. For example, I like the wording "historical documents" instead of 17th, 18th, 19th C. etc.
The teacher guidance documents will be extremely helpful!
I noticed very few revisions proposed for 7th grade ELA and those proposed included minimal changes.
The state of GA needs to not be a part of Common Core
I would like to see more skills-based standards, leaving LESS to be subject to interpretation. I'm all for giving teachers leeway to make their own instructional decisions as a classroom teacher, but I think some of the standards are very vague, and I am seeing different states define them in different ways as they break down the standards into classroom activities.
The current standards offer enough guidelines to see exactly what skills a teacher should be teaching; however, there is not enough information in the standards that clearly outlines the variety of topics or methods that teachers should use to teach those skills. One of the great things that the Georgia performance standards offered was providing specific topics to cover. I would definitely like to see a true melding of the Georgia performance standards and our current common core standards as one. For example if we are going to teach students how to cite textual evidence, allow the standards to determine what topic we would do that with. For example, in the Georgia performance standards, we were given topics pertaining to our content, such as poetry, novel study, etc. Now we are given very broad instructions from the state curriculum maps that do not work well with the current standards given. Perhaps we need to revise our curriculum maps and frameworks to match those standards.
The only difference is a few standards have been reworded. There needs to be true revision. Some of the standards are not appropriate for first grade-especially the conventions standards.
At what point is the state going to realize that these mandates are unrealistic and do not benefit every child.
The only decent revisions to make to these standards should be to get rid of them and start from scratch. Most parents cannot help their children with their homework because they do not understand them. This means that there children have no support at home.
Multiple detailed standards have become overwhelming for teachers to access, document and teach. Also, confuses students with details and loose the "big picture."
Phrasing like "grade level" and "counterclaims" are abstract to guarantee successful implementation across counties and in classrooms. Abstract thinking is required for many of these standards' mastery and is not developed really until a student's Junior year.
ELA standards are set at a level that is too high in some areas and too specific in others.
Please provide more time to thoroughly cover them or reduce the amount of standards that need to be covered in the grade level, so that students can get many great lessons as opposed to rushed ones. Thanks!
The standards are developmentally inappropriate for early childhood education
Knowing how to avoid common mistakes like apostrophes and commas are not detailed in these standards. The comma standard only says restrictive and nonrestrictive elements. What about compound sentences and introductory elements? Grammar cannot be glossed over with too simplistic of standards.
The ELA standards are not developmentally appropriate for K-2 students. Student learning should be focused on reading fluency and comprehension skills. Teaching children at this age about parts of speech, singular and plural possessive nouns, contractions, compound words, antonyms, synonyms, using commas, authors purpose, etc. is worthless if they can NOT read.
This is a joke.
Common Core ELA Standards need to be scrapped, not revised. Students need good, classic literature in order to be able to learn to think critically, and they need to be able to analyze texts using their own life experience as well as the historical context of the literature and it's author. Literature should not be read in a vacuum, it should be experienced wholly in order to allow the

Question 5 Comments - ELA
reader to analyze and discuss their thoughts and feelings about it, and in turn, analyze their feelings about the world around them. ELA should never be used to indoctrinate a student to believe in a particular value system, but should be used to allow the reader to discover what their private personal beliefs are, and why, through critical thinking on their own part. Also, learning to read mostly informational texts at the expense of classic literature is an excellent way to turn kids off to reading completely.
The standards are more vague than the previous GPS we had. We're expected to teach such a broad area, without knowing anything about the tests. Although this question asks about the standards, I also have to include my thoughts on teachers' pay being tied to test scores. This is the only profession that is graded on the performance of others. Teachers are exhausted from all the long hours, testing, progress monitoring, and mandatory-volunteerism, from which we're judged. We rarely get weekends with our families that doesn't include getting ready for the next week. Teachers teach because they want to educate children, but so many have about reached their limit.
These changes are minimal. Georgia's kids deserve better.
Social agenda. Teaching to the test. No classical instruction. Where is data collection in this survey?
My first grade son is on a waiting list for IEP. If there are so many kids needing IEP obviously the standards are set way too high. I'm not sure of what the "standards" are, but if someone does not modify them to adapt to the age Children that they are made for we are going to have a massive problem. I am currently spending \$60/week on tutoring so that my son can meet the current "standards" and pass the first grade. His teacher makes the class miss recess to gain extra instructional time for her students to test well on the standardized tests. Something has to be done.
I would like to see common core done away with all together!
There are many gaps between grade levels. Teachers spend too much time at the beginning of the year catching up the students, from the previous years, instead of teaching new material. Our school system is on a downward spiral, due to so much assessing.
I don't like the required reading books. Example: Junior high having to read about how great Islam religion is.
These are a farce. Grammar is hardly taught in high school. Students don't know parts of speech!
They are extremely vague and have gaps from 4th to 7th grades. Strict pronoun usage in 6th grade standards is not effective given the rigor of 7th grade grammar and writing component standards.
The books and lessons I've seen seem to be random collections. They don't seem to be a pattern for learning.
Common Core must go!
Too much, too soon! Same with math. Kindergarteners are learning about nouns before they can read. Ridiculous!!
Materials for proper implementation of the standards are lacking, as well as real world applications.
Hardly any of the standards were revised. GPS was more specific and certainly more rigorous. Carroll County is test crazy. The high schools will test 70 days out of 186. Middle School children at age 11 and 12 should not be reading 1100 Lexiles without a ton of support. You are destroying their desire to read.
Too much is packed into each grade level. Our kids need to be tested on less, master those concepts deeper, then have a few more skills added the following year. We teach fast and furious, constantly moving on to cover a year's worth of material before March, in less than a year, so that everything has been taught before the all mighty test is given. As a result, students do not have time to master and apply skills to writing. Everything is choppy and teachers are teaching to the test, not to student needs.
The common core standards are very broad. There a many concepts placed into one unit. Unfortunately, there is not enough time to give the concepts the amount of instructional time they deserve.
Please fix this mess!
We have made "with rigor" our motto, while not teaching the students the basics on which to

Question 5 Comments - ELA
build and achieve the rigor.
The 9-10 standards weren't revised, they were edited. I had to read one of them ten times and I still couldn't see a change. I was expecting that the TASKS would be adjusted, and that's not what happened. Ridiculous.
I believe in flexibility in the classroom-
Parents did not ask for the "wording" of the standards to be revised. Many of the standards are STILL DEVELOPMENTALLY INAPPROPRIATE! The state is asking young children to complete tasks that their brains are not developed enough to complete. The state is asking them to complete assignments when they have not been taught the basics to complete them. I do not like that there is no emphasis on spelling. Cursive writing has been removed. If they are taught cursive, it is the "bare bones" minimum to just be able to sign their names. I also do not like the informational texts that they are given. How can they possibly write a compare/contrast, inference, opinion, etc essay on a text that they do not understand? Children cannot "infer" when they are young. Children who were caught in the middle of this during the implementation of Common Core, did not even have experience doing book reports, and now we are asking them to write an essay fit for high school or college students, while they are in elementary school. This is wrong. I have an entire collection of these essays from my children and will happily provide you with examples. Also, with these writing assignments, the directions on many are written in a confusing convoluted manner, and are even difficult for adults to understand. Occasionally, no directions at all. Assignments are given to merely check off the "standard" box. Our kids are not learning anything from doing this. Concepts applicable to post-secondary and workplace environments do not belong in elementary school. Asking our students to do things above their developmental level is frustrating them (and their parents and teachers) and it shuts down their joy of learning! I witnessed an assignment such as these, cause my son such extreme frustration and anxiety that it caused him to hyperventilate. That is not "rigorous" it is abusive. Assignments such as these will not encourage a "love" for writing. By the way he has always scored well on the CRCT. Our children and our society deserve an education system based on proven solid concepts that work. I ask you to REMOVE Georgia from Common Core, not just tweak the wording of the standards.
There are still far too many standards to teach when we must lose so much Instructional time for mandated state and local testing. E.g., I will have 4 full days of instructional time due to testing.
There is very little change. The standards are completely ambiguous.
Most of these revisions seem unnecessary, as they are essentially just rewording standards to make them less technical-sounding.
Next question please
ambiguity of GaDOE and lack of tasks related to the standards
I believe this revision was unnecessary. The revisions to the 6-8 ELA standards involved verbiage, semantics, punctuation, etc. I feel our valuable resources, i.e., man hours, effort, and monies, could have been more effectively spent focusing on actual implementation of said standards, training teachers in technology usage and lesson creation, etc.
These new standards are not age appropriate for elementary school students. While they may be aligned from grade level to grade level, expecting a first or fourth grade student to be able to read two different passages (fiction and non fiction in the same topic) and then generate a 2-3 page paper comparing and contrasting the articles is TOTALLY inappropriate for the developmental stage of a 8-9 year old child. The standards themselves are too far reaching and "lofty" without specific detail in many cases. There was nothing wrong with the old standards other than making sure they were implemented appropriately. Those should be reinstated with the addition of more upper level skills, but those that align with the appropriate mental development of the child.
Just changing the wording is not acceptable. We need developmentally appropriate standards and less standards in all subjects so that foundations and mastery can be obtained. Yes, we do need to challenge but we need to do is adequately prepare our students not just cover all standards. As teachers, that's what we feel we have to do because there are so many in all subjects. As well, we need the grade level classroom teachers input not someone who is sitting in an office that disconnected with today's classroom. I teach 5th grade and still have a

Question 5 Comments - ELA
majority of my students who don't capitalize, write complete sentences, and many can't write a focused paragraph. Please listen to the teachers who are crying out and want to help our students be successful!
End the social engineering of this testing culture, Race To the Top, Common Core, STEM and give our children an adequate liberal arts education. Since 1957, there has not been any evidence, other than anecdotal, that have a great quantity of scientists is better than having a great quality in the scientists we do have.
Please list the specific 'common prefixes and suffixes' students should know at grade levels.
End the social engineering of this testing culture, Race To the Top, Common Core, STEM and give our children an adequate liberal arts education. Since 1957, there has not been any evidence, other than anecdotal, that having a great quantity of scientists is better than having a great quality in the scientists we do have.
Incorporate professional development training opportunities during the summer as PLUs to provide teachers support
Cursive Writing needs to be a requirement, along with the fundamentals of typing. In the elementary grades the focus needs to be on the grammatical elements of the language before requiring students to produce elaborate writing pieces
The Language Arts Standards they are required to master in the 4th grade must be taught in isolation in order to be able to master and apply to the Writing and Speaking and Listening Standards. Our students are still learning what relative pronouns are, order adjectives within a sentence and how to use progressive verbs, not to mention so many other grammatical elements. To be able to produce complete sentences and correct fragmented sentences and run on sentences these must be taught in isolation. In elementary developing a strong and firm foundation of the written word seems to be much more important than producing a complete writing piece.
My fourth grader cannot break down a sentence. He should already know nouns, verbs, adj, etc. The DGP used in schools until 2 years ago was by far a better program for sentence structure. Also cursive is just beginning now in 4th grade; this should have started in the 3rd grade. I have a 7th grader who knew grammar, could write in cursive and had excellent penmanship beginning of 4th grade. He did not have as much common core in elementary. Grammar and handwriting matter in adult world. The kids need two full years of learning cursive before 6th grade. They also need grammar to speak and write correctly before leaving elementary school. My sons are 3 years apart in school and I see a very big difference in the level of education. Common core lacks in my opinion.
Anyone who has taken a course in brain development would know that kids at these age (middle school) are not developmentally ready for abstract thought. I feel that we are setting these kids up for failure. Since GPS was introduced (after QCC) I've seen an increase in kids who are illiterate, don't know their times tables and lack basic skills. I believe that Common Core is Washington's attempt to "keep up with the Joneses" in Asia, but it is not a fair comparison. In Asia they only educate the elite. Here we educate everybody. I believe we are doing our children a disservice if we continue with Common Core. I believe our children are better off if we go back to QCC where the standards are cut and dry, and they have more opportunities to be successful.
Except for the 11th grade standard change in which you have added multi-cultural and British literature into the standard to expand the types of texts that can be studied and allow for a better range of classes to be offered at the high school level (which makes sense), you have basically done nothing to change these standards. The changes are only changes in semantics. I cannot fathom the amount of time and money that has been wasted in order to make a few changes in the wording of these standards that does not even impact what is being taught. It is ridiculous. Why don't you let teachers get comfortable with the standards, teach them for about 10 years, and then do some studies and take some data on how the standards have impacted the students. You are trying to change things before they even have a chance to get implemented fully, and before you analyze the impact on the students. And the changes you have proposed are basically moving words around. What a WASTE OF TIME AND MONEY!
The CCS are somewhat ambiguous and lead to interpretation which can be problematic to newer teachers who do not have the classroom or curriculum experience to bring to the

Question 5 Comments - ELA
classroom.
It would be nice if k-2 teachers could have a chance to provide input concerning the proposed standards. This would be based on the consistency of the students understanding/performance vs what is expected for each subject matter.
Standards should be aligned with developmentally appropriate skills based on Piaget's research. Students should not be pushed into adolescent activities when they really need early developmental activities.
I am very glad that some were combined because in doing I Can statements for class there are days we have 6 or more for ELA.
The wording is still not clear. The standards are not common. There is too much open interpretation. I have acquired new students from other counties in GA and they had no idea of what I was teaching in my county.
To be honest, I didn't really see that much of a difference in the revisions that I looked at- We do not need the common core.
The problem is NOT the material being presented but that it's being presented to children too early in their mental development. The standards are not age appropriate and frustrating not only the children but the parents and teachers also. These standards are hurting the self-confidence of children because they feel as if they're failing and not capable to succeed. These standards are hurting our future. We don't just need a few minor "revisions" to these standards. We need to get back to teaching children age appropriate curriculum and focus on preparing children to be confident and successful! Thank You!
Failure to encourage early learners with opportunities to read for FUN ensures they won't want to read for information later...it's backwards and kids HATE it!!! Where's poetry, where are classics? Why can't teachers read to them for FUN? Where are memorization skills being taught? The whole system is sad, sad, sad and more sad!!! Ask psychiatrists why their offices are filled with sad and depressed children who DONT want to go to school...whereas before when classical curriculums were the norm they didn't see this? And THAT generation put a man on the moon!!! Common core is a Gates and cronies inspired money-making scheme you need to STOP!!!
Parents and students find them confusing. Some vocabulary words may not be age appropriate.
My child is falling behind due to common core standards and we as parents do not feel we are able to help with homework. Have had to hire tutor that we honestly can't afford just to assist our child with homework.
It is still unclear what is to be taught at each level. Furthermore, students are coming to me without the prior knowledge expected in Common Core Standards!
Lower elementary students(K-2) have no reason to do non fiction research. They need to focus on grammar and what a sentence is.
Stop common core now!!!
Lack specificity. Too much room for poor interpretation.
While the standards are aligned as defined, the interpretation factor keeps them from actually being alignable. Everyone that reads them interprets them differently and there are no parameters as to which ones are power and which are somewhat expendable...again, this is up to interpretation. This is not The Bible. Standards should not be so very vague and undefined. Also, the thematic units only serve to isolate skills and knowledge and continues to not allow students to actually internalize and generalize. Teachers are having to reteach each the basic elements each year because not enough concentrated time is being spent on them. Jumping around based on a unit theme is ludicrous.
Standards are not aligned to what children are developmentally ready to learn. They are being asked to learn plurals in kindergarten and adverbs in 2nd grade. These are simply 2 examples off the top of my head that are absurd.
I would like to see more attention paid to grammar. Every child should be introduced to classic literature. What is the deal with the dystopian books at the middle school level? Our children should still be taught cursive, because if they can't write it, how can they read it? I would love for my grand children to be able to read the letters from their grandfather.
The changes are so minimal that I wonder why we spent the time and money to make the changes. I feel that we should look at standards that are too complex for the grade level and

Question 5 Comments - ELA
remove them. One example would be coordinating and subordinating conjunctions in third grade. Another example is teaching levels and branches of government in third grade. This is a concept most adults don't understand.
The standards are not teaching enough basic grammar concepts to students.
I do not agree with implementing Common Core in any form. We should no allow our local school systems to be controlled by the federal gov hundreds of miles away. I do not believe in cookie cutter plans for kids and schools across the US.
The CCGPS standards certainly include rigor, but are not developmentally appropriate for children. Young children are unable to think at the level required. Application, analyzing, and making inferences are skills that are extremely difficult. These skills are not appropriate for a child who has not developed an abstract way of thinking. Most elementary age children are still thinking in concrete terms and their brains are not developed enough to reason abstractly as many common core standards require. I feel that young (K-2) students should spend the most time working on phonics, phonemic awareness, and basic beginning reading and writing skills. Many LA skills are too difficult and require a lot of time that could be spent building a better foundation for reading and future academic success.
WANT COMMON CORE to be expelled from Georgia schools period!
Simplify where possible. Accept recommendations and advice from teachers who actually teach these standards.
Some of the standards are too broad such as prefix and suffix. Which specific ones need to be taught per grade? Multiple meaning words are the same. Give specifics
I do believe students should held to higher standards and should be encouraged to participate in rigorous tasks; however, many of these standards are applicable for a more mature audience. As it currently stands, I work well over my contract hours to find resources and plan lessons to target a child audience. Parents are at a complete loss on how to help their children, and quite frankly I can't educate parents and their children too. When I do challenge my students, I receive very little parent support, and spend even more of my personal time trying to explain the curriculum to parents. My county does not give us our required lunch break every week required by law either, so I can't even plan during my lunch break. Unless the state doesn't do something soon, teachers are going to leave in droves. Children need to be children, and the state should focus on improving teacher work conditions as well as the standards. Happy teachers make happy students!
We need to use the GA performance standards used before no child and race to the top!
ELA and all other Common Core Standards are no more rigorous than those used in the past. The standards are not the problem; the fundamental problem is apathetic students that do not see a reason to learn when they have instant access to any information they need at their fingertips.
ELA skills are not represented enough. One lesson every 4-5 tasks on verbs, nouns, etc. is not enough for mastery and I can't take enough time for mastery if I'm expected to teach all the tasks. The tasks are not beneficial to my first grade class's need for skills to move on to second grade. They are also lacking phonics skills that again, I don't have time to do if I'm expected to fully complete the tasks in the units.
Until this educator has witnessed GA schools that are properly staffed, class size reduced, realistic - evidence based protocols in place (implemented with integrity) for all students, and students with disabilities in gen/ed classrooms receiving the support they need (including appropriate modifications), then minor revisions to common core subjects will not be acceptable.
The standards themselves are not poorly constructed; however given the time constraints, RTI, TKES, career readiness and the new GA Milestones roll out (that no one really seems to know what they are to look like), Teachers are drowning. The exceptional teachers are leaving in droves. We are fighting a culture of helicopter parents who refuse to hold their student accountable. Yet we (teachers) have to explain, justify, placate, and hand hold the parents. I witness everyday teachers/admin whose health is crashing because of the stress levels. We are not opposed or closed to helpful tools but we are at a point of color coding our lesson plans so they will be TKES ready. We are sick of the tail wagging the dog.
The language in revised ELA CCL 9-10 W7 appears to be the same as the original standard.
Where is the realistic approach for students with special needs? Yes, these standards are

Question 5 Comments - ELA
successfully preparing students for college, but what about the students that don't go to college?
The English Language Arts Standards remove the ability for teachers to creatively express themselves in writing. Students are asked to cite from the text in writing and restate questions for responses at too early an age. The standards and expectations ignore research of early child development and their need for creative expression in learning. This takes the love of reading and writing away from children.
Some of them are too vague.
I do not see any significant revisions to the actual standards for either ELACC6L6 or ELACC6RL2. A few words are changed but not enough to make the standard any more specific. In ELACC6W6 I agree that the keyboarding standard should be removed from ELA, but I do think that somewhere in grades 6-8 keyboarding should be emphasized.
The new standards assume a great deal of prior knowledge that our students simply don't have. Until all students have been taught these standards from the beginning, we have to spend too much time on background information - helping them play 'catch up' just so that they can stretch to reach these standards. In addition, HALF of our performance evaluation will now be based upon their success on a test that also assumes that they've had this prior knowledge. This is RIDICULOUS! Why are you doing this to our children? Once this test rolls out, you are going to see two things: 1) older secondary students dropping out to pursue an alternate path toward a successful future, and 2) parents removing their children from this circus and opting for home school or private institutions. Proper implementation of this would have begun at the lower grade levels and then gradually phased out the CRCT commensurate with the students being exposed to more rigorous standards. Currently, you've set the students up to fail and in so doing, you've set teachers up to fail no matter how much we do right. The standards aren't the issue. The high stakes testing is. If you want to get at the heart of the frustration of your entire state's educational work force, you very seriously need to consider the effect that MASSIVE failures will have on the psyches of our students, their parents, and to the educators who have done everything possible to insure their success. Many things look like a good idea on paper, but their practical application is simply not in the best interest of ANYONE (except perhaps whoever has been paid to create the tests.) This is a travesty at best in addition to being ethically questionable.
They are STILL not very clear and too much is required under one standard.
The ELA standards are developmentally inappropriate. They limit instruction to lower level thinking skills through the instructional texts. They do not teach advanced vocabulary and the vital literary techniques for critical thinking taught by classic literature. These include figurative language, similes, metaphors, personification, irony, symbolism, and so forth. Additionally, the content in the aligned textbooks and supplemental materials are biased, graphic, and very objectionable. The exemplars are very sexualized and anti-Christian and anti-American. The standards drive curriculum and methods. Teachers become test-focused data drones. And they lose autonomy to develop and teach quality, creative, and innovative lessons and units.
The ELA standards still seem vague. The revisions aren't detailed enough, particularly with the conventions. I also don't think the convention standards are age-appropriate. For example, should an 8 year old really understand the difference between a subordinating and coordinating conjunction?
The reading material required is not appropriate for middle school students. Too much profanity and adult situations in many of the books.
The early grades defy pre operational stages of development. Many of them cannot construct responses from information text in the manner that is required for the standard.
There are too many standards to ensure that they are mastered thoroughly.
It appears, once again, it's just a matter of semantics. These are not drastically changed at all.
Standards are too broad. It is hard to determine what students are expected to learn
Very little changes. There is a huge gap in skills of students coming into middle grades since common core began. 6th grade students are not able to identify basic parts of speech or write more than simple sentences. As a twenty year teaching veteran and mother of five, I am greatly saddened by the direction our education system is heading.
The standards consume more time to teach than available before the end of the year, much less before testing. Children need to spend more time reading on their own reading level, but

Question 5 Comments - ELA
there is not enough time in the school day.
Continue to work on the language of the standards. Many are too broad.
R10 changes eliminate a standard for basic Read Alouds which is an integral part of Kindergarten. This standard should not be changed. RF4d , the reading of irregular spelled words should include sight words.
There are some children that are not test takers and get nervous when taking the test. I think as a parent the kids should not be penalized if they don't do good on test that their overall should be looked at. What ever happened to the three RRRs.
Too many advanced concepts being pushed down to early childhood and not enough instruction or time given to appropriate and important developmental skills. Many children and teachers are frustrated, not succeeding and not getting the support needed. Students are not getting a well balanced education. Many areas and many subjects are being neglected because there is not enough time to accomplish all of the Standards. I see a huge decline in penmanship, spelling, language skills, and vocabulary. Emphasis on reading and writing is important, but must be well balanced with all areas and subjects and should be better balanced to developmental levels.
ELACCKR17- Why would words that further explain a standard/ element be removed? ELACC1RF3-g.- Recognize and read grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words. Many sight words come under this standard. It see it was moved since it maybe is not considered decoding. However, there is a skill we could include there. Maybe something should be included about trying other vowel sounds when the rule does not work. For example the a in wallet sound like short o. An a in banana sounds like short u. The ey in they sound like long a. ELACC1L1: Use determiners (e.g., articles, demonstratives). All the others listed here give specific examples of words that fit the terms used in the standard. Examples like "the" and "an" as articles should be given. ELACC1L1: K. Print with appropriate spacing between words and sentences. Because of its importance as a skill, this should have been element "b." or at least much higher on the list. In Richmond County, the biggest challenge is that our curriculum map needs rearranging. We should follow the order of the text which are the main materials that we use to teach. This would promote easier teaching and learning. Jumping around means kids encounter more difficult vocabulary and tasks that they are not prepared for because we skipped the lessons that would teach those skills. It also means teacher have to spend a lot of time hunting for resources to pre-teach a skill needed for background knowledge. We dont have online access to Benchmark, and it is not possible to load the entire kit up to take home to do your planning. Building up background knowledge takes time from teaching the material that we are working with. If we went in order the background knowledge would have been covered already and materials would be readily available.
Proposed changes were worded more clearly and are easier to understand.
I agree with these changes, because they make sense and clearly explain the standards.
I think that changing the wording for the standard regarding Modal Auxiliaries is a positive change. I think that revising RL 4.7 is also a positive change- the wording is more appropriate for their cognitive abilities.
These standards, revised or not, are a giant step down from GA's previous standards. I do not think GA should keep these standards. We need to think about our children first.
I would like to see some sort of labeling for each standard (i.e. ELACC1RL1).
The revised standards are so generic as to be useless. The existing standards are duplicative and too detailed, but the revisions have erred in the opposite direction. We might as well have "standards" that say, "Teach whatever comes to mind."
I agree with the revisions.
I do not like that you are telling the classroom teacher in 9th and 10th what she must teach. The non-fiction choices are political and politics have no place in the classroom. If you don't think I'm capable of using what works for my students then please find a monkey to stand at the front of the room
Go back to the traditional way of teaching English. Get rid of Common Core!
More computers are needed in the classroom for students to use who live in low income school districts to ensure they have the opportunity to engage in standards that require the use of technology.
The standards would not be so bad if they were feasible for the mid to low students to truly

Question 5 Comments - ELA
achieve. Students are not being given sufficient amount of time to learn the BASICS of reading, writing, and math. If they DON'T have the basics, they are NOT going to be able to perform rigorous work, and we keep pushing them through expecting it to just click! Let the elementary age be the basics, with of course acceleration for students who are ready, and let the middle and high school be for the more rigorous work with continued remediation and acceleration when needed!
The standards would not be so bad if they were feasible for the mid to low students to truly achieve. Students are not being given sufficient amount of time to learn the BASICS of reading, writing, and math. If they DON'T have the basics, they are NOT going to be able to perform rigorous work, and we keep pushing them through expecting it to just click! Let the elementary age be the basics, with of course acceleration for students who are ready, and let the middle and high school be for the more rigorous work with continued remediation and acceleration when needed!
I feel that as a first grade teacher, our standards are rigorous enough for our students.
The standards are too general. The Georgia Performance Standards broke down every standard, specifying what students should be able to do, but the CCGPS just provides a standard and expect teachers to go for what they know. Also I feel as if standards should be tailored to the state test since teachers are being asked to teach to the test more so than teaching authentically and ensuring that students comprehend the standards prior to moving forward just to have enough standards covered for the end of the year tests.
Why was RF1d (identify letters of the alphabet) removed? I believe that this standard should remain in Kindergarten. Also, RF2 standard and all elements should remain. Otherwise, I really like that the standards have been streamlined and that most of the writing standards have been removed.
There needs to be a Stronger, not weaker, emphasis on direct Phonics instruction in grades K-2
A big focus on a well developed literacy foundation in phonics and the continued support as students develop their literacy skills.
I do not agree with moving ELACCKRF3c (sight word recognition) into ELACCKRF4 without having it as a separate item (ex: a - sight words; b - read grade level texts.
The standards were ok.
These standards do not provide ALL students with opportunities that will help them after high school. Our students would benefit more from varying standards depending on post-secondary plans.
I think we need to allow all acceptable teaching methods as not every learner learns the same way.
I think the grammar standards need to include spelling along with vocabulary and that specific grammar standards are spelled out
The importance of keyboarding skill practice be considered as not all students have technology classes in middle school. Vertical discussion with elementary feeder schools.
I think it was wise to include "with prompting and support" OR "with guidance and support" for the primary standards.
In the kindergarten standards, the knowledge of sight words and students being able to read fluently at emergent reader was combined into one standard. These are two different skills. While knowledge of sight words does help a child with fluency, recalling words and reading a text require different skills.
There are a lot of revisions for kindergarten. Some seem to be developmentally inappropriate and will be difficult to achieve for some kindergartners and those that speak another language.
My only concern is with taking out the typing component (Grade 6) when in the future all of the Milestone testing is supposed to be taken on the computer. Students will be required to type their constructed and extended responses on the computer but throughout the year they will not be expected to meet a required standard.
Standards need to be more specific as to which irregular sounds, specific prefixes & suffixes, etc. To be mastered at each grade level. Revised standards are still too generic to provide statewide consistency.
I think the revisions are subtle and do not denote significant change. They seem to primarily concern clarification of certain aspects of the previous version of the standards. I think there is

Question 5 Comments - ELA
value in the revisions made.
Clarification seems to be the norm for these. Shifting fluency standards out of phonics standards is very appropriate.
I teach SPED pre-k and we do not use the common core standards.
Thank you for providing Georgia educators the opportunity to review and revise the adopted standards. In my opinion, the voice of the educators was clear that very few substantial revisions were necessary. Georgia teachers like the ELA Common Core Georgia Performance Standards, and we appreciate the clarity provided in the DOE guidance documents. I respectfully request that you adopt these standards as revised.
From a parent perspective, the 6-8 ELA standards make sense and clearly identify what my daughter needs to learn in ELA while she is in middle school.
The proposed standards document that I saw was very confusing. Why in the world would the same highlighting refer to a standard that had been 90% approved and one that had been deleted or modified? I wasn't sure which side of the standard column was most applicable.
I have been working with CCGPS for the past 4 years. NO TEACHER IN GOOD CONSCIENCE, CAN TAKE A STEP BACK! We did struggle, but we have seen that the kids CAN DO it!!! I am very pleased with the ELA revisions.
First of all, there are standards that are to be taught in younger grades that the older grades are to maintain. These standards should be listed with the other standards as well. Secondly, the standards are covering too much ground. Students need time to truly master a concept, but because of the amount that must be taught, that time is not available. For this reason, there can't be much rigor. By the time you teach the lesson, there isn't time for rigor- mainly because the students haven't had time to master the concept yet. I feel there should be less standards which are more specific. Give students ample time to learn it, practice it, THEN "rigor-ize" it. This way they will have a true understanding of each concept.
There needs to be a clear place for the standards to be posted and accessible to all.
For writing, the standard that encompasses the use of textual evidence, RL1, has been removed. The new, all-encompassing standard, describes that the students should be able to provide a summary of the text. This reflects a significant change both in content and rigor. At the high school level, students should be required to do more than "regurgitate" a summary of texts read to be adequately prepared for job skills that go beyond perfunctory, manual labor. Perhaps I am reading the changes incorrectly. If not, I have sincere reservations about the lack of rigor represented by the "new" standards.
The standards only benefit the students who are on grade level and are high functioning in the classroom.
The revised standards are strikingly similar to the original standards. The wording is still very ambiguous especially some of the standards for K-3.
I did not see many significant changes in the 9-12 standards.
Adding the middle events to RL5 was a great idea. The old standard can be misleading because the students might not think that the middle of a story is not important because the standard stresses why is the beginning important to the end and vice versa.
The proposed change in ELACC4L1 (c) from modal auxiliaries to helping/linking verbs seems a little too broad, not specific enough.
ELACC1RF3 - 1. Add "blends" to standard. 2. Add variant and r-controlled vowels ELACC1W6 - "With guidance and support from adults and collaboration with peers, use a variety of tools, including digital tools, to produce and publish writing.
It appears that they were made more clear by the added language.
More defined as what we are assessing
The standards are hard to understand and they are hard to teach
While I agree that the standards in and of themselves accomplish the above goals, I do believe that they are conditional to the texts that are taught.
Regarding ELACC6-8SL1 These are behavioral objectives. To ensure the quality of reporting, we will NEED a standards based report card. Students demonstrating proficiency of this particular standard support their own success and demonstrate academic and social gains. Students who do not demonstrate this proficiency in this standard often show less academic gains and higher rates of discipline concerns.
The standards are too general. They are not well organized or specific enough. They are mixed

Question 5 Comments - ELA
up and not broken down into a logical hierarchy. They do not outline what students should know.
Some of these skills are too difficult for elementary students. Their cognitive development is not able to process some of the advanced skills listed.
There are too many.
I feel that the revisions better state the goals or the current standards..
Revised standards are much more appropriate for inclusion and UDL approach. I would consider adding a standard addressing emerging handwriting skills/pre-letter formation to encourage districts to develop curriculum that support these skills.
Overall, there are still too many standards! Teachers need the State to define the most critical, essential standards for each grade level. The expectation that teachers teach and students really learn over 40 standards in 180 days is unrealistic and sets us all up for failure.
The standards are not specific enough for the amount of sight vocabulary that must be mastered. At the Kindergarten level, the students should not be expected to learn no more than 50 sight words.
Language of standards are "too wordy"
The revised standards for first grade are much more understandable. They are more developmentally appropriate for 6-7 year old students. They are rigorous enough to ensure readiness for second grade.
PLEASE LEAVE THE STANDARDS AS THEY WERE WRITTEN! They are rigorous standards and we are just now becoming comfortable and familiar with them. I, as an educator, know what I am expected to teach and I would like them to remain as is.
I hope the guidance documents will provide specific clarification for some of the more difficult standards (exactly what is expected for the RI 7 standard, for example).
First, the revision of ELACC9-10RI9 includes the addition of Nelson Mandela's Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Neither of these are U.S. documents as mandated by the standard. (ELACC9-10RI9: Analyze seminal U.S. documents of literary and historical significance...) Second of all, to "provide vertical alignment from one grade to the next," 9th and 10th grades and 11th and 12th grades should not be lumped together. To be more "clear and understandable," students and teachers should be able to distinguish between 9th and 10th grade curriculums as well as 11th and 12th grade curriculums.
Common core is NOT age appropriate, and our students are suffering. I've heard too many parents, teachers, and students comment that their children are now miserable. My son now feels like a complete failure! He is a bright, young man, and I am watching common core destroy my child's confidence, motivation, and love of school!!!
Was not sure where cursive writing is being taught. I saw it on the 4th standards but only that they are to write in cursive. We do not have time to teach it in 4th.
I teach special education and I believe we miss opportunities to align standards to subjects that coincide with each other. Ex. We are reading WHILE THE WORLD WATCHED in L/A and studying the Vietnam War in SS. This would be a great opportunity for timelines on world events that were happening at about the same time. It would bring our global community closer; I think!
The changes aren't significantly different at the third grade level. Seems like a waste of time to change them.
The changes are acceptable.
From reading the current standards and the proposed standards they are exactly the same just worded differently! How is that any different from the crap they are forcing the kids to learn now! just do away with these standards all together and go back to teaching our children the way they should be taught. Listen to the experts that work with the children on a daily basis. With the doctors that are having to treat the children because of the anxiety and other disorders these standards are causing our children to have. We want our children to learn and not be stressed out by these standards and all the standardized testing they are subjected to for nothing more than a bunch of numbers. They don't correctly measure what the children are learning or how the teachers are teaching! Try listening to the parents, teachers and doctors who KNOW WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT!! Stop giving money to the greedy companies. Stop letting the government break the laws and do away with our Constitutional rights!

Question 5 Comments - ELA
If merging the two subjects into one on progress reports and report cards is a state level decision, PLEASE do not. Some children are excellent readers but struggle with writing and grammar concepts. An '85' average could be very misleading if the child writes poorly but reads well. With the way CC is currently set up, There is a distinction and a clearer picture of strengths and needs in each. Yet there is ample opportunity for writing in the reading subject.
There were only 2 standards revised in the 11-12 standards overall. The standards should be revised to not be so vague and open-ended. The other subject areas are much more narrow and can be easily identified in lesson planning and data analysis. ELA standards are not.
There were no changes in my specific grade level, but my problem with current and revised standards is in how very broad and vague they are. There are too many concepts/topics in one standard - misinterpretation is almost certain from one classroom to the next, much less from county to county or state to state. We desperately need a more specific breakdown (as an auxiliary resource perhaps) with grade level skills/topic lists or content descriptors to help guide our consistent "common core" teaching. Otherwise, there will be nothing common about it - just a bunch of professionals guessing about what an all encompassing question or standard implies in their opinion or experience (which varies dramatically across our state). Thank you for this opportunity to speak.
The revisions appear to be more apt wording/verbiage for relevant skills the students need to demonstrate.
Not enough emphasis on real world needs
I do not agree with the emphasis being placed on reading informational texts. Common Core standards, both current and revised, are stifling all forms of creativity in our students.
The typing of two pages in one sitting in the fifth grade language standards is not appropriate for the average fifth grader.
Changes provide clarity for those standards that were often "fuzzy" for some teachers.
There are too many common core standards to effectively teach in one school year. The standards need to be condensed to include fewer standards instead of revised. What was wrong with the GPS standards? The new standards put teachers under a lot of pressure and students at a disadvantage.
More phonics based instruction, emphasis on handwriting, brain connection to hold symbols and sounds.
I would like to have more clarification of the sight word standard and to make it a statewide #. Many counties make up how many sight words are acceptable. Our county expects the kindergarten students to recognize a minimum of 220 sight words. This is an unrealistic expectation for ALL kindergarten students. Please make further adjustments to state a specific # of sight words state wide. We get several students from other counties that do not recognize but a few sight words and are then behind.
I'm most concerned about how developmentally appropriate the standards are for primary grades.
Although I agreed with all the above, I do feel that we are forcing our students to learn above and beyond their capacity in the elementary grades. Education is supposed to be a fun learning experience, but sadly it has become more about testing and preparing our 5 year olds for college. Take the focus off of rigor and put it back on the children.
In ELACCL11-12RL9, it specifies that 18th-, 19th-, and 20th century texts should be studied in British lit; there are very important pieces from Britain that come from much earlier centuries that are important to our culture and are suitable for study.
Much better!!!!
I think these standards are on the right track to getting our students where they need to be, and they are definitely better than what we were using. However, the Teacher Guidance documents need to be revised to provide teachers with a better understanding of what students should know/do at each grade level. The standards are clear and appropriate, but the majority of teachers at my school do not know how in depth they should go. I think there was not enough training on that aspect before implementation, so adding that to the lack of materials and resources teachers have available means many teachers have not increased the level of rigor in their instruction.
Standards are still very vague in what students should be able to do.
These standards have not changed, but only been revised slightly. They are still ambiguous

Question 5 Comments - ELA
and provide no vertical alignment or difference and are still wordy and difficult for students and teachers to use and refer to.
We need to give our kids something to RISE to; no one rises to low expectations. What is offered in these "so-called" revised standards is nothing more than the status quo. Georgia's students WILL NOT be competitive as citizens in a global society if we do what is proposed here.
The proposed revisions are more concise and understandable.
I am VERY pleased with the changes and I would like to see them remain the same for my child's entire educational career!!!!!!
The revisions primarily make the standards more concise, which is fine. The revisions for Kindergarten seem more age appropriate as some kids just need more time to learn to read than others. While I would like cursive writing to be taught I do not think it should be a requirement. I wish Kindergarten and 1st grade included a standard for printing so that more handwriting instruction would be provided in the earlier grades. I am concerned the keyboarding requirements, including into middle school, were watered down. Keyboarding is a fundamental skill for everyone and kids who struggle with handwriting greatly benefit from early and frequent access to a computer to produce written work. It would be great if all first graders drafted papers by hand and then produced finished copy via keyboard. By 5th grade all drafts & final papers should be done on the computer. In my opinion, at least..
When answering question #4, there should be an option to state that the changes are minor. There has not been a significant change to the standards - nor do I think there should be; however, to perpetuate that in some way they have been truly revised is somewhat misleading. They have been edited at best. The Common Core GPS standards were in an acceptable state previously and these 'revisions' are almost negligible. I do hope that that 'revisions' weren't made simply to appease a political agenda.
Throw out all Common Core standards and instead base ELA on the standards defined by NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English)
I think they are clear and concise.
The old standard for 9th and 10th reads: ELACCL9-10RI9: Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington's Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt's Four Freedoms speech, King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail"), including how they address related themes and concepts. It now reads: Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington's Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt's Four Freedoms speech, King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail", Nelson Mandela's Nobel Peace Prize Speech, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights), including how they address related themes and concepts. My questions are about the inclusion of the Mandela Speech and the Declaration of Human Rights as an exemplary texts. A. Why are these considered U.S Documents? B. Is the idea that we are to compare and contrast U.S. Documents with other documents of historical and literary significance for related themes and concepts? Thanks for the clarification.
I still believe we have too many standards in first grade.
There are between 41-43 standards per grade level in grades K-5. There are only 36 weeks in a school year. Instructional time is interrupted with many state or county mandated events (see ITBS/CogAT) which allows for 30-32 weeks to effectively cover 41-43 standards. The lack of protected instructional and planning time is one of the greatest factors in regards to ineffective teacher/learning. The lack of professional development to effectively unpack the standards and implement them in the classroom for teachers who have been out of college for 5+ years also had a negative affect on the effectiveness of the standards. Now we get to the actual standards and whether they are correctly revised. I do not believe they are correctly revised. ELACCKW5 - Please clarify what it means to "respond to questions and suggestions by peers and add details to strengthen writing as needed." Is this age appropriate? It is asking students to comment on the writing of their peers orally or through written communication? How many students in a Title 1 school with a high ELL population will meet this standard? How does a KK child who doesn't know how to read give feedback to invented spelling? How do you assess this standard to make sure it has been met? Is this standard always whole class being modeled by the teacher with student participation? Is the student expected to actually read the writing of a peer and then provide feedback which will "strengthen their writing as needed?" 2)

Question 5 Comments - ELA
ELACCKL1a: Print many upper- and lower-case letters. There are only 26 letters in the English alphabet. Double it (upper- and lower-case) and you get 52 letters. What constitutes many? Does it mean that they can print 50% or 75% or 90% of the letters? Trying to justify a student meeting this standard using the word "many" is too vague and allows for too many counter-arguments. It should state that KK students need to print ALL upper- and lower-case letters. 3) ELACCKL1b: Use frequently occurring nouns and verbs. How does a teacher assess this standard to determine it has been met? Is there a definitive list of frequently occurring nouns and verbs for KK students? Once again, this standard is too vague for teachers to know what is truly expected of them and their students. Those are only 3 samples from the KK standards out of the many that I could've given throughout the entire list of standards in grades K-5. Also, out of the 3 standards I listed as examples, how are they rigorous enough to ensure college and career readiness? Some standards are not rigorous and just need to be taught as foundational skills. These standards need to be addressed as such and clearly communicated with the educational professionals of Georgia.
The proposed standards are clearer to me.
We need language about proficiency or many of the standards are pretty useless. (What does "demonstrate knowledge" mean, for example?) We also still need to divide up the high school standards by grade. 9 and 10 shouldn't be the same; 11th and 12th shouldn't be the same. The new wording about American, Multicultural, World, and British documents improves the standards, but it would make even more sense to have grade or course level specific standards for all of the high school ELA.
Keep them short and simple
You have to be kidding. I am a physician, with more education than virtually anyone taking this survey, and I have no idea what that gibberish meant. And frankly I consider it meaningless to begin with. The only thing that needs to be done with regard to Common Core is to remove it from our schools. Immediately.
Get rid of Common Core, PERIOD!!!!
Some of the standards are too rigorous and are developmentally inappropriate. I know educators, leaders, and parents were on the committee for revisions, but were any developmental psychologists on the team?
The standards do not appear to have had any significant revisions. Just adding a word or two does or revising structure of a sentence does not warrant an important revision. While the standards MAY prepare the students for college, they don't really appear to have any connection to the workplace.
For kindergarten I do not think it is appropriate to ask this age group to be able to use digital tools to publish work. Some of the standards for kindergarten are too rigorous for this age group. Only half the student population actually attends preschool. Most of our students come to us not even knowing how to hold a pencil.
They are still somewhat vague and these changes are in minor wording. There were no major changes addressed in these revisions.
The GA-DOE still lacks the competence to implement initiatives. Sadly, many of our schools are inept, because the state lacks the foresight to effectively develop teachers. The obsessive focus on student growth is in stark contrast to the menial investments of Common Core initiatives. Obviously, the GA-DOE blindly follows initiatives (FEDERAL DOLLARS) without the fervor to develop its own mark on educational history. I think Henry Ford said it best, "If I had asked people what they wanted, they would have said faster horses." Continually, the state obliges teachers into the mold of "faster horses". While we (teachers) lack the political prowess to subjugate educational reform, our students suffer. TEACHERS ARE THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT SCHOOL BASED FACTOR IN STUDENT SUCCESS. At best, the GA-DOE showcases our state's flighty assumptions that standards are the issue. Standards are not the problem. Teachers are the key. Invest in us!
I disagree with Common Core frameworks. The standards were not acceptable in my humble opinion based on not them not providing my students with enough exposure to a variety of genres. Also, school were/are not financially equipped to provide books for all students.
Our standards are still "a mile wide and an inch deep". There are so many that time for in depth study is impossible.
These standards are reasonable and clear. Both students and parents need standards that are

Question 5 Comments - ELA
understandable, and these are. Please accept with revisions as posted.
The revisions show better what students need to be able to perform at the end of the year. However, the changes were minor.
ELA standards are not clear on grade-level grammar and vocabulary expectations.
There was no significant change to the standards. The standards are appropriate as they stand.
There seemed to be very little change in the wording and some standards seemed to not change at all
I have a problem with the ELA standard ELACC4RL4. Why teach the meaning of words and phrases in mythology when students aren't expected to read myths. Some of the myths are inappropriate for fourth graders.
Although only two standards were revised, I feel that they more clearly define what is expected of the students (to know and to be able to do).
The changes for eighth grade raise a question on instruction. When the new standard says "And/or" will some students think they have to do both? If that is the case and the test is timed, they may incorrectly assume they have to do both. If timed, their results could be less than stellar, while students who read it as only having to do one or the other could excel at answering only one of the two.
Our present curriculum does not align in any way with the standards. It is obvious to me that it does not matter what you read to accomplish the standards, however, the outcomes and instructional strategies do not reflect the demand of the Milestones Test. Additionally, the exemplars on the sample test were obviously drafted by a professional writer. What a travesty!! This is clearly not the type of writing to be produced by a 14 year old with a much more limited scope and vision. I can only say that I am glad I have until May to parse out this ridiculousness that is the new test.
In the first 11th-12th grade revised standard, delete the close parentheses. In the second 11th-12th grade revised standard, do not capitalize the M in the word multicultural.
In 4th grade, many of the standards appear to be random and unconnected to other aspects of the grade level curriculum. One example is the standard relating to Greek mythological vocabulary. It seems out of place. Also, this is the first survey that I have been given an opportunity to take on the CCGPS. It is reported in the news that teachers responded to surveys regarding the Common Core standards, however, we were only given access to a survey pertaining to the Math Standards.
Clarification on phrases such as "age appropriate words
It might be applicable to have clearer definitions for what students should be able to know/do with regards to specific literary devices that should be known in each grade level. It may also be relevant to have poetry be in its own category rather than just shoehorned in literature, because there are enough differences between poetry and prose that it is arguable that it merits its own category within the standards.
For 7th Grade the changes are very minor and basically won't change what we are doing. At this point in the year when we are all trying to prepare students for a new and more rigorous test that we have not seen, I think that is a very good thing.
I am glad this opportunity to give comments has been given. Although many standards appeared workable initially, implementing some proved otherwise at the elementary level. The revisions are very helpful in moving towards what is effective at the classroom level.
As is the standard issue with any standards, they are left to the interpretation of those reading them. While these are, seemingly, an improvement over the previous versions, I personally feel that there is still more work to be done. That, of course, is the nature of change.
I believe the state should develop its own curriculum and drop the entire Common Core that does not include American authors and stories.
Using and/or is awkward. "Or" is inclusive of "and" from a logic standpoint. One change for high school was replacing "formal style and objective tone" to "appropriate style and objective tone." I'd say "appropriate style and tone" and leave at that. If "objective" is appropriate for the purpose at hand, it's covered. In L3 the bit about MLA/APA/Chicago was added to the statement, removing the bullet. That's fine, but the sentence has too many "and's" now. It should be reworded.
With the importance of technology increasing, I do not see the need for students to spend the

Question 5 Comments - ELA
time to learn and practice cursive writing. Legible printing is sufficient for students whose writing will be done primarily on a computer or other electronic device.
I believe the standards for ELA need to be revised. It is clear to the instructors. Some of the standards aren't aligned.
I would like to see more consistent teaching of the ELA standards that meet students needs at their academic level. Too often Georgia is changing their teaching standards and methods that keep students, teachers, and parents confused. If this continues the goal for failure to students and teachers alike will be accomplished. I would also like for Georgia to stick with one method of teaching these skills so that they are master teachers in this skills and standards and not learning as they teach the students. It makes the teachers and staff look like they don't know what they are doing and allows for negative behaviors and attitude to enter into an atmosphere of positive learning. In the middle school level there are students that have not mastered the elementary level standards but yet, they are promoted to the next grade in order to save and foster an image that is so untrue and hurtful to the student and society in whole. Please understand that if we truly want a future for this world the way we teach our children is the way to ensure that a strong future is within our children in the manner of being able to speak, read, and communicate in this world.
I think the proposed revisions will help teachers and students!
There are too many ELA standards. As a teacher, it is extremely difficult to manage and instruct all of the standards. I hope that the number of standards is decreased in the future.
It is critical that students are given the opportunity to master prerequisite skills before being expected to grasp concepts required by common core curriculum.
The revised standards are acceptable.
A child psychologist needs to be an advocate for the children and their readiness. I believe the cognitive development of the young child has not been duly considered.
The revision of the standards eliminate skimming across the surface of many standards and allow teaching for depth and breadth of knowledge.
It would be extremely helpful to be provided samples of paired selections with related extended and constructed response prompts.
I was happy to see minimal change. I am very happy with the current standards.
I think these core standards are acceptable. However, I don't like the federal gov't dictating them and tying funding to them.
The changes for 6th grade ELA seem to focus on wording and the standard did not change (and/or). The only difference was in the keyboard requirements.
The standards are not written to the least common denominator for both the students and some teachers; they tend to mean one thing, yet another.
These standards are a lot more understandable than the ones we have now. I feel these standards would be clear and to the point as where the current standards are not to least common denominator of understanding.
The proposed revised standards do not seem to be much different from the original standards. What was the purpose?
If students are to master skills using tech and complete assessments using word processing why is the 6th grade standard for typing dropped?
I felt the ELA standards were very well written from the beginning. I do like the way modal verbs (4th grade) are going back to being called "helping verbs." This will help parents understand what we are talking about. I do have to say that the one standard I find most difficult to teach 4th grade children is relative pronoun/adverbs. It is such a hard concept for children to understand.
These are not written in a manner that parents can easily understand. We don't know what to do to help our kids, and are forced to wait until they begin having problems. From what I can tell, they don't appear to be the most desirable concepts needed for the workplace.
I think the ELA standards are highly inappropriate for early childhood years. I think having kids read "informational texts" rather than literature or books that help children to identify with the storyteller as in developing empathy, happiness, sorrow, etc. is ludicrous. Children need literature books and story books! Not blanket, non-opinion paragraphs.
90% of these standards are misaligned. They need to be moved to later grades and a stronger foundation developed. They are asking abstract thinking skills far younger than most children

Question 5 Comments - ELA
develop the ability. This creates toxic stress in the classroom and is pushing children to hate school. This is not rigor. This is the result of writers who had no idea what they were doing.
It appears that most of the standards are the same.
Your process for making changes is not rigorous and I strongly oppose any changes made only at the Georgia level. If these are going to be useful and allow Georgians to compare our system across the country and to ensure children in the military or otherwise move across county or state lines, then changes should be made on a broad scale and done with the Common Core organizers. You do all of us a disservice going out on your own just to score political points. I am not opposed to adding standards or clarifying, but I am most strongly opposed to the many standards I saw that make the Common Core less rigorous--by the way, the teachers surveyed responded in your survey that these weren't rigorous enough in some areas, not too rigorous-- Here is an example of dumbing these down and also changing the intent of the standard: ELACC4RL7: Make connections between the text of a story or drama and a visual or oral presentation of the text, identifying where each version reflects specific descriptions and directions in the text. Make connections between the text of a story or drama and a visual or oral presentation of the text, identifying similarities and differences. TO ELACC4RL8. I am also strongly opposed to any changes in standard from one grade to the next, this also puts our students at a disadvantage nationally and disadvantages children moving to GA from other states. Changes should be made in a rigorous fashion on a national level and your suggestions should be vetted by the advisory body that created them. Shame on making changes without understanding what they are written like they are in the first place.
The test do not match the standards. If the teachers are not given more information on how the standards will be tested, it doesn't make any difference how you change the standards.
The two revised standards pertaining to my grade level seemed only to be revised due to wording. Only a few words were taken out per standard, but the standards are not any clearer than before. The common core standards overall still remain vague. The concepts listed are very broad and STILL not narrow enough. The former GPS and even the QCCs were at least focused so that the teacher and students could better understand their teaching/learning goals. I feel the common core standards were written so that our state and national officials, as well as testing companies, can not be held responsible or liable if students do not do well on the testing of these broad standards (in other words, there are built-in loop holes for the "Powers-That-Be") while the teachers can be left holding the bag. As an educator of 14 years, I have asked for narrow and specific in regards to the CCGPS, and I have yet to get it.
Leave well enough alone!!!
It would be really helpful if there was a list of the sight words necessary. We use the words that are needed for Level C and D books.
ELACC3RI8- language in the standard needs to be more specific, before looking at the examples listed for the expectation, I was thinking in terms of meaning or adding to the development of the plot of a story
Add cursive writing back into the ELA standards
Schools should be required to continue to teach grammar as a part of the standard curriculum throughout both middle and high school. Students are advancing to the next grade levels and lack the ability to write a cohesive and grammatically correct sentence. Because of students diminished grammar skills, some teachers have instituted grammar review sessions during the first ten minutes of their language arts class. This is an inadequate amount of time toward helping students who have either forgotten or never grasped grammar. The teachers that I have spoken to about this issue have advised that the writing skills of the majority of students is poor due to lack of good grammar use in their work.
When looking for revisions, I was expecting more specific concepts and less vagueness in the standards. Instead I see very little change. The standards as presented for revision continue to lack specificity as the original standards did.
The reduction in the number alone are a HUGE improvement!!!! These are manageable and will help us be able to spend more time actually TEACHING instead of fumbling through papers to try and find the standard number in lesson plans, and to display, etc.
A comment concerning the revisions is that of the standard, ELACCL9-10RI9. "Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington's Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt's Four Freedoms speech, King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail"),

Question 5 Comments - ELA
including how they address related themes and concepts. Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington's Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt's Four Freedoms speech, King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail", Nelson Mandela's Nobel Peace Prize Speech, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights), including how they address related themes and concepts". Why is the standard the same except for the literary pieces in the parenthetical example? Does this hint at what should be taught, or just exemplify the literature that could be used? Also, Nelson Mandela's speech would not be a U.S. Document, would it? It seems that numerous amounts of time and money have gone into the revision process, and thus, the changes are so subtle. Any of the documents listed are excellent choices to use in the 9-10 grade band, and there is not a problem there, but it seems that the proposed changes are a bit of a waste of time. For example, ELACCL9-10W1d: the words, " while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing" have been removed from the original standard. How is that to be interpreted? Of course, a teacher will involve teaching tone, and style when teaching writing argumentative essays; however, the word "formal" has also been removed. Is this not ambiguous? If the tone is objective, it must be formal. Therefore, it appears that the revisions were done to make it seem that changes are being made, but in reality, the subtleties and ambiguous nature of the changes will only frustrate educators further.
For middle school, it does not provide time for the direct instruction of grammar. If students are grammatically correct, it will be because they come from homes that speak correctly. This puts low income and minorities at a huge disadvantage in using correct English. Grammar cannot be learned without direct instruction. It takes practice. I hope the grammar standards can overlap like the GPS and be as clear as the GPS.
One size fits all is not an acceptable approach to teaching children or adults. Cheating scandals are the result of the increasing focus on standardized testing.
Standards are still wordy, would like examples like the ones given in the math standards
The standards are still too wordy. Please provide examples like those given in the revised math standards.
The standards are still very wordy. Please provide examples like those given in the math standards.
The standards are still too wordy. Please provide examples like those given in the revised math standards.
Rigor is important, as is being developmentally appropriate. It seems we are neglecting the latter.
Get rid of them!
Just as the Math standards appear, the Language Arts standard are worded in which multiple standards are embodied into one. Indicators of achievement should be broken down into achievement bullets
The standards do not work for our children.
I like the way they are aligned from one grade to the next. I would be able to cover the standard in a student friendly way.
Standards need to have specific skills listed in them.
I would like more specifics. For example two lists: 1) grade appropriate irregularly spelled words 2) the most common prefixes and suffixes.
Some of the standards proposed are very aligned to the next grade level and have minor changes in phrasing, however, other standards have changes that shift the expectation for student outcomes. For example, standard ELACCKW7: Participate in shared research and writing projects (e.g., explore a number of books by a favorite author and express opinions about them). Has been changed to "with guidance and support". By lowering the expectation for students to independently accomplish tasks I think the requirement to achieve is lowered.
Why can't English teachers write standards that are easy to understand and teach? I believe a bunch of ELA teachers sit around and argue about word choice and sentence structure rather than stating the standard simply and accurately. KISS!
The middle school standards for ELA are too wordy and long.
I would like to have a language arts' map like we have in all other subjects. Language Arts is clear as mud when it comes to when to teach what.
The problem isn't the standards, it is the testing, the pressure, and the high stakes. If you just

Question 5 Comments - ELA
ask us if the standards are ok, you are asking the wrong question and getting the illusion of agreement with a system that is fundamentally harmful to our kids, schools, and teachers. It is fine, good even, to want our kids to have deeper understanding and critical thinking skills. But we know that kids are all different - they learn at different paces, they have different levels of privilege at home, different learning abilities. Useful assessments would be very short, given throughout the year, and designed for diagnostic purposes. Questions and answers would be available to parents and to teachers. Then we could use the information to help each child learn - to determine where that child is at and what he or she needs to work on. High stakes end of year testing doesn't help us teach our children, it just provides system-wide statistics of dubious value. It seven the needs of administrators, not of kids. The standards are fine, but the approach to assessment has tribe radically altered.
The inclusion of phonics instruction is crucial to the acquisition of language for ELL as well native English speakers.
Still not enough emphasis on actually teaching reading and making reading fun for kids.
Thank you for the opportunity to read and respond on this important decision.
We need to ensure that word processing is taught/included in the elementary school curriculum due to constructed response questions and computer based tests. We also need more information about constructed response essay assessments (scoring, rubrics, and exemplars). Vocabulary in the writing standards needs to consistent with assessments.
Vertical alignment in ELA has always been a challenge: Frequently the difference between two grade levels is a vague and/or subjective adjective (analyze vs. "closely" analyze, etc.). It would be nice if we actually had a curriculum that we KNEW was more rigorous as it advances. As it stands now, it depends on the teacher and the teacher's interpretation of the "level" presented in the standard.
Please continue the CCGPS. This rigorous content has been a learning curve for teachers, students, and parents, but we must see it to fruition and not abandon these standards too quickly.
Irony is included but not very clear. Make one for all the types: dramatic, situational, and verbal. Explain that irony is all forms of media and literature. Include something on the concept of reading aloud: it is unclear on how this could be measured. All students, but especially ELL need to focus more in reading accurately in context. Do we really need to teach all the moods for grammar? Are gerunds that important in eighth grade? Need to focus more on film as literature, and students making films as well as screenwriting.
I support the ELA Common Core Georgia Performance Standards.
The common core standards leave too much room for educators to individually interpret them their own way. Different people read the standards, and each has their own interpretation. They need to be written in a way that the expectations for student learning as well as teaching, leave no room for interpretation.
As a first grade teacher, I feel the language arts standards are acceptable and rigorous for this age level.
As a social studies teacher I find the current ELA standards easy to apply to reading and writing components for my subject matter
The standards teach skills in isolation. For example why do fourth graders need to know progressive verbs and modal auxiliaries. Isn't basic grammar and sentence structure more important?
I did not read the revised standards just before completing this survey. My answers relate to the Common Core Standards. If there has been a revision to those standards it should be posted w/this survey
One standard reads " will read fluently on grade level. How is that defined? How many words per minute? Fluent in my room may not be considered so in another room. There is no funding to ensure 50% split of non- fiction/ fiction. Students are asked to perform tasks and study concepts they are not developmentally ready to do. Also, many standards repeat or overlap within same grade level. The suggested read alouds are not grade appropriate nor provided by our district. Plus, my TKES measure is fluency, but there is no fluency component spelled out in these standards. How is that fair? I'm graded on something not even specified. Bottom line- these standards are poorly written and not specific. It would be better if written as " just teach them to read." from a frustrated veteran teacher

Question 5 Comments - ELA
What I love the most about the CCSS is that we ask the students to read closely in science and social studies. We ask them to read and form opinions about primary and secondary source documents to form their own opinions. Then we ask them to write about and show evidence for their work. This is a skill that students must have both in the college and career setting. This is also something we did not ask of students before CCSS.
The standards are not the problem. We've already demonstrated for two years that we can teach them. It is the high stakes testing... Comparing scores of counties that have totally different demographics and using those scores to have such a high value on teacher evaluation.
Get rid of common core!!
My son is in 10th grades w/ Dyslexia & I was told he didn't need to know how to spell . . . That's what spell check is for. I have just paid \$10,000 for a Academic Coach who has had to teach him.
Complete removal of Common Core GPS is necessary! Local and parental control of education is a must. As an educator, I feel forced to teach what the federal government is coercing us to teach through "incentives" that unconstitutionally have given federal government control of education.
Students need to have grammar textbooks or lessons on a weekly basis. If grammar books are not budgeted, teachers can copy and create their own lessons. We are teaching kids life skills - writing, great, thinking critically, analytically, creatively - not if they remember what happened in Romeo and Juliet. The literature is a vehicle for these skills.
Students need ongoing grammar and writing skills - meaning lessons and evaluations in these areas on an ongoing basis. Being able to think and write independently and do it well should be one of the top goals!
The standards assume students enter on the same level, which is not the case. The standards are vague and subject.
Common core is a way to attempt to make round pegs fit in square holes. Education is not a one size fits all kind of thing. Local schools and communities should have input into education not a common core gov't initiative.
Our kids should be learning multiple languages within the language arts. This is the age to learn different parts of all language. The rating system is very vague and it is really difficult to gauge where your child is academically. It is one size fits all and doesn't seem to push the top performers and hold down the weak. Teachers need the latitude to teach from different methods. Not dictated to through a mandate.
The standards exclude important skills like writing research papers. Additionally, students need to learn to enjoy reading. That is difficult if they never/rarely get to read and analyze fiction.
I mostly feel there are too many standards to cover well enough for mastery and each standard is then embedded with so many elements. They are not all appropriate for elementary when lower grades need to focus a lot more on foundational skills and BASIC comprehension. Many of the standards are skills that will naturally develop with reading experience and cannot be explicitly taught. We have zero reading resources for ideas or activities. Teachers create and spend their own money buying things, in hopes they align. The standards are so vague in regards to how deep to go with the standard, therefore everyone ex interprets the standards differently due to how generalized they are with lack of examples.
The content of assignments is offensive and inappropriate for children.
They are too difficult/rigorous. The vocabulary in the standards is not developmentally appropriate (elementary); thus, disadvantages parents because they do not what their child is nor teachers are talking about. They are not able to help with homework. Teachers, students, and parents feel like failures. Students in elementary school should be learning the basics and NOT worried about whether they are college and career ready. That is absurd!
I am an IRR teacher for grades 3-5 in Cobb County. While I agree the standards are appropriate, I see everyday that the teachers are not "unpacking" them correctly. Do they need to be more specific? Year after year, the children I teach come to me without the foundation of the skills they need to reach the standard. Do we need to be more specific and create objectives to go along with the standards?
"Standards", as such, do not ensure each student is ready for college or even what is next on curriculum. In general they just make sure student, in my opinion and experience, was brought

Question 5 Comments - ELA
up to those said standards.
Please do research on Common Core. It is not a good thing for our children.
The standards are too vague and random. There are too many gaps vertically.
Textbooks and/or worksheets are needed for the students to bring home to help enforce what was learned that day.
I think my child needs to be more prepared for college and conversing intellectually in a corporate setting.
Work on consistency when transitioning from one grade to another.
Not enough time spent on any one subject. Everything is rushed, and no review is done at the start Of the new school year. Parents don't know what is being taught in order to help their children, until completed work is done. I think the teachers are feeling so much pressure as well.
I am a second grade teacher. The standards in ELA have butchered my teaching and student learning in Reading and in Grammar. I find myself focusing on random skills like "collective nouns" because that is the standard - while I skim over nouns, and all the rules involved with plural nouns. Another example would be reflexive pronouns. When these standards first appeared teachers had to look up what they meant. We are skimming over what is important and focusing on what should just be "touched on". The reading standards are just as bad if not worse. There are so many standards and skills that I am hopping from one to the other without time for the students to have depth and understanding. The lack of resources is appalling. I am creating a grade level assessment in reading this week using teacherspayteachers.com as my primary resource.
I strongly oppose the Common Core Standard for each subject it's applied to in the Georgia Public School System. The standards are too rigorous for middle school children. These kids don't have time to let their minds rest and take a break from these ridiculous standards and take time to just be a kid. I can't speak for high school level as I don't have a student in HS but I can only imagine it's worse. There's more to life than school work.
The most important thing that needs to be looked at is class size. Testing students more is not the answer. Thanks!
The standards lack specificity. The things changed in the 7th grade standards were meaningless. "And " was added in one standard, but it didn't really change anything; in the other standard, a misplaced modifier was corrected, yet neither gave us insight in to what is "grade-appropriate general academic and domain-specific words and phrase." We expect our students to be specific with their evidence when writing, yet we don't hold ourselves to the same accountability measures.
There is too much rigor for low functioning student. We are expecting way too much from these children who are not ready, not mature enough, and incapable of such difficult or rigorous material. As teachers, we push and push our students, but if the child's parents do not have the education or the know how or the want to help, then we are pushing them for naught.
Stop common core! It's making c and d students out of a students and crushing the love of learning especially in the youngest students!
These standards allow for response to already created content, but there is no room for original work produced by students. By requiring students to always show textual evidence, we are stripping them of the development needed by their own writing skills.
Keyboarding should be added back in to the 6th grade standards.
Kindergarten is doing first grade work. Tenth grade can't help with math.
I think with all the discipline matters that instructors need to bear out everyday, this course of action in settings these strong standards is too much for k-6 the grade. I think you need to work on the discipline action first in the schools so the instructors have fun, joyous, eager to learn students first. Half the day these instructors are disciplining and kids interrupting class how in the world are they going to teach and follow these standards that you are implementing. Let the instructors show there personality when they teach give them some room to use there imagination. These standards are what you have said in this survey vigorous!! Let the kids have fun and I bet the school system will turn around and you will have kids eager too go to school not come home crying because they don't want to go to school...get the parents involved...
Parents are not provided with copies of the standards at the school my son attends. We were

Question 5 Comments - ELA
not made aware of any changes. The only thing I have been told is that the 8th grade writing test will possibly be typed this year. The teacher whispered this during our conference, like it was supposed to be a secret.
Do not misunderstand me. There are "proposed changes" that are simply changes in syntax or semantics. They do not really change anything. While the standards may be rigorous, they are not used in the classroom to provide experiences that are real life applicable. They may be linked to the next grade/level but that does not mean they are appropriate for ANY grade as written and applied.
When assessing students, I want to know what they are able to do independently - not "with prompting and support".
As revised, the ELA standards fail to meet the goal of Common Core. I do not want my children held to a lower standard. The revisions weaken the educational expectations. At what point did the goal become to ensure our kids are less prepared than others for the challenges they will face. I am completely aghast at what these revisions imply.
I am a 4th grade ELA teacher, so those standards are the only ones I really looked at in detail.
Georgia needs to back out if common core and take back state and local control of education. Common core is an unconstitutional set of national standards no matter how Governor Deal dresses it up. The Common Core standards do not prepare our children for college or career.
ELACCKRF4- The proposed change to this standard groups reading high-frequency words in the same standard with emergent text. This grouping does not make sense to me. These skills are related, but many of my students with special needs are able to do one or the other and should receive credit for the parts separately in order to give them an opportunity to master each piece. ELACCKL5c- This standard is so unclear to me, and is very difficult to assess. I feel that it should be revised or removed from the standards.
The standards are too rigorous to allow mastery of 1st grade level skills. They inappropriate for developmental stages of 1st graders. Common Core needs to be completely depleted so students can be successful.
Common Core should be pushed out of Georgia.
Stop common core.
Common Core is an infringement on the state's right for local control in education.
Common core takes away local control of education.
States should have local control in our children's education.
Repeal common core.
It is very important that key terms and specific standards are clear. For example, major differences. What is major to one isn't major to all. All expectations must defined and free of ambiguity.
I can appreciate the clarification, re-wording, etc., of the CCGPS and are relieved that the initial intent was for the most part unchanged. Kindergarten's addition of "with guidance" is an understandable clarification. The addition of the last sentence for 11-12 RI9, should probably include "literary and/or historical significance."
ELACCL11-12RL9 should remove World Lit and then rewrite ELACCL9-10RL9 to include World Lit since 10th grade ELA is World Lit focused and 11th is American and 12th is British.
They are more clear, direct, and understandable.
I would like for the state to spell out more about High Frequency number of words and a common list for Kindergarten. It has been left to each individual county/school to set a number and list that can be unreasonable. Also in 1st-3rd grade give a common list and reasonable number of grade appropriate irregularly spelled words to be read. Again it has been left up to each county/school to do this often with unreasonable number and lists. I would also like for the state to define what the appropriate reading rate is for each grade level. I am glad that cursive writing was added in 4th grade but didn't see it anywhere else.
Need to provide a list of high frequency words for Kindergarten. 1st-3rd grade needs a list of grade appropriate irregularly spelled words. Need to provide what appropriate accuracy rate is for each grade level. 220 in Kindergarten 600 in 1st and 617 in 2nd seems unrealistic and no common list.
The wording is still very vague and not as specific as our standards have been in the past. This leaves a lot up to the interpretation of individual teachers unless the state will also resources and materials that are specific to what level of instruction teachers should be teaching to. I

Question 5 Comments - ELA
have seen many resources provided in other states that make these standards much clearer to the teachers who have to teach them.
Since special education teachers are now treated as if we were regular education teachers how would these new rules apply? If you are teaching students who are 6 or more grade levels below their nondisabled counterparts how are the special needs student expected to live up to the standards? How are the special education teachers, especially MID/MOID or severe and profound students, expected to teach these new standards? Also, will there be new materials for the special education teacher to teach from. For the past 5 years I have had to teach from packets I make each week and buy own materials to teach with. I even noticed in this survey that I had to click other in order to answer question 1.
The only problem I see is the writing does not specify paragraph writing and written responses. They now need to know how to write a written response to any type of questions. If we don't have a writing test at the end of the year, will we still need to focus so much on paragraph writing in 3rd grade?
I would like to see more specific examples from the state as to types of assessments to better prepare my lessons to the state interpretation of a standard.
Yes, cursive writing should be taught in elementary grades and typing skills should be a primary focus in the middle grades!! The current common core is way too rigorous. It sets the bar too high and sets up every child for failure in college and in the workplace. There are too many over-specified standards that leave little to no room for continued practice and success in all areas of the written language. The revised standards, however, if understood correctly, have way too few standards. There should be some repetition of standards to carry over each year. As new concepts are introduced, the same skills (writing and reading) should be emphasized and practiced year after year in order to be honed and refined. Writing is a process that must be learned and honed over time. The revised standards should gradually build over time as well. It must be concluded that, if read correctly, the revised standards do not have enough of the critical standards repeated each year to support rigorous reading and writing in the classroom.
In reviewing the Kindergarten standards, I appreciate that many of the standards have had "with prompting and support." Additionally, I feel that clarification has been added to many of the standards, clearly explaining to all stakeholders, the expectations for each grade level.
It is amazing to me that the very people teaching these standards are not listened to, but the Chamber of Commerce and others like that. When was the last time that someone from the Chamber of Commerce taught an 8 year old? These standards are not age appropriate.
You didn't revise anything. You reworded it. My son is in 2nd grade and i got to say teachers are doing ok for now. But you got to get the ones out of there that push political mostly left leaning objective.
Many of the revisions were to clarify the standard, which really does not do much to claim that there is a "change" occurring. With that being said, I enjoy CC standards, as I understand that the GOP governors did a great job of putting these standards together long ago.
Although rigorous, a significant amount of scaffolding is needed to bridge gaps for students. Due to this scaffolding, more time is needed for implementation in many instances.
Please stop asking laypeople for their opinion about educational standards. We are not qualified to provide an opinion that's worth a damn.
I agree that changes need to be made
Students come to my fourth grade classroom not reading on grade level and unable to write a complete sentence or paragraph. The standards should reflect more basic skills. Also, the standards are often worded in such a way that it is hard to understand what exactly the student is supposed to be able to do and HOW to teach them that skill. Students become better readers by reading more. There should be some way to incorporate more reading and more number of texts or amount of time reading. The standards are way too much to cover in an entire year, especially since most students come in behind grade level in most areas.
Many standards are still vague as to what the students needs to be able to master.
The audio standard is not really one that should be implemented in 2nd grade. This is too difficult for students to do and teachers do not have the time and resources to do this correctly. The same holds true for digital recordings. In 2nd grade a focus needs to be made on writing sentences. Many students struggle with writing a basic sentence. More focus should be on

Question 5 Comments - ELA
grammar.
<p>The revision of the standards is unnecessary. I am a Kindergarten Teacher. When I read the proposed revisions, I see very few substantial changes. These changes were made for political purposes for Governor Nathan Deal. These revisions have nothing to do with students, have nothing to do with teachers, and have nothing to do with education. The fact that only a few unsubstantial changes were made confirms this assessment. This process of revision has been a waste of taxpayer money that could have been used to help children. I want to also give my feedback on the specific changes to the Kindergarten Standards. Here it is. ELACCKRL4 is intended to require students to do their own thinking about unknown words. The change removes that requirement and is less rigorous. ELACCKRL7 is supposed to be about when in a story an illustration occurs. Students would have to answer questions about sequencing and relate it to illustrations. Now they do not have to do that. ELACCKRI2 adds in two synonyms that test writers use in their questions (main idea and supporting details). Teachers use these already. There are many, many more synonyms that test writers use in their questions. Are we adding all of them? ELACCKRI7 is the same issue as above with ELACCKRL7. Additionally, illustrations do not always support the text. They also challenge the text, enhance the text, and tell part of the story. ELACCKRI10 The standards have two separate sections: one for literature, and one for informational text. This standard falls under the Information Text heading. It is implied that the standard refers to group reading of informational text. ELACCKRF3 is about word-analysis skills and phonics skills. Recognizing high frequency words is a word analysis skill. Students look at the word, analyze the order of letters, and either read it from memory or use another strategy to figure it out. Learning high frequency words is part of word-analysis. All of the word analysis skills are a part of reading emergent-level texts with purpose and understanding. ELACCKRF4 is about reading emergent level texts. It should have stayed how it was. All of these changes are unnecessary and have been changed for the wrong purposes.</p>
<p>Unfortunately, the standards need to be more appropriately sequenced. The foundational standards are placed after the comprehension standards which can surprisingly be very confusing. Does this mean students are expected to compare and contrast characters before they can even recognize letters and sounds? Our system, and others as well, has us teaching the standards straight down the list of how they were written without regard appropriate scope and sequence.</p>
<p>I am not at all confident that the standards are developmentally appropriate, particularly those for kindergarten and first grade. Many of those standards were moved from later grades where students had problems with them. This survey is superfluous at best.</p>
<p>I like how the sight words are put into ELARF4, but I wish they were broken into ELARF4a and ELARF4b.</p>
<p>I disagree with adding the phonics component into the third grade standards. Third grade already has many standards that need to be covered and this would be adding an extra burden to the teacher.</p>
<p>There are too many standards to cover in a school year. Moving the EOY test to May would give teachers more time to make sure the material is covered. There has to be time to remediate and re-teach as a teacher deems necessary. Some of the standards are not developmentally inappropriate. All students do not learn in the same way or at the same time. Please consider that each district mandates a county pacing chart that puts pressure on teachers to follow the pacing, rather than focus on the needs of the class. All standards should be able to be taught by February, to allow for teachers to prepare their students for the EOY test.</p>
<p>Standard expectations need to be more clear – fluency ... how many words in what amount of time for kindergarten and first grade students. Same for high frequency words how many should each grade level master.</p>
<p>The common core has never been field tested on a single student and neither have the revisions. Georgia should not participate in the common core anymore. Both Stanford Medical School and Columbia University's School of Education have opposed the common core as developmentally inappropriate. I hate it!!!!!!</p>
<p>Poorly implemented program, too much reliance on computers, not enough writing, no textbooks, rinky-dink. I'm very disappointed that our state would implement a program as</p>

Question 5 Comments - ELA
terrible as this is. It baffles me how quickly adopted this substandard program has been adopted. Families are fleeing to private schools or homeschooling to avoid this inadequate and poorly conceived curriculum. I'm very disappointed in our state for adopting this mediocre experiment in education. I am a supporter of public education, but can't support Common Core. It's lousy.
The changes made were so minute- a word change here and there- that I don't see it is worth all the conversation.
You need to scrap common core and start again. Insane!
I don't understand why money was spent for this process. There isn't enough of a change to bother. These changes are grammatical at best and have nothing to do with the developmental status of the children. A waste of time and money is my opinion of this standard revision.
I believe the standards and minute revisions maintain the rigor that we have set for the students in Georgia.
LEACCL9-10RI9: Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance. The revision of this standard inaccurately includes examples of documents that are not U.S. documents, thus detracting from the intent of this standard. To retain the integrity of what the students are to know and be able to do with this standard, these additional documents should be removed. ELACCL9-10L3: I recommend an edit to reflect an easier read of this standard. Consider this instead: "Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, to comprehend more fully when reading or listening, and to write and edit so that it conforms to the guidelines in a style manual (e.g., MLA Handbook, APA Handbook, Turabian's Manual for Writers) appropriate for the discipline and writing type. ELACCL11-12RI9: Since the intent of this standard is meant to analyze U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (i.e., American Literature included), is it necessary to reference American Literature (again) along with British and Multicultural Literature? This seems redundant.
I feel that the revisions will be helpful and that the standards provide the rigor that I students need.
Revised standards are rigorous and easily applicable.
Most 5th grade students cannot type two pages in a single sitting. ELACC5W6 I see that you changed the 6th grade standard, but not the 5th grade standard. All other revisions look great!
I think some of these standards are too much for all fifth graders.
I think we should have spelling and make reading in class fun and creative and not so much informational.. Let them express themselves. And feel comfortable with the English language.. Stop testing them all the time ... Give the a national pre evaluation at the beginning of the year... And a small national evaluation at then end of the year to see their progress. Specially at this age kids mature at different speed. Provide teachers with the right materials to teach... Is crucial and is not done at this time. Our teachers have to spend so much time finding sources they do not have time to prepare or have their personal life so they can be refreshed the next day in the classroom. As all the teachers for their true feedback.
Changes not significant
There is not a clear, developmentally appropriate scope and sequence for these standards. It is almost like completely different groups wrote each grade level in isolation. More work should be spent in lower grades with decoding and vocabulary instead of analysis. 4th grade has some isolated reading and grammar standards. After implementing these for a few years, I am seeing some real learning gaps in students. (I teach several grade levels) Please go back to the old standards. They were more developmentally appropriate and did not leave gaps in learning. I know many want to "stay the course" because of all the time and money spent, but these students we have only get one shot at this and we are really harming them. Don't let adult decisions and politics hurt our children.
The changes are inconsequential and vague.
To the 8th grade ELA standards, the changes consist of reversing the order of a verb and an adverb in one standard, and in another, the word and was changed to and/or. Hopefully, this did not cost us too much money.
Changes are subtle and do not substantially change the former standards.
Make the wording easier for teachers to understand.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
If some of the standards could be modified just a little more so that they are not so "wordy", I think it would help teachers, especially those who struggle or who are new to the profession, understand them better.
The standards are clearly defined for the teachers. They are more user friendly
There are many gaps between grade levels especially for ELA. Students are expected to master too many concepts, many of which are abstract, in too short of a time span for Elementary students. Therefore students are not mastering any concept and only brushing it each year. When they reach upper elementary they are unable to write clearly and think for themselves. The amount of concepts being taught need to be reduced, and time for mastery, and thought development allowed. Differentiation will play a key role, and there will be those students who can be pushed beyond.
I am comfortable with the changes and hope we keep them as published.
Tougher grammar standards. Our students still can't write and spell.
Consider the focus of middle school ELA standards be solely based on informational text.
I have no comments as the changes to the 8th grade were minimal and only to move words around.
I cannot even understand this presentation. The grey-highlighted areas means *which* of the many things you have cited? Graphically it is a mess. The standards themselves as written are sheer gobbledegook, jargon, meaningless to ordinary people. And where are the items in the teacher guidance manuals you refer to? If this is Georgia's idea of clear writing and communication, we are in serious trouble. I am appalled you represent this to the Georgia voters as anything other than a joke. It is the best argument for private or home schooling I have seen yet.
I like the detail that is included on standards
Handwriting develops fine motor skills that are necessary for learning and brain activation. The following article is only one of the few that outlines the importance of teaching handwriting. http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704631504575531932754922518 Cursive writing only builds on this learning and allows students to find the rhythm for reading and writing with a strong fluency for taking notes and other higher learning activities.
Some of the standards in ELA such as ELACCRL5 parts of stories, drama, poetry..... are still unclear. What are the students actually supposed to be able to do? Also the ELACCRI3 and 8 seem to be almost the same. What is the difference between these standards?
These standards are clear and preserve the rigor expected of students across the country. Georgia students deserve to be prepared and competitive. APPROVE AS REVISED.
Not enough emphasis on workplace readiness or career and technical application. Not all of my kids are headed to college. Yes, students need to know how to read and write; however, too much time is spent on rigorous text that they see no relevance to or can even understand much less write about. My lower level students will not read. They need skills that will help them fill out a job application, a resume, or become a functioning member of society who votes, pays taxes, and open a bank account.
Please approve as revised. These make sense. There has been too much nitpicking over these standards, and our state needs to approve these and move ahead so that our students don't suffer.
Looks fine
The standards are very wordy and some are subjective as to what is expected of students.
ELACC2L5 - We do not have time or equipment to implement this standard for recording audio. This is an unreasonable requirement of students at this grade level.
Elaccr10 We think that discussion should be about all text, not just informational. ELACcKW6 some schools may not have enough technology to meet this standard
There are too many standards. You should trim it down to fewer than ten.
Phonics standards are critical.
Standards should be further revised to reflect the following: KL1c. should use /s/ and /es/ should be moved to 1st grade, KRF2e should start in 1st grade, KRL5 should be moved to start at Grade1 and the current KRL5 should be similar to KRI5, KW1 should start in 1st or include with guidance/support
I'm very pleased with the revisions. They clarify some wording and show that we're not just blindly adopting a national program. The vertical alignment is critical and helps me see clearly

Question 5 Comments - ELA
what I can do to address student needs from one grade to the next. THANK YOU!
I didn't note any significant changes. Most were change in format
Thank you for giving GA teachers the opportunity to provide feedback on the standards. Please approve as revised. And please note: I trust you will be prepared to recognize that the link to this survey being public means that the anti-common core groups all over Facebook probably will have a campaign to overrun the results with negative comments. It's a shame that there will be no way to differentiate between actual Georgia citizens and the people from other places who seem to want to influence our decisions in Georgia.
I would like to see more defined standards for grammar concepts. It's very vague.
I agree to accept the revision from modal auxiliary to helping/linking verbs. Keep however, examples (e.g., can, may, must) ELACC4L1C
I agree with the revision to change modal auxiliaries to helping/linking verbs. However, we would like to keep (e.g., can, may, must) for ELACC4L1.c.
I love these standards. They are easy to understand and easy to apply in the classroom. I would like to see more opportunities for speaking. This is an important skill and all students need practice. Handwriting is important. Students are using cursive handwriting in the classroom. Grammar is somewhat of a problem area. We need to show this on the report cards. Is this part of the ELA in Reading or Writing? It should be clear for all teachers.
ELACC4L1 c. We agree with the revision to change modal auxiliaries to helping/linking verbs. However, we would like to keep (e.g., can, may, must).
ELACC4L1 c. We agree with the revision to change modal auxiliaries to helping/linking verbs. However, we would like to keep (e.g., can, may, must).
4RL4 - seems similar to L4, if the standard expects us to do a mythology unit than those expectations need to be clear, to my & my colleagues it seems more of general context use skills in literature. 4RL9 - need more clarification on "traditional literature from different cultures" (is this fables, folktales, telltales?) 4W4 - seems redundant, I think the language of W4 standard could be included in the W1, W2, W3. for example: produce clear and coherent informative/explanatory writings to exams a topic and convey ideas and information clearly appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. 4W9 - is this response to a text writing similar to constructive response items expected in the Milestones?
ELACCKRL4: Agree with "prompting and support" ELACCKRL7: Agree ELACCKRI2: Agree; supports vertical alignment with main idea and details ELACCKR17: Agree ELACCKRI10: Agree ELACCKRF3: Agree ELACCKRF4: Agree ELACCKW6: Disagree; Leave as is (prefer the word "explore") for kindergarten ELACCKW7: Agree ELACCKL4: Agree ELACCK5: a. Move to Math Standards (Sorting is a math standard.) ; b. Agree SUGGESTIONS ELACCKRL10: Add "in literary text" ELACCKRL2 & RL3: Combine
ELACCKRL4: Agree with "prompting and support" ELACCKRL7: Agree ELACCKRI2: Agree; supports vertical alignment with main idea and details ELACCKR17: Agree ELACCKRI10: Agree ELACCKRF3: Agree ELACCKRF4: Agree ELACCKW6: Disagree; Leave as is (prefer the word "explore") for kindergarten ELACCKW7: Agree ELACCKL4: Agree ELACCK5: a. Move to Math Standards (Sorting is a math standard.) ; b. Agree SUGGESTIONS ELACCKRL10: Add "in literary text" ELACCKRL2 & RL3: Combine
ELACCKRL4: Agree with "prompting and support" ELACCKRL7: Agree ELACCKRI2: Agree; supports vertical alignment with main idea and details ELACCKR17: Agree ELACCKRI10: Agree ELACCKRF3: Agree ELACCKRF4: Agree ELACCKW6: Disagree; Leave as is (prefer the word "explore") for kindergarten ELACCKW7: Agree ELACCKL4: Agree ELACCK5: a. Move to Math Standards (Sorting is a math standard.) ; b. Agree SUGGESTIONS ELACCKRL10: Add "in literary text" ELACCKRL2 & RL3: Combine
The fourth grade standards are now more aligned to the 5th grade standards.
ELACCKRL4: Agree with "prompting and support" ELACCKRL7: Agree ELACCKRI2: Agree; supports vertical alignment with main idea and details ELACCKR17: Agree ELACCKRI10: Agree ELACCKRF3: Agree ELACCKRF4: Agree ELACCKW6: Disagree; Leave as is (prefer the word "explore") for kindergarten ELACCKW7: Agree ELACCKL4: Agree ELACCK5: a. Move to Math Standards (Sorting is a math standard.) ; b. Agree SUGGESTIONS ELACCKRL10: Add "in literary text" ELACCKRL2 & RL3: Combine
The standards are developmentally inappropriate for young children. CCSS assumes all children learn at the same rate and in the same way. The standards are grossly out of step

Question 5 Comments - ELA
with the cognitive development of 5, 6 year olds.
Much more clear than before
ELACC3RL4 I agree with the proposed standard. It makes the standard clearer as to what is expected. I would like for there to be examples of literal and non-literal language included in parentheses along with the standards. ELACC3RF3 I approve of the move of d. to ELACC3RF4 to read these words in context. I am unclear about what grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words consist of. I would like examples in parentheses included with the standard. ELACCRL6 I am unclear as the what depth of knowledge is expected for point of view. I think this needs to be clearer. ELACC3L1 I suggest abstract nouns© be moved to fourth grade. It is a difficult concept for third graders to grasp.
ELACC3RL4 I agree with the proposed standard. It makes the standard clearer as to what is expected. I would like for there to be examples of literal and non-literal language included in parentheses along with the standards. ELACC3RF3 I approve of the move of d. to ELACC3RF4 to read these words in context. I am unclear about what grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words consist of. I would like examples in parentheses included with the standard. ELACCRL6 I am unclear as the what depth of knowledge is expected for point of view. I think this needs to be clearer. ELACC3L1 I suggest abstract nouns© be moved to fourth grade. It is a difficult concept for third graders to grasp.
ELACC3RL4 I agree with the proposed standard. It makes the standard clearer as to what is expected. I would like for there to be examples of literal and non-literal language included in parentheses along with the standards. ELACC3RF3 I approve of the move of d. to ELACC3RF4 to read these words in context. I am unclear about what grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words consist of. I would like examples in parentheses included with the standard. ELACCRL6 I am unclear as the what depth of knowledge is expected for point of view. I think this needs to be clearer. ELACC3L1 I suggest abstract nouns© be moved to fourth grade. It is a difficult concept for third graders to grasp.
ELACC3RL4 I agree with the proposed standard. It makes the standard clearer as to what is expected. I would like for there to be examples of literal and non-literal language included in parentheses along with the standards. ELACC3RF3 I approve of the move of d. to ELACC3RF4 to read these words in context. I am unclear about what grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words consist of. I would like examples in parentheses included with the standard. ELACCRL6 I am unclear as the what depth of knowledge is expected for point of view. I think this needs to be clearer. ELACC3L1 I suggest abstract nouns© be moved to fourth grade. It is a difficult concept for third graders to grasp.
ELACC3RL4 I agree with the proposed standard. It makes the standard clearer as to what is expected. I would like for there to be examples of literal and non-literal language included in parentheses along with the standards. ELACC3RF3 I approve of the move of d. to ELACC3RF4 to read these words in context. I am unclear about what grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words consist of. I would like examples in parentheses included with the standard. ELACCRL6 I am unclear as the what depth of knowledge is expected for point of view. I think this needs to be clearer. ELACC3L1 I suggest abstract nouns© be moved to fourth grade. It is a difficult concept for third graders to grasp.
ELACC3RL4 I agree with the proposed standard. It makes the standard clearer as to what is expected. I would like for there to be examples of literal and non-literal language included in parentheses along with the standards. ELACC3RF3 I approve of the move of d. to ELACC3RF4 to read these words in context. I am unclear about what grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words consist of. I would like examples in parentheses included with the standard. ELACCRL6 I am unclear as the what depth of knowledge is expected for point of view. I think this needs to be clearer. ELACC3L1 I suggest abstract nouns© be moved to fourth grade. It is a difficult concept for third graders to grasp.
ELACC3RL4 I agree with the proposed standard. It makes the standard clearer as to what is expected. I would like for there to be examples of literal and non-literal language included in parentheses along with the standards. ELACC3RF3 I approve of the move of d. to ELACC3RF4 to read these words in context. I am unclear about what grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words consist of. I would like examples in parentheses included with the standard. ELACCRL6 I am unclear as the what depth of knowledge is expected for point of view. I think this needs to be clearer. ELACC3L1 I suggest abstract nouns© be moved to fourth grade. It is a difficult concept for third graders to grasp.
The revised standards provide clarity to the standards.
The revised ELA Standards seem to be more precise.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELACC1RL5: should have an –s on the end of difference. • ELACC1RL5: agree with the change. Wording much clearer. • ELACC1RF3: agree with the change of moving g. Recognize and read grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words to accuracy and fluency section. • Propose for ELACC1RF3: Including an example in parenthesis of the type of words that the standards are suggesting for a-e. Ex: b. Decode regularly spelled one-syllable words (cat). Like

Question 5 Comments - ELA
<p>the examples in ELACC1L1. • ELACC1RF4: agree with change. • ELACC1W6: agree with change-not feeling required to multiple uses of digital tools but simply including. • ELACC1L1: not an example in f in parenthesis. • ELACC1L1: to be more clear this standard needs to either have an example or be more clear about the following: the teacher will question or prompt a child with a declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentence and the child must respond correctly to the prompt using a simple or compound sentence. • ELACC1L1: on standard b. please place an example. • Propose, ELACC1L5 d.: attempt to reword: “Expose” shades of meaning among verbs differing in manner. (Rather than distinguish).</p>
<p>• ELACC1RL5: should have an –s on the end of difference. • ELACC1RL5: agree with the change. Wording much clearer. • ELACC1RF3: agree with the change of moving g. Recognize and read grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words to accuracy and fluency section. • Propose for ELACC1RF3: Including an example in parenthesis of the type of words that the standards are suggesting for a-e. Ex: b. Decode regularly spelled one-syllable words (cat). Like the examples in ELACC1L1. • ELACC1RF4: agree with change. • ELACC1W6: agree with change-not feeling required to multiple uses of digital tools but simply including. • ELACC1L1: not an example in f in parenthesis. • ELACC1L1: to be more clear this standard needs to either have an example or be more clear about the following: the teacher will question or prompt a child with a declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentence and the child must respond correctly to the prompt using a simple or compound sentence. • ELACC1L1: on standard b. please place an example. • Propose, ELACC1L5 d.: attempt to reword: “Expose” shades of meaning among verbs differing in manner. (Rather than distinguish).</p>
<p>• ELACC1RL5: should have an –s on the end of difference. • ELACC1RL5: agree with the change. Wording much clearer. • ELACC1RF3: agree with the change of moving g. Recognize and read grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words to accuracy and fluency section. • Propose for ELACC1RF3: Including an example in parenthesis of the type of words that the standards are suggesting for a-e. Ex: b. Decode regularly spelled one-syllable words (cat). Like the examples in ELACC1L1. • ELACC1RF4: agree with change. • ELACC1W6: agree with change-not feeling required to multiple uses of digital tools but simply including. • ELACC1L1: not an example in f in parenthesis. • ELACC1L1: to be more clear this standard needs to either have an example or be more clear about the following: the teacher will question or prompt a child with a declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentence and the child must respond correctly to the prompt using a simple or compound sentence. • ELACC1L1: on standard b. please place an example. • Propose, ELACC1L5 d.: attempt to reword: “Expose” shades of meaning among verbs differing in manner. (Rather than distinguish).</p>
<p>• ELACC1RL5: should have an –s on the end of difference. • ELACC1RL5: agree with the change. Wording much clearer. • ELACC1RF3: agree with the change of moving g. Recognize and read grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words to accuracy and fluency section. • Propose for ELACC1RF3: Including an example in parenthesis of the type of words that the standards are suggesting for a-e. Ex: b. Decode regularly spelled one-syllable words (cat). Like the examples in ELACC1L1. • ELACC1RF4: agree with change. • ELACC1W6: agree with change-not feeling required to multiple uses of digital tools but simply including. • ELACC1L1: not an example in f in parenthesis. • ELACC1L1: to be more clear this standard needs to either have an example or be more clear about the following: the teacher will question or prompt a child with a declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentence and the child must respond correctly to the prompt using a simple or compound sentence. • ELACC1L1: on standard b. please place an example. • Propose, ELACC1L5 d.: attempt to reword: “Expose” shades of meaning among verbs differing in manner. (Rather than distinguish).</p>
<p>• ELACC1RL5: should have an –s on the end of difference. • ELACC1RL5: agree with the change. Wording much clearer. • ELACC1RF3: agree with the change of moving g. Recognize and read grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words to accuracy and fluency section. • Propose for ELACC1RF3: Including an example in parenthesis of the type of words that the standards are suggesting for a-e. Ex: b. Decode regularly spelled one-syllable words (cat). Like the examples in ELACC1L1. • ELACC1RF4: agree with change. • ELACC1W6: agree with change-not feeling required to multiple uses of digital tools but simply including. • ELACC1L1:</p>

Question 5 Comments - ELA
not an example in f in parenthesis. • ELACC1L1: to be more clear this standard needs to either have an example or be more clear about the following: the teacher will question or prompt a child with a declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentence and the child must respond correctly to the prompt using a simple or compound sentence. • ELACC1L1: on standard b. please place an example. • Propose, ELACC1L5 d.: attempt to reword: "Expose" shades of meaning among verbs differing in manner. (Rather than distinguish).
2RL5: We agree with the change. 2RF3: We agree with the change. 2RF4: We agree with the change. 2W6: We agree with the change. 2SL5: We agree with the change. We would like to see a standard for handwriting in 2nd for more than letters, but words and sentences.
2RL5: We agree with the change. 2RF3: We agree with the change. 2RF4: We agree with the change. 2W6: We agree with the change. 2SL5: We agree with the change. We would like to see a standard for handwriting in 2nd for more than letters, but words and sentences.
2RL5: We agree with the change. 2RF3: We agree with the change. 2RF4: We agree with the change. 2W6: We agree with the change. 2SL5: We agree with the change. We would like to see a standard for handwriting in 2nd for more than letters, but words and sentences.
2RL5: We agree with the change. 2RF3: We agree with the change. 2RF4: We agree with the change. 2W6: We agree with the change. 2SL5: We agree with the change. We would like to see a standard for handwriting in 2nd for more than letters, but words and sentences.
2RL5: We agree with the change. 2RF3: We agree with the change. 2RF4: We agree with the change. 2W6: We agree with the change. 2SL5: We agree with the change. We would like to see a standard for handwriting in 2nd for more than letters, but words and sentences.
No changes were proposed for fifth grade standards. I do believe ELACC5W6 should be considered for a change. All schools are not equipped with adequate numbers of computers or time to teach keyboarding to the extent that 4th and 5th graders can type their writing. When we are not able to teach keyboarding to our students it is completely unfair to expect students to successfully meet this standard. After all, what is the academic gain from being able to type quickly and correctly in fourth and fifth grade.
The standards for Kindergarten did not change that much for ELA just some syntax with the standards was changed.
Think some of the wording is vague to have to grade students on like with prompting and support
Please make them easy to understand. Explicit would be best. Nothing should be inferred.
The standards need to be easy to understand.
They are what I want for my children and our state.
We must stay the course if we expect teachers to master the teaching of these standards. The review that has been done was appropriate and strong. Thanks.
Oh gosh -- I just filled out this survey literally 5 minutes ago and realized I put strongly disagree across the board but meant to put strongly agree!! Please throw out my prior response. Thank you.
Thank you for adding British Literature, Multicultural Literature, and World Literature to the language at least two of the high school standards.
Standards are too vague and interpreted by teachers in so many diff. ways. I think for all of us to be on the same page, standards need to be clearly defined.
Everyone knows common core is a failed system and the only reason it exist is because of someone with money and power. The only reason more people aren't standing up against it is because the everyday person doesn't like to get into politics and they feel they are too insignificant to make a difference. The everyday person knows that money and power buy these decisions in.
There are too many standards to teach for true mastery and in-depth learning. Most students are not developmentally ready for the learning tasks that are needed for mastery.
The issue is not whether or not the standards are understandable. Some are developmentally inappropriate & there are so many that often times students cannot master one before being forced to move to another. The revisions are almost unrecognizable & need to be revised further.
I think they need to be laid out better to give exactly what we should be teaching as far as grammar goes. It is vague. We should be told exactly what will be tested.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Supporting and maintaining these standards are critical for our community and state to continue to thrive!
Although students in 8th grade should be able to recognize and use verbs in the imperative, indicative, interrogative, and conditional moods, subjunctive mood is too difficult for 8th grade. It should be moved to 11th or 12th grade.
Much needed clarification on the kindergarten standards! Thank you!
ELACCL9-10SL3: How do we assess reflection? ELACCL9-10RI9: Why is Nelson Mandela's piece omitted as an example?
The revisions do not really change much.
Please go back to the old way of teaching and get rid of common core it is horrible!!! The curriculum is not developmentally appropriate for the children and causes them way to much stress. The homework sent home is ridiculous and at times as a parent I can't answer the questions with two college degrees.
In regards to ELACCKL5 standard, the phrase "shades of meaning" is still very vague. I have found that the teachers that I work with still have difficulty understanding this phrase.
I did not see any revisions made to the fifth grade standards.
Referring to kindergarten standards only, some of the standards are totally inappropriate for a five year old to be held accountable for. I will use one example, inflectional endings. In order for a child to understand how inflectional endings (-ed and -ing for example) change a word, they must understand the concept of time. There is plenty of research that shows that most kindergarteners do not understand the concept of time. They do not fully understand yesterday, today, and tomorrow. So how will they understand that the word 'walked' means an action that has already been done, or 'walking' is something that someone is doing now. Who is making these standards? Just because we want them to learn skills that in recent years were first grade skills, doesn't mean they are developmentally ready to learn them. Is anyone paying attention?????
Changing a couple of words are not suitable revisions for making standards better suited to our students. I think at the K-5 level we should focus less on college and career readiness and more on developmentally appropriateness. I think many of the things we are asking our kids will be necessary once they are in high school. Asking my 9 year old to do it now is almost abusive. We are causing kids to no longer want to learn they are just trying to survive. Most research is proving developmental milestones haven't changed in hundreds of years. All that has changed are the crazy politicians and the money changers that now control are educational system.
The changes are clear and seem easy to understand. I see how they help progression through the grade levels also.
The revised standards are more specific and not as wordy. When standards are too wordy misinterpretations often occur. Especially in early grades, it is important that standards are short and to the point in ELA.
The changes were very minimal - with the exception of a few words that did not modify or change the context of the standards. Also, one standard eliminated the need for "keyboarding/typing" skills which are important for post-secondary study or career.
The standards are vague, and need to be more specific to each grade level.
I think common core standards would be even more effective if we set objectives that are realistic toward our students' needs. I feel that we test our students too often for mastery of a standard/standards that we loose purposeful instructional time. Additionally, research findings and I believe that hands-on, creative projects and task would support more meaningful learning. Nonetheless, we really need to consider sociological-and psychological factors when we implement programs and instructional instruments to realistically build-on student educational development. We need to understand to educate someone is a process and this process takes place through students' different cognitive development.
Too many standards for ELA / Reading to cover and master in one school year for one grade level. Need specific examples of how standards are to be taught....too vague to leave open for teacher interpretation to be uniform across Georgia.
The ELA standards do not make sense to the average parent nor to the child when we are trying to help them with their homework.
According to the link, 5th grade does not have any revisions

Question 5 Comments - ELA
There have been no revisions made in 5th grade ELA standards.
I don't see where these have changed. The wording is the same as well as the concepts
They are more clear & concise
The revisions were fine.
Many times the standards are too open to interpretation. Many of the specifics have been removed from the standards and this makes it challenging.
The Teacher Guidance provides examples and clear concepts for each standard.
All you have done is reworded the same inappropriate standards. You have not changed anything to the benefit of the students.
Nice changes to include more specific writing and World Literature
The ELA standards need to put less emphasis on informational reading and more emphasis on literature and critical reading. Students read for information in all other classes --science, health, social studies, CTAE, and even the Internet and social media; reading and analyzing literature is more rigorous than reading for information--and all English teachers nod our head in agreement when we discuss this. Reading historical documents needs to be in the history standards, not the English standards. Writing emphasis needs to be in the history and science and CTAE standards too. The EOC/Milestone for ELA to assess the standards has constructed responses and an extended essay, but the EOC/Milestone for economics and history has no constructed responses or essay, which does not encourage writing in these classes at all. Writing emphasis (on EOC assessment) needs to be in all subjects, not just ELA. With all subjects emphasizing writing, student ability will increase in both reading and writing. My son just took his freshmen college history exam and it was ALL writing--writing 10 constructed response, an extended essay, and some fill-in-the blank; yet it was a rare day that he wrote in his high school history classes. With no writing on the social studies EOC, and consequently no writing emphasis in the social studies classes, students opting to attend college are inadequately prepared. Secondly, ELA EOC/Milestone needs to be in the 10th and 12th grade too so that the teachers in the 11th grade are not dealing with the burden of the previous teacher taking a vacation since there was no assessment. My son just graduated from high school, so I know what happened in classes with a state assessment and in classes with no state assessment. Teachers of EOC classes are assessed on TKES by student growth, but teachers of non EOC classes are assessed by the SLO that the students have already been exposed to at the beginning of the year. This is not an equitable method of assessing student growth since students in EOC classes have not been exposed to the exact same assessment at the beginning of the year in the form of a pretest.
For first grade, changes include different wording for the revised standards.
This common core crap is stupid. Teach our kids the way we were taught. If some kids can't learn, then they need to be segregated into a class together where teachers can spend more time with them without holding up the brighter students.
I it okay
I have 2 kids in 2nd and 6th grade. Minor tweaking of common core standards wont help. Drop common core entirely. Follow something like Massachusetts standards that actually worked. Drop online testing, especially for K-8. Use money to reduce classroom size instead of increasing non teacher costs. Do not provide private student information to federal gov. Do not take federal grants when it is just blackmail to participate in a bad program.
I have 2 kids in 2nd and 6th grade. Minor tweaking of common core standards wont help. Drop common core entirely. Follow something like Massachusetts standards that actually worked. Drop online testing, especially for K-8. Use money to reduce classroom size instead of increasing non teacher costs. Do not provide private student information to federal gov. Do not take federal grants when it is just blackmail to participate in a bad program. Teach the teachers common core before you make them teach kids.
It would be nice if the writing standards were written to be more clear to teachers and students.
I think that it is important that the standards for ELA be clear to teachers and their students. Some of the wording on the original standards can be vague and confusing.
For consistency, two minor changes should be made to ELA 9-10 RI2 Determine a theme and/or central idea of a text and closely analyze its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
The standards are vague as to what the students should know. It is unrealistic to expect the students to have the skills the standards mention because contemporary students do not have the reading habits nor the critical thinking ability necessary to learn the skills. The skills are also not applicable to most post-secondary environments because they (the skills) are not needed in any but the most academic fields.
Standards should be consistent across the states. The Common Core Standards make consistency possible.
I would have appreciated having these standards when I was in the classroom. The QCCs were a checklist. These standards are recursive in nature and narrow in scope.
I don't see a significant change- a few words- but I think the minor changes do attempt to provide more clarity.
They really didn't change all that much.
The revisions are appropriate. The number and depth of the standards are too many and too rigorous to attend to all of them during one school year. We are rushing through them and that makes us uncomfortable.
As an educator for 26 years, I still feel that there are a few standards in kindergarten that are not age appropriate for students who are 5 years old, even with prompting and support, such as: ELACCKRI2:With prompting and support, identify the main topic (main idea) and retell key details of a text (supporting details) and ELACCKL4b: Use the most frequently occurring inflections and affixes (e.g., -ed, -s, re-, un-, pre-, -ful, -less) as a clue to the meaning of an unknown word. (This should be with prompting and support if it remains as a K standard).
What is the revised number of standards? We are totally confused. Are you deleting standards? Too much was shaded gray. There should be shades of gray (maybe even 50 :))
The writing standards need to be more developmentally appropriate. If writing letters for sounds is our standard, then beginning to write simple sentences should be a standard (focus on the mechanics of getting a sentence on paper)...not sharing an opinion or reaction to what happen. The genres can only be mastered when writing sentences is mastered. The way the standards are written now, skip that developmental milestone.
Still need clarification on the amount of words appropriate for high frequency, dolch or frye and what is actually considered grade level text. Is this based on the adopted series?
I would like to have clarification on the most common prefixes and suffixes.
The English Language Arts department agree with the proposed High School curriculum standards; however, request that further changes be limited in nature to foster an ability to ensure student success.
My take continues to be, "ditch the test." Go back to decades prior teaching methods consistent with learning theory. Teach the basics in an "age appropriate" way Read classic literature, read for understanding, and learn how to think (not group think.) Eliminate the need for monopolies like Pearson and Bill Gates, costly to taxpayers and students alike in more ways than one.
You are not looking at what is best for the kids! This is not going to help the kids in Georgia!
These Common Core standards are totally unacceptable. Unacceptable. The English arts standards diminish the study of classic literature and are overall very, very poor.
I would like to note that 5th grade students are not ready to type papers over one page in length.
The standards are more organized and clearer.
The concepts are TOO rigorous. The focus on "the language of the standard" is not appropriate for children this young. It is important for the children to know that friendship is a noun although we cannot see or touch it. However it is NOT a good use of teaching time to have to teach that friendship is abstract.
It is understandable that standards are broad and encompass many embedded components. However, when we hold educators and students responsible for standards, there should be an established list of skills that are expected at each grade level. Most of the teachers read and unpack the standards, but still are clueless of the expectation level of the standards. (If you don't believe this, send a survey to the teachers asking if they understand what they are to teach. You will be surprised with the responses.) Perhaps it is the skills that should be tested and not the standards. The issue is the alignment between the standards and the assessment tools. It is sad that teachers are being held accountable because of the growth on one test.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
<p>Teaching is more than the measure of one test. The success of teaching cannot be measured by one test. The success of teaching is the end product. Is that student able to accomplish what he/she hoped to accomplish at the end of the 12-14 year journey? If the answer is yes, all the teachers have been successful. Accountability is more than a single test. Do committee members realize the despair that is out there among teachers, among students, among parents of students who are not good test takers or who are struggling students in one subject area. We hear it all the time. Have committee members ever considered asking parents and teachers and students via a survey of how to evaluate good teaching? There probably isn't anything really wrong with the standards. It's the assessment. We've been taught to start with the end in mind. The new GA Milestones is something that teachers, students, and parents are dreading. It would seem that we could go several years without testing our students. They have been tested way too much. We should be using more formative assessments rather than summative assessments to guide instruction. The work of the committee members is appreciated, but they really aren't listening to what Georgia parents, teachers, and parents want. They want their students to learn and embrace the arts and have choices in what they learn. They do not want all of their children to be mathematicians, etc. Thanks for allowing input on the standards. The confidentiality of the SEDL leadership on this survey is appreciated. If we don't begin really listening to teachers and parents, we are going to lose more and more students to online learning, parochial schools, private schools, etc.</p>
<p>It is misleading of the GaDOE to say you conducted surveys, went on a listening tour, and then "revised" the standards accordingly. The opportunities for feedback via survey were not sufficiently promoted. The chance to attend a meeting was announced just before the actual meeting, giving busy adults inadequate time to arrange travel and childcare in order to attend and speak. Your website and twitter feed were not properly utilized. The truth is, the powers that be are pretending to care what the actual people who have to live with teaching and learning CCSS think about the standards. As for the revisions, which are ever so slight as to be ridiculous...NOTHING substantial has changed. Nothing has changed because when the fools who signed on for CCSS, sight unseen, agreed to implement them, they agreed to adopt copyrighted standards that could be added to or moved around very minimally but could not be deleted. CCSS is not developmentally appropriate, and this fact is especially apparent in early childhood. The concomitant testing is ridiculous and a corruption of children's opportunity to learn in a safe, appropriately challenging, respectful classroom and school. It is insulting to see this fake revision simply so that state leaders can make a headline that says Georgia has made them their own. It is a joke. Sadly, the joke is on the children. The work of CCSS and high stakes testing is all about adults and profit.</p>
<p>I am not sure of the long-term benefits of very young students (K-1) having to name the author/illustrator of a specific book. It is more important to understand what each one does.</p>
<p>I don't need my 7 year old to be college and career ready. I need him to learn the basics and be in an environment that encourages learning, not how to take a test. Enough is enough.</p>
<p>It would be beneficial for the state to create units which appropriately align with the standards and cover all areas. Also, a checklist or unit assessment would ensure all skills are being taught.</p>
<p>K-5 ELA standards are not developmentally appropriate. We have too many students in the upper grades who cannot write/speak proper English because they never had adequate time to learn it in the lower grades. K-3 ELA standards do not allow time for mastery before moving on the next item on the list to teach/learn.</p>
<p>The standards need to be clearer stated so therefore it isn't difficult for the teacher to breakdown for the student's intellectual level.</p>
<p>More specifics with grammar and more friendly user student terminology such as SL3 using DELINEATE - REALLY? Why not use depict, draw, or illustrate. The standards need to be more specific rather than so broad.</p>
<p>Please consider that teachers have been working with the CCGPS for over three years and that these revisions are thoughtfully presented to maintain consistency while improving the standards.</p>
<p>I would like all reference to sexual deviation programs removed. Children should not be exposed to the radical teachings of Kevin Jennings.</p>
<p>In Kindergarten the standards say "With guidance and support" from teachers. Can it be clearly</p>

Question 5 Comments - ELA
stated what that means? I think that from teacher to teacher the meaning of that varies when it comes to assessing that standard and completing GKIDS. A solution might be to explain this further in the GKIDS manual.
*Spell grade-appropriate words correctly; Use common, grade-appropriate Greek and Latin affixes; Demonstrate understanding of figurative language, word relationships, and nuances in word meanings. These are too broad. Specifics would help tremendously.
Too advanced for the grade level. My students are struggling with the basic concepts that should have been learned in prior grades. These things have to be taught before I can move on for them to understand the 3rd grade standards.
More confused than ever
No Common Core!
The Common Core Standards were developed with input from all states and not dictated by the Federal Government. Any revisions to the Standards should be reviewed and accepted by all states, not just individual states (e.g., Georgia). We need a consistent national approach to education if we are to have an informed citizenry.
Everything looks good.
I do not believe the ELA standards align well between second and third grade. The standards are also vague and it is difficult to determine expectations for implementation.
The standards we have now are fine and workable. To constantly change is a waste of time and money.
More work does not equal better performance. Grading on a meets standard level is crazy when GA standards are so low.
Kindergarten goals are too rigorous and not developmentally appropriate in some areas
I believe it would be helpful to have more of the vocabulary/key words listed in the standards and elements. Many teachers only look at the standards and elements and are not aware of the transition guidance to really define what the students should know and be able to do. This makes it hard to know the depth of what the students are really expected to know.
When are we supposed to teach material that children have not understood from past years?
There are minimal changes in second grade level. What job is my second grader going to get? They all want to be super stars right now. Very much unfriendly and not age appropriate.
We feel that the phonics skills in each grade level need to be more defined as to which ones are covered in which grade level. A suggested timeline for spelling skills that correlate with the phonics skills would be beneficial.
I think they are workable in most class settings.
Thank you for making these changes. It would be best in the future to make changes before a school year begins. I feel like other standards need to be revisited as well.
I feel they are too broad and difficult to understand.
I would like the phonics skills more clearly defined with a suggested correlated spelling list for the year.
I would like the phonics skills more clearly defined, with a suggested correlated spelling list for each grade level.
I feel like there is not clear explanation on some of the LA standards of what the students are expected to do. I feel that the GKIDS assessments are not clear and too broad.
The phonics skills that are taught in each grade level aren't specific enough.
The teacher resource guide is helpful in defining what the students are expected to do, but I'm not sure that many teachers have access to this. Perhaps it would be helpful for the state to remind districts that this resource is available. The curriculum map is also too broad. It is impossible to cover all of the standards in each quarter so I'd like to see it broken up into a manageable scope and sequence for the year. I also would like to see more generic units that focus on specific skills without focusing on specific texts.
Emphasis on sentence construction is good; my young children are writing plenty. Concern that so much time is given to core subjects that socialization skills have been pushed out of the daily lives of students. Playing and learning to get along is a CRITICAL concept to being successful in the workplace!
As a high school English teacher, I am still adjusting to these new standards. I do appreciate the changes made that clarify what the student is expected to do/know. I believe that we should

Question 5 Comments - ELA
work with these standards another length of time, and then re-look at them.
Many of the standards are not clear. It takes hours to dissect the standards and we teach six year olds. Our goal is for our students to develop a love of reading and writing, and we are not sure how the standards help us to do this. The revisions are very minimal. It would be best to examine the developmental appropriateness of the standards.
ELACC4L1f needs clarification. Why does it state a poor fragment, when a fragment is not ideal in writing sentences?
ELACC4L1f needs clarification. Why does it state a poor fragment, when a fragment is not ideal in writing sentences?
ELACC4L1f needs clarification. Why does it state a poor fragment, when a fragment is not ideal in writing sentences?
I appreciate the rigor of the standards, but it concerns me that a majority of the state test will still be multiple choice about grammar and mechanics. The emphasis should be on writing over grammar/mechanics if one is goes by the current set of standards. According to the standards, it seems that any grammar or mechanic question could be asked on a state test. If that is the case, then the standards should clearly state that students need to know ALL grammar and mechanic rules.
Nice to include "with prompting and support" for additional standards on K level
While the ELA standards do a good job of telling what the student should know, that is about the only thing they do. There is no curriculum map (like other subjects). While some teachers may enjoy "free reign," it is very hard to design a curriculum by yourself. Very few textbooks are linked to the standards and therefore, make it very hard to design lessons where teachers can be successful in their instruction.
The standards, as currently configured, are too rigorous setting many students up for failure.
Very few changes were made in the 6 - 8 grades. There are some vocabulary differences which teachers will need to present to their students in a test prep fashion. Using state issued resources are a great way for us to do so.
These are the standards that we would like to see changed: RI3-take out this standard--not developmentally appropriate for this grade level RF3-give a list of age-appropriate specific prefixes/suffixes L1-focus on regular pronouns and provide a list of age-appropriate collective nouns SL5-we do not have the technology at this time to make this feasible for all students
Standard we would liked changed: RI3: take out this standard out because it is not developmentally appropriate RF3: need a list of developmentally appropriate prefixes and suffixes L1: focus on regular pronouns and provide a list of collective nouns to cover SL5: we do not consistently have the technology to complete this standard
They are clear and sufficient
Clear and concise
Too rigorous, leaving no room/place for those who are not going to attend college.
Details, the standards are to vague. For example: Guide words are not specifically mentioned. Do they need to know this are not when we teach reference skills? I need the standard to be very clear about what is to be taught. I find myself throwing skills in to make sure all the bases are covered.
The standards are great, but I wish I was provided students who could accomplish the standards. The standards are fantastic for the Honors Level student, but the standards are not realistic for the remedial student population.
The wording is much more understandable.
Make sure students are able to properly cite references. Needs to happen in 9th grade not as a junior or senior!
I am glad to see the revisions. They clear up some misconceptions regarding some of the standards.
Students should learn to type earlier. Many of my students come to 6th grade using the "hunt and peck" method. More technology instruction is greatly needed...
The ELA standards are not age appropriate. As a first grade teacher, WHY are we teaching demonstratives, compound sentences, and other skills instead of contractions, compound words.
The standards are too broad.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
I believe the standards to be very broad for the subject matter included within the standard.
Standards are not developmentally appropriate for students of this age.
Given the legalistic and intellectual format, I don't see how anyone actually having any sense and ability to teach can weed through the gobblygook. Throw Common Core out, it is garbage and will do nothing but insure the students don't learn anything at all. "There is no teaching, only learning."
They seem a bit clearer than the current versions.
Revisions made to ELACC8rL2 & ELACC8L6 are so minor; one could argue they are ineffectual.
The concepts are extremely rigorous and are not age and developmentally appropriate. Students do not have enough time to grasp a full understanding of the standards because there are so many and often times, they are above their developmental ability. I agree with having high expectations for our students, however, the bar is being set too high and is setting students up to be unsuccessful. There are gaps of knowledge between grade levels due to the students inability to retain the information presented to them due to being overloaded and being afforded the time to gain a full and concrete understanding of foundational concepts which are critical to their entire educational performance.
A new curriculum is needed
The ELA Standards are not successful! There are many gaps between grade levels and students are not mastering the standards. The standards are vague and should be more content specific.
The standards as written show a large gap between grade levels. Students are not "building" knowledge from one grade level to the next. Students do not learn the "basics" before being taught skills that are well beyond their level.
I did not see where the standards were really revised. The only area I noticed changes (for K-3) were in wording only. It appears that the original draft contained errors in wording, not content. In particular I'm referring to the technology standard where students must use a variety of digital tools for publishing work, changing to students using a variety of tools INCLUDING digital tools. I'm very discouraged in all the changes for teachers. I'm discouraged about our pay being connected to test scores. I don't see how teachers will want to remain in education because of the way we are being judged. How would you like to have YOUR pay connected to how all the schools are performing????
I would like to see standards based on a third graders TRUE ability.
I strongly feel as if there are too many ELA standards for students to complete and understand within one year. Students do not have enough time to grasp and understand one concept before moving on to another standard. Also the standards are very vague and are not developmental appropriate for students. Students often become frustrated and shut down rather than work through the educational process.
Many are still not clear about specific expectations
The ELA Standards are very vague and hard to manipulate as an educator. It was much easier to use the QCCs and even GPS standards than Common Core. At least with them, we knew exactly what we were teaching. I spend a lot of time trying to understand the standard and then trying to break it down for my students to understand it. We have to teach concepts that are not worded in the standards and that a new teacher would not even realize they needed to teach if it were not for our veteran teachers telling them. I am very frustrated with education in Georgia and the way it is developmentally not appropriate for students and teachers are burnt out and not heard.
The ELA Standards are very vague and unrealistic for third graders. Students are required to perform at levels that they are not developmentally ready for, which causes frustration and failure, rather than success. There is little evidence given to teachers of the level of in-depth study that needs to be given in order to require grade appropriate mastering of the skills. Teachers are required to teach skills that are not listed as standards in order to ensure students master required standards. The common core is not user friendly for veteran or new teachers. Students are not given ample time to master skills at an age appropriate level.
Students need to focus on basic skills in K-2 to have solid foundation to build on before such rigorous standards can be effective. Brain researchers tell us how much is developmentally appropriate in reference to age, and the standards do not align to that research.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
The standards are very rigorous and do not seem developmentally appropriate for the grade levels they pertain to. I think that the amount of skills these students are supposed to master in a year's time is much too large. We feel we are, for lack of a better term, shoving information down our students' throats and expecting them to retain and master, which they are unable to do in such a short period of time.
When a standards includes knowledge of terms and vocabulary for the domain, be specific on what terms and vocabulary that includes for the grade level. Teachers are left to guess which terms should be covered at which grade level.
The standards are not developmentally appropriate. They expect kids to do too much at such a young age. Students are not having a chance to learn the material before we have to move on to new skills.
Standards are NOT vertically aligned. Second grade standards DO NOT prepare students for third grade standards when they are being tested. Second grade needs to step it up.
I feel that some standards are not developmentally appropriate for first grade students.
The read 180 program that our district has adopted does not help provide enough rigor to support these standards.
Changes seem to be only semantically based, no content or requirement.
The revised standards are clear and concise. The teacher will be able to document the progress of the students easier.
I am in favor of the proposed revisions to the ELA standards since they empower teachers to make more individual/creative choices related to classroom content.
Changes are slight and are acceptable.
Standards are still a little vague. I would appreciate clearer, more specific standards even if it meant there were more for each grade level. It would also be appreciated if there were materials available that matched grade standards.
Standards are appropriate.
I am very please with the recommended revisions.
I feel that students are pushed forward without having the knowledge needed in the next grade. For example, a student in the 8th grade will not be successful if he/she is reading on a fourth grade level. The same goes for a student in math. We need to focus more on the basics of reading and math before students can be successful in whatever path they choose in life.
These standards are hard to follow in schools/districts where language arts and reading are taught separately. It would be better to see the standards divided appropriately to each subject area.
The revisions provide increased flexibility and provide better direction for teachers.
The changes are more clear and concise. It is wonderful that technology is included more.
You only changed one/two words on most standards. We still have 41-43 standards to complete in a year. Less standards would allow for more focus and in-depth attainment of the standards.
The following needs to be included in order to strongly agree with some of the statements above: (1) Technology should be pushed as it is in the original standards. We cannot avoid emerging technology and consider ourselves teachers of communication, (2) We need to include wording that emphasizes the need for oral communication, i.e. the need for discussions, performances, public speaking, and debate. Written communication is only one form of "Language Arts", and it really is one of the most seldom used forms.
I think that while the ELA standards are rigorous and challenging, students are capable of doing them. I am seeing students do things that I did in middle and high school.
The standards need to be made more clear to teachers...with specifics made as to what students are expected to accomplish.
The revisions to specific standards are clear. The overall number of ELA high school standards is still quite large. The 10 reading standards and 10 writing standards could be compacted.
Please do not change the standards for a while. Give the teachers time to grasp how they should teach and really see how students learn. It is important that we look at data trends throughout the years to truly evaluate the vertical alignment and create next steps.
Too many standards were taken out. I understand wanting to condense standards, but some of the standards taken out have rigorous merit.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Do not change the standards simply because people do not understand education and think that the Common Core is evil. The Common Core is not evil. Changes made for political reasons are not appropriate, and our children are more important than misguided politicians and news broadcasters who are looking for a Red Scare/McCarthy-type story.
Kindergarten- add counting dimes to MCCCK.CC.5; add a standard for calendar concepts First Grade: add a standard with specific calendar concepts; add identifying/counting nickels to the new proposed standard that only contains dimes Second Grade: As a pre-requisite of standard MD8 (word problems involving money), add in a standard for counting mixed collections of coins Third Grade: Add multiplication and division to the fluency standard
Kindergarten- add counting dimes to MCCCK.CC.5; add a standard for calendar concepts First Grade: add a standard with specific calendar concepts; add identifying/counting nickels to the new proposed standard that only contains dimes Second Grade: As a pre-requisite of standard MD8 (word problems involving money), add in a standard for counting mixed collections of coins Third Grade: Add multiplication and division to the fluency standard
Please stop changing the standards every time the wind blows.
Thank you for not getting caught up in the hype to pull Georgia out of Common Core. These are great standards and a huge improvement.
A strong phonics program is essential in K-2 for success in other grades. I believe it will improve the graduation rate in Georgia.
It would be beneficial if the standards were a little more specific.
The proposed changes are needed. No additional revisions are necessary.
I really like the way they connect from grade to grade. There is a strong focus on reading for understanding and building vocabulary, which I really like.
It needs to be more streamlined in a simpler bullet format for teachers. It appears too wordy and difficult to follow.
Standards are still to vague and can be read many different ways.
I love the standards. The ways we teach them may cause some concern, but the standards are excellent. I wish the publicity would get that across.
The standards are outdated and need to be revised with vertical alignment in mind. For example - GA 5th graders spend 5 weeks discussing the holocaust. Then in 6th grade students are expected to cover it again in depth through The Diary of Anne Frank. 12 year old kids do not want to spend that much time discussing one historical event. They arrive to middle school bogged down on the topic and they need new, updated, engaging literature to read and analyze. The novels and literature suggested on the current middle school scope and sequence needs to be revised if we expect students to want to read the material.
Regarding the use of Turabian's Manual for Writers as a reference source, I feel that Atlanta Public Schools should purchase a copy for each student.
I think the new revised standards are more clear and age-appropriate.
Revised standards are appropriate.
Personally I don't see the need for collective nouns in the second grade.
There were not many changes that affected ELA at the primary level.
Changes to the ELA standards were applicable to students' learning.
I think the some standards are too broad. Possibly more specific on the number of words for high-frequency or sight words, what types of text...poem, informational... What about handwriting? I think there should be a specific standard for handwriting.
Thank-you for the revisions. Clarity and alignment are essential in the guidance of excellent teaching.
The standards, just as with math, have not changed. Taking an "s" off of a word or changing one word does not change a standard.
They do not actually define what students should be able to do because there are no assessments. What does read fluently mean? How many words per minute are considered fluent? We get new students all the time that are marked as knowing or not knowing a standard and we find the opposite to be true because the assessments are totally different. For a curriculum to be aligned, the assessments must be as well. Many of the standards are not developmentally appropriate at all and because there are so many, there is not enough time to go deep. Instead we skim the surface and do a lot of rote memorization. Especially with

Question 5 Comments - ELA
language. Terms like pronouns, reflexive pronouns, possessives...those are like a foreign language to little ones. The money that is being spent to write, print, rewrite, print, revise, etc.. could be better spent on a solid curriculum created by specialists that include everything needed to teach and assess the standards.
More specifics and details concerning what students should know for each standard (delete vague wording: most, some, and replace with clear objectives).
I think that standard: ELACC3L1. Demonstrate command of the conventions of Standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking. a.Explain the function of nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs in general and their functions in particular sentences, should have been made more clear in what is meant by "explain the function". For example, with nouns, do students need to know that the noun is the subject, direct object, indirect object, etc.? Or just that nouns names a person place or thing? This standard is confusing to all of the teachers that I work with and I am surprised that it has not been revised.
It would be great to have examples available!!
I think moving the Reading Foundational Standard 3d regarding irregularly spelled words is unnecessary. Irregular spellings falls under phonics (RF3) not comprehension (RF4). please strongly consider this suggestion
Standards are too hard for students and parent to understand." Keep it simple" should be the motto. If students are to read fluently, then how many words per minute is that? At one county it is 90 and in our county it is 50! Spend time and money on a curriculum for us! Each county should be the same.
These standards will assist our students in a readiness for higher expectations in upper grades. It aims for success.
I like the Common Core Standards. Please keep them in GA
These comments are great!
I support the revisions and encourage them to be adopted.
The standards are still vague and not age appropriate at the primary level. There is very little emphasis placed on foundational concept that are essential for students to acquire during those specific years. Systematic instruction in foundational skills in phonics, spelling, and language are virtually non-existent. This would be fine if systems used the standards as a "guide." But many systems give these standards to teachers and say "they" are the curriculum. This leaves gaping holes in instruction.
Puts our kids in the steps to being able to compete globally.
This is a great step in the right direction!
I believe there should be a stronger emphasis on grammar and business writing.
Many of the standards are redundant.
The standards are well written and reflect what students should learn at each grade
The standards appear to be good for students at all grade levels
I didn't see much change, specifically for 4th grade aside from removing modal auxiliary verbs and replacing them wit helping/ linking verbs. Most other changes simply removing some of the cloudy language that was unnecessary.
There is still a lot of ambiguous language and unclear grammar standards.
The revised LA standards are still not developmentally appropriate for the students. The students are not mature enough to understand them.
They're fine as they are.
Revisions effectively help clarify intent and appropriately expand the range of literature for students to use for consideration.
The expectations for third grade students are too rigorous. There isn't time to teach basic knowledge because we must spend time teaching and practicing skills that are above their skill level.
I appreciate the changes in the verbiage that makes the standards concise as well as easier to understand.
Some need to be more specific; some are perceived as subjective
It should include more novels.
Please consult teachers and receive their input before devising the standards.
Some of the standards are too vague. Some are unrealistic in expectations for the age and

Question 5 Comments - ELA
grade of the student. More instruction is needed before practice and independent work is done.
The standards are effective and should not be changed.
Standards are too broad. With GPS, vocabulary was easily identified within standard. With CCGPS, standards are very broad resulting in numerous interpretations of the standard.
No revisions were made for my grade.
Not too sure about the rigor or that literary sources are appropriate for 3rd grade students.
Many of these standards are too rigorous for 4th graders.
Not sure exactly what is changing. It says the highlighted gray could possibly be changed, deleted, or moved to teacher guidance. All are highlighted gray except theme.
Gleaned from research I have done, education experts warn that seniors will be reduced to what is currently 7th grade. These are skill sets, not fully developed standards. They cannot point to readiness for a high school diploma or a four-yr. college diploma. The Fordham Institute analyzed the Common Core against GA standards in ELA and math, and it scored no better than what GA had in place! "The Georgia K-12 ELA standards are better organized and easier to read than the Common Core." (State of State Standards, 2010)
We must prepare our students for success the world in which they will work. Success in that world will require creative and discriminate writers and thinkers. We are failing our students if we do not stay the course.
Standards are too vague. They also seem very sporadic, and do not build from one year to the next.
There were not many changes. I felt some changes were not needed to the ones that were changed. I also felt other standards needed to be changed, but weren't.
Students in middle school at this point are not able to adjust to the "rigor" of the standards. They should have been gradually implemented or it should have started with elementary students and then phased in to the middle schools and high schools. Also, there are not enough resources or time to teach the standards.
The change in some of the elements was just so minimal, that it was irrelevant to change.
I was very excited to hear that the ELA standards were going to be revised. However, the noted changes in the standards can hardly be considered revisions. The standards are lengthy and difficult to understand. As a teacher, I want to help my students be successful and meet the goals set forth by the state. That's difficult to do when the standards are so broad and vague. I'm very disappointed.
As a kindergarten teacher, I feel that there are too many standards. It is impossible to teach ALL of the proposed standards well. Some of the standards are too difficult for the kindergarten level, especially considering the fact that some children come into kindergarten as 4 year olds for the first month.
Standards are very wordy. They have to be broken down step by step to understand what is being stated.
Although I am a RESA science content specialist, the ELA and math CCGPS are very important for the work I do with science teachers. The CCGPS provide excellent opportunities to support student learning across content areas, for example through the literacy standards and mathematical practices. The CCGPS supports cross-curricular integration in a way that previous standards did not. As a result, the CCGPS benefit student learning in science and other subjects while also supporting high levels of student learning in math and ELA.
The revisions seem to clarify the standards a little bit more. The moves in RF3 to RF4 seem to be developmentally appropriate. Thanks for the hard work.
These are vague and wordy -- hard for parents and public to understand and difficult to assess.
These standards do not are not applicable for my students on a day-to-day basis. Most of the students that I work with will be or need some type of assistance for the remainder of their years.
I think that young children are not being given time to grow and learn. It seems like kindergarten is what first grade used to be.
Per the revised standards for grades 1-3 standards are stated in a clear statement than previous. Per standards that were not revised, specifically third grade writing standards. Standards are conducting research are unclear as well as other standards dealing with presenting information using technology and other ways.
The teachers have been implementing the standards with fidelity. Student expectations are

Question 5 Comments - ELA
increasing with noticeable gains.
Some of them are repetitive. There are too many. Some are too vague or broad. Kindergarten needs a few, important basic skills standards. That's it. There is not enough focus on basic skills. Some are too hard for Kindergarten age students
Standards are rigorous enough, but in some instances are too rigorous and not developmentally appropriate for each grade level.
Some are basic for 5th grade learning. I think that is why the students feel like (and teachers) that there are so many:)
Am not familiar with above 5th, so no way to judge upper grades
I think the narrative writing standard and its sub-standards are not applicable to post-secondary and workplace environments. They certainly help students who will be taking creative writing, but that encompasses a very few overall students. It certainly should not be given any heft on an EOC>
English Language Arts standards are stated in such a way that students can understand and apply what they are required to do in the classroom.
The ELA revisions are simply a matter of semantics. Nothing has been changed or improved.
The word "delineate" has two definitions - one is to examine boundaries, the other is to describe. While these meanings are related, they have different implications for expectations. In addition, because there are two different definitions, a teacher may select the more familiar "describe" definition only - and if this is what is wanted, then why not just say "Describe" in the first place? There needs to be further clarification, maybe in parentheses, explaining that the standard is to examine boundaries of the argument as well as describe it, or examine boundaries, or describe the argument. Also, the standards are written more for college readiness than they are for workplace communication readiness.
I feel that some of the standards expected for kindergarteners to know is too challenging. When the standards were created students from poverty stricken community were not taken into consideration.
There is too much emphasis on nonfiction. Nonfiction and fiction should not be given equal weight in literature courses because students read nonfiction in all of their other classes.
The standards are too rigorous for young learners K-1. Students do not come to school as well "learned" as they use to. The children are coming into school too young and are not developmentally ready for structured school. Parents are not spending the time to prepare their children for school either. They come very immature and with no respect for authority or other students. Many of the basic life skills are now being taught by teachers. How can they write a sentence if they do not know how to even speak clearly and in a sentence. They have minimal fine motor skills and are not expected at home to write, read or color in the lines.
Lack of adequate instructional time still remains a concern, especially for struggling students who need additional supports to meet standard mastery.
Very "wordy" and sometimes confusing (before and after revision)
On ELACC6W6 the following was omitted on the new standard: demonstrate sufficient command of keyboarding skills to type a minimum of 3 pages in a single setting. Was it omitted because students do not need this skill or because they should already have it? I teach 6th grade ELA and the majority of students do not have adequate keyboarding skills to type one page. Their writing ability will not be accurately assessed on the GA Milestones because of their keyboarding skills.
There are no proposed revisions for the grade level that I teach.
I believe that they need to be more specific.
ELA teachers need to receive a more clearly defined directive in the expectations DOE has for instruction. Simply having a set of standards is not enough if instruction is going to be consistent and streamlined within our state.
It is unnecessary to require elementary aged students to compare texts. How does this help prepare students for college and careers? I have two graduate degrees, and from kindergarten to the present, I've not had to read "paired texts." I cannot think of a job or profession that requires people to compare and contrast paired texts in the way we are teaching students now. The time spent drilling students on how to read and compare two texts could be better spent teaching students to love reading authentic literature.
Some of the 5th grade standards should have been revised and/or broken down.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Perhaps I missed something, but these revisions did not appear to change any standards. It appears that a few standards and/or elements were moved around.
I do not agree with the movement of ELACC2RF4d and ELACC3RF4d - I believe it should stay where it was. The standard where it was moved is about fluency and I don't believe reading irregularly spelled words is just about fluency. Needs to be with the decoding standard where it was originally placed.
Although rigorous and relevant to students on track for college, we must be mindful that some students (particularly those with disabilities) may not be on track for college, but for the workforce. These standards do not allow for teachers to prepare students for real-life problems such as building your credit, writing a resume, successfully completing a job interview, selecting and understanding health insurance, or opening a bank account. We need to take a moment and consider the relevance of the standards for those not preparing for collegiate level course and also consider the fact that all students are blessed with their family and support systems with which many of us grew up accustomed to. Statistically, educators and educational leaders come from middle to upper class families; conversely students in rural counties with a low socio-economic status are not afforded that luxury. Realistically, the world needs all kinds of workers - from the woman who cleans my classroom to the man who runs our system. Without each and every employee, the college graduate and the GED recipient included, our system would not work. Currently, our educational leaders are trying to create a one size fits all education in Georgia and it is not working. Essentially, I have to break the rules (i.e. not follow the standards) in order to provide my students with skills they need to be successful in a work force. It goes without saying that I also deliver content targeted by the standards and I also support their rigor and the push for increasing writing is an essential plus for Georgia; yet, the reality is being drained from the classroom. If we want to develop students with higher order thinking skills, we also need to ensure we are setting realistic goals. Some argue this is not a teacher's job, but they do not realize that it is our job. We are teachers, parents, psychologists, statisticians, detectives, nurses, police officers, comedians, and so much more. When our government realizes that a student is not a statistic or a test score and removes some of the binding laws which hinder schools, that is when we can ensure Georgia's future is bright.
I looked at the 11-12 standards, and I'm glad to see the adjustments. The adjustments make those 2 standards applicable for non-American Lit classes.
While many of the standards are very good and applicable to the classroom environment, they are also extremely redundant. That causes a large amount of extra work for the teacher, but it does not benefit the students.
I believe the ELA standards have been revised with student achievement as focus.
Many of the ELA skills for first grade are absolutely too advance for them. I understand increasing rigor and implementing higher-level learning but some of the writing standards are impossible because students in first grade simply are not developmentally ready to perform some of the tasks at that age.
Some of the standards are to vague and hard to understand. They should be written more precise so that you could understand them.
There are some standards that needed to be revised that were not. Some things are entirely too difficult for a kindergartener to understand much less master, while other standards are too easy (write most letters). There are too many that are subjective - "with prompting and support" - any child can master anything with prompting and support!!!!
I think the standards need to be more specific to address different ELA courses such as adv. comp., multicultural lit., ap lit, ap lang, British lit., American lit. instead of just 11th-12th grade. Many of these course are vastly different, yet the standards do not allow for that necessary differentiation needed for the students.
Thank you for clarifying some of the wording in the standards. It will be very beneficial to teachers. Please continue to use these standards as they provide the rigor needed for students to become college and career ready.
I think that students need more Language Arts. Our students do not seem to understand the difference between a formal writing and an informal writing. Possibly because of technology!
These standards are not developmentally appropriate.
I believe the standards should come with more resources and graphic organizers for DI for SPED Students.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Too rigorous
As a former first grade teacher, it is my opinion that the standards are SO developmentally inappropriate that it is setting the teacher and student up to fail. I do not understand how 2 standards can differ so drastically in the same grade level. For instance one standard for first grade says to place the correct SPACING between words and another standard is talking about teaching students to write compound declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentences. Totally inappropriate and developmentally asking too much for first grade students. This is just one extreme example of why I believe the ELA standards should be completely REVISED again.
Standards are ok. Testing (Milestones, EOCTs, etc.) doesn't make sense...especially online only. Reading passages and comparing them needs to be done on paper...not on a screen. Tests need to relate to standards.
Georgia's problem with our standards is that we are teaching too many standards without the students mastering the concepts. When us teachers were in school, mastery of the concepts was very important and enforced. However, with Georgia now trying to implement concepts too early in education, students are not capable of mastering the concepts. We are simply "skimming the top of them" and moving on to the next concept. No wonder our students are failing and hate school. For some students with learning issues, it is impossible to master this many concepts. What is the point and why do those who write these new Georgia standards feel the need to cover so many in one grade?? Why not go back and try to cover fewer standards and cover them to mastery? The next grade level can cover the other standards instead of covering the same standards in 3 different grades!
These standards and common core in general provide way too many in number to promote mastery and transfer to other contents. These "revised" standards just are a way to pacify the public rather than a real effort to address the issues at hand. Although the standards allow rigorous college-bound study, they do not allow flexibility for students who do not wish to enter college. For students who wish to enter into a trade, there is not enough study of ELA language of loans, credit, savings, stock portfolios, insurance, etc. In fact, these issues need to be given to all students since these are life skills students' need.
It's too much too fast. Many students are not capable of doing this as such a fast pace along with all their other standards.
The rigor expected of 9th graders is too much for some of them. This rigor needed to start earlier for them, and it has just been dropped on them without the full eight grades as support. These proposed standards should have been introduced 1/2 grade, then adding 1/2 and 3/4, and then the next year 1/2, 3/4 and 5/6 and the following year 1/2, 3/4, 5/6 and 7/8 and then the following year having the high school students who are prepared for such drastic increase in rigor. Some of the changes have been extremely stressful for many of our students who have no support at home.
They are basically the same because only minor revisions were made.
Please stop changing them!!!!
Based on grade 2 CCGPS revisions
Please take into account that many of our students are not ALWAYS on grade level and have the background knowledge that you envision they should. I do not feel that these things are taken into account.
Based on 5th grade standards
Better, but still a lot to be assumed.
As a former English teacher and current instructional coach, I am mostly pleased with the revised CCGPS standards for high school ELA. I am still somewhat concerned with the lack of focus on reading classic literary works and a larger focus on reading informational texts, but I do understand the necessity, as students should be reading more informational texts in order to be globally competitive citizens in our ever-changing society.
There is not enough time in the school year to ensure the students have mastered all the ELA Standards.
The revisions are so minor that they will not have a significant impact on instruction.
I believe the standards allow students to learn to think critically and at a higher level.
If would be helpful is the standards could be grouped together to ensure that all standards are taught.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
There are too many. Once people have to cut, and they DO have to cut, there is NO accountability. Also, clarity is needed as to what level. Students should be able to spell. Well, which words? "Appropriate level" is argued to death-- I need clarification. Fewer skills with more rigor and examples of rigor is preferable to a huge list that will never be tackled.
Like adding "With prompting and support on ELACCKRL4. ELACCKRF4-Reading sight words and reading emergent texts with purpose and understanding should be 2 different standards.
I could not tell that they were revised.
While I do like our current standards, I feel they fail to address students are not college ready, and who will more than likely work in blue collar jobs that need more basic skills.
The changes are minimal.
Why don't ya'll leave well enough alone and STOP changing it. We all still speak standard English!
As an educator I didn't see where the changes would make major impact.
This should be gone over.
I feel that some of the standards are hard for the students at their grade level to master, especially for our lower and special ed students.
Be more in depth...such as the CRCT study guide
The standards need to be rewritten rather than revised.
A lot of the standards are not age-appropriate. It is hard for me to understand how much promoting and support that I need to give in order to say that the child mastered it. While grading in G-kids it is hard to for all teachers to be on the same page due to the wording of the standards and rubric for grading.
Why do we keep re-writing standards and tests in GA? Why don't we use what has been proven to work in states (such as the Midwest) where scores are much higher?
We are pushing students too hard too fast. The students are getting very frustrated.
The standards that were reworded are easier to understand.
The focus of the literature standards seems to be nonfiction and that is far from the focus at the postsecondary level. The standards do seem geared otherwise to the college-bound student, however, they are neglecting the career oriented student.
I think the standards are extremely vague, before and after revision. It's really very difficult to determine what to teach, much less even how to teach it.
My son will be getting a job following graduation and he has not been prepared for the workforce.
English courses should be sequential just like math
The standards provide clear guidance on standards to be taught. The state has always provided standards/objectives to be taught whether it was through QCC, GPS, CCGPS.
I wish the standards were a little more student friendly. If it's easy enough for students to understand then there would be less teacher interpretation of what the standards are asking us to teach and students to learn.
The standards were fine before revision. Some may fall in line with others, so maybe combining some would be in order.
As an ESP teacher, I feel that some of these standards are not attainable for the population I serve. Also, I think we needed more time to implement some of the standards. The students ARE NOT used to constructed responses. They have become accustomed to "scantron learning."
Standards are not age appropriate. The writing pieces for kindergarten definitely are NOT appropriate for 5 and 6 year olds.
Standards are still very vague.
The ELA Common Core standards are very broad and require students, 6th grade students especially, to complete work that is above their cognitive abilities.
They are fine. The only changes were in wording. There aren't any significant changes.
The standards do not need to be changed.
CCGPS standards are not age appropriate for 3rd graders. There is too much content to complete during the period before State Mandated testing.
More adapted for the special needs
As these standards need to be taught, many students are not developmentally ready because

Question 5 Comments - ELA
for whatever reason as they do not have fundamentals. This may be due to students labeled special needs, 504, or some environmental factor.
These standards are strong and make our goal clear. They are the best we've had in 15 years.
Some of the standards are not developmentally appropriate for most fourth graders.
Each of the 2nd grade CCGPS revisions, better defines what students should know and be able to do.
Some of the standards are too rigorous for ESP students.
With the new GA Milestone test forthcoming, I believe the ELA standards don't help the teachers tier lesson activities to address the question formats of the new assessment.
1st grade expects incoming students to more proficient than kindergartners are when they finish the year. Kindergarten is not required and has no entry level requirements. Some enter with zero knowledge. They do not know letters, sounds, numbers, or even how to hold a pencil.
I feel the Standards are too difficult for the average child.
ELA Standards- There are little changes that would affect K-3 teachers in this area. The major change that we noticed was with the wording. The standards that were tweaked provided a more clear understanding of the expectation.
Please have all parts of all standards printed on the reports cards for elementary school parents to see. A condensed version of the standard is not enough.
The 8th grade "revision" only consisted of changing one word and moving a comma. I think the standards are still very vague.
I feel the ELA standards are too hard for first grade. Examples include: possessive nouns, imperative, interrogative, declarative, and exclamatory sentences, conjunctions, and prepositions. Students at this age don't have the mindset to retain all of this vocabulary and what it all means.
Standards are vague or too detailed. Both can apply to various standards. While the standards do prepare students for college, the content area is vast. there are too many standards and too much information to cover in one semester.
There were no significant difference only in the wording. There are still too many standards in kindergarten to cover.
I would like to see a specific number of high frequency words for Kindergarten.
I feel that there is too much left to interpretation among different teachers in regards to what is expected.
I appreciate the changes made to the standards for clarity for our teachers. However, researching online for "I can" statements related to these standards puts this terminology into "student friendly terms". It would be amazing to add under the present standard for teachers an I can statement for students. Example: W.6.8 could be - I can gather appropriate information about a topic from different resources including books and technology. Sample pdf from web : http://www.etown.k12.ky.us/uplimg/cms/gr6_ela.pdf
The students are being pushed way too hard too fast at the Elementary Level. Teachers are working 12 hour days just to keep up with all that needs to be done for students to be prepared at the end of the year(even veteran teachers).
The standards are very straightforward and rigor based; however, I am concerned. Since implementing the program and Common Core, I have noticed that testing scores have declined in the past two years. In the younger grades, I have observed there seems to be a gap that is harder as a teacher to bridge. Students are weaker in phonics based instruction and overall writing.
Our effort at clearly defining skills that are essential to success is what we should be doing. I commend the state for this effort.
These standards are set to address students who are capable of going to college. Many of my special education students get lost in the shuffle of all these changes, and although they are given accommodations the pace is much to fast and rigorous.
After review of the ELA revisions, we determined that all changes were needed. Standards were clarified, shortened or shifted to the appropriate place. In some standards expectations were clarified in regard to DOK and whether or not support was to be provided. We hope the teacher guidance documents will provide the expected support.
I would like for them to be easier to read.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Students are learning with our ELA Standards. The bar has been set high and I am trying my best to make sure the children learn.
Nobody needs to know how to write in cursive anymore. Why not use the time that we would save teaching cursive to teach our students how to code (HTML, etc.)? We are rapidly approaching a society in which most of our writing will be typed. Why are we wasting our time with this outdated knowledge? Shall we also teach our math students how to use a slide rule?
The standards are overly vague and full of meaningless information. The standards are too broad and cannot be used effectively by teachers to construct a cohesive plan. The standards leave out necessary information needed prior to studying a particular standard. They do not flow from year to year and leave large gaps of missing information in our classrooms. Teachers are burdened by the lack of defined standards and struggle to teach all the possible test elements within the confines of the current school environment. These standards need to be developed by teachers who actually spend time in a classroom teaching, not by those in academia who cannot possibly understand what actual teaching is supposed to involve.
I would like a little more specifics on things like grammar standards that say "Greek or Latin affixes" list the ones that need to be studied. Quotations can be used in many different situations. Specifically list a few expectations for use of commas. Commas are the same way a little vague. Write with 5th grade spelling - what exact words would be classified as 5th grade? I don't want QCC's back just a little more specifics.
They should be explained more for kindergarten
I think these standards try to teach too much for children that are so young. I understand that we need to push our students and have high expectations; however, children need to be children. We need to make sure that we are not putting so much on children that they do not want to come to school, because they do not ENJOY school. Learning needs to be FUN!!!!
Language standards are too vague. It is difficult to look at vertical alignment and know what exactly and to what extent a standard was taught or expected level of mastery.
What was the purpose of revision (a term used lightly)? They seem to only be slightly reworded--some only add additional documents as examples to use.
Very broad and difficult to explain to my child. They are extremely rigorous. They do not allow time for writing development to occur at the primary level.
I am only speaking for the fourth grade standards when I say that they look fine.
I am ok with these, but still feel especially in the K standards that though there are very rigorous standards, we should consider the developmental levels of these children and consider taking off some of these such as inflections and affixes- doesn't seem appropriate in the K setting-
The standards need to stay the same. Too many changes are being made in education within a small time span.
The fluency and comprehension standards state "grade level text", but there are no guidelines as to whose definition of "grade level". Stories vary by publisher....
I feel that the standards are complex and provide rigor at the elementary level, but a few standards are not developmental for the younger students, such as inflections, affixes and suffixes, and publishing using digital tools.
We have found the ELA standards to be appropriate and students very capable.
Students are learning what is needed to move forward.
I believe the expected progression from 9th - 10th and from 11th-12th is still not clear.
I really didn't see much as far as revision goes. ONE element was moved to a different standard; a couple of words were changed in the others, and a few words were removed. These changes made no real difference in what the students are being taught or in the clarity of the standard. Hopefully, you didn't waste taxpayer money paying for someone to make these irrelevant changes.
There are really too many standards for ELA. In reality, we should only need to concentrate on about 4 or 5 core standards total about writing, grammar, speaking, and reading; the rest are ancillary standards that are imbedded in the bigger standards. This would also encourage educators to teach with depth and rigor rather than trying to cover all of the standards listed. The core standards I recommend are: Citing evidence. Writing for a specific audience, task, or purpose. Speaking in public and working with partners. Grammar Rules
The wording is too vague. "The student will understand..." is not a measurable. Grading and testing is too subjective to be able to accurately measure.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
The standards are written in general terms. Specific skills such as the parts of speech (e.g., pronouns, nouns, verbs, adverbs,...) are not directly addressed at the fifth grade level. It is the teacher's responsibility to analyze the standard and embed these prerequisite skills in their lessons rather than strictly adhering to the generally written standard. As a result, many of my students have completely forgotten what a noun or pronoun by the time they are in fifth grade.
Many standards are not age appropriate in my opinion.
For primary grades, it's often difficult to understand how deep we need to teach a skill. For example, prepositions and conjunctions. This is the first time they've seen these. Exactly how much are they expected to know. Is this just an introduction or does it need to be deeper?
The revisions are understandable.
There are too many standards for kindergarten. Many are not developmentally appropriate. Kindergarten should be about building the foundation for reading and math. We should not be accountable to the same standards as every other grade level. Students are not able to master the basics skills before they are pushed to skills they are not developmentally ready for. We introduce a lot of the standards but to be graded on them in kindergarten is not appropriate.
The revised ELA standards language is precise and understandable for all stakeholder.
Standards need to be more exact defining what the students should know and be able to do. (For example, students should be able to read 70 out 100 sight words)
ELA standards for reading should include specific skills that teachers need to teach. Many teachers are guessing at specific skills that go along with the standards presented. We would like to see more specifics like the GPS were stated.
The ELA standards contain too much information to be developmentally appropriate for children, especially those residing in economically disadvantaged homes. Proper English is rarely spoken in many of the homes in our district, which directly and negatively influences students' vocabulary and writing.
Great job of defining standards for implementation
Although I think standards about making digital recordings are stupid. Why is this necessary in elementary school? Students need to master writing sentences that are written correctly. I think the digital push is more appropriate for grades 6-12. Don't you think we should teach children to actually write with a pencil correctly before we push all the digital publishing? That seems to be a more developmentally appropriate sequence to me.
The revisions are clear and appropriate and should remain in place to help Georgia's students continue to be challenged for success.
In addition to the standard revisions, the performance indicators should also be reviewed to make sure they are clear and not confusing.
The standards are a little too broad in my opinion. The GPS (standards) were more specific, narrowing in on what the students were supposed to be able to do. Many of the revised standards require much more higher order thinking than the average elementary student is developmentally ready to do.
I think the list of sight words should be specific. By that I mean, should be use Fry's list or Dolsch list? I think the same list should be provided and used throughout the state.
I teach first grade and have taught first grade fir the past 11 years. I am writing in regards to the first grade ELA standards. The standards for first grade are way to rigorous for mastery. The level of rigor does not match the developmental level of a 6 year-old child. The parts of speech are way too much for children to grasp and fully understand. This is almost impossible for students who struggle in reading. Students are struggling trying to memorize facts and concepts. I have been teaching for 11 years and I can truly say that the children are being introduced to information and tested quickly before they forget the information just to provide data. The scores are not really measuring what a student has learned, but only on what they have memorized for a short period of time. I feel that the standards should be changed dramatically. I have taken my children out of public school and placed them in private schools due to this problem. It is a problem that really needs to be addressed. I have a MED degree in Curriculum and Instruction and these standards go against everything that is being taught in this field of study. We need to focus on teaching the children to read and to develop a love for reading at an early age. That is not what is happening. Children are stressed out.
Standards need to reflect specific goals. "The student knows some sight words" is too vague. Is some five? Is some 62? Our system has designated a specific number for mastery of sight

Question 5 Comments - ELA
words. But what happens when I get a student from another system in GA? They may be required to know less sight words for mastery. The amount of standards in kindergarten is large. I feel I test more than I am able to teach and that is not right. With progress monitoring, SLO's, and scores for data analysis, we test all the time. The majority of the testing that has to be done in kindergarten is one-on-one. This is VERY difficult to do in a timely manner without a full time para, in which we do not have. The proper attention cannot be given to the actual teaching of the standards. The number of standards needs to be lessened so teachers can successfully teach what is important for our students to know in order to be successful when entering 1st grade.
For Grade 1 the CCGPS standards are clearly defined.
I feel we should go away from Common Core!!
The standards are easier to unpack which will make it easier for teachers to identify what students should know and be able to do for each grade level.
The proposed, revised standards emphasize conceptual comprehension that is not developmentally appropriate for elementary children. There needs to be a much greater focus on phonics in first and second grade and less on standards, such as: 1) comparing two texts 2) reasons an author gives to support a text 3) describe key details 4) identifying key words in poetry that suggest feeling 5) identify who is telling the story at various points in the text
Too much nonfiction/informational text Not enough literature or at least carefully chosen informational texts Time periods in socio-historical context? Commas in compound, complex, compound-complex sentences? etc.
Our students are using technology more and more to produce writing pieces. Spending time on cursive writing may not be the best use of the students' time.
The revised standards are very rigorous and seem to now be aligned with the end of the year assessment.
I love the idea of more rigorous standards, but I think one danger of these standards is the expectation that ALL students will be successful with ALL standards. We need to keep in mind that there will always be those students who are performing below the average. That is what "average" indicates - but from the few samples of test questions we have seen concerning the Milestone tests, they seem to be designed with the idea that ALL students will function at the highest level of expectation. It is fine to have a rigorous test, *if* it is understood that having some students perform poorly on such a test does not mean said schools or teachers are not doing a good job. I am also concerned about the rumor that there will be open ended questions that will require "typing" skills from lower elementary students. Our children DO NOT know how to type. Many schools do not offer typing in the elementary grades, and the idea that 8 year-olds should be able to type out essay style answers is foolish. Students will not give the best answers they could because they will not be able to type all they know. I am afraid what will happen is that schools will now be expected to start teaching typing skills to young children, which though possible is not feasible when you consider how much other material we are supposed to be covering. Not to mention that many schools do not have enough computers to offer typing skills to their entire student body in a timely manner. They may also not have enough computers to actually GIVE the Milestone to all students in a reasonable time frame. All of these issues do not appear to have been taken into consideration, but are likely to result in students not being able to demonstrate their true potential on the Milestone tests.
Remember that our schools have a high proportion of second language students, who take longer to acquisition these ELA skills.
Some of the current standards such as shades of meaning is very difficult at this grade level due to vocabulary. Students are ready for exposure to this standard, but are not ready for testing. Also, collective nouns needs to be moved in the frameworks to be taught after subject verb agreement.
There are too many standards to cover effectively in one year.
I'm not sure about these standards, but most changes cause more problems than solutions.
I feel that the standards in second grade for shades of meaning and the standard that covers collective nouns do not have enough foundation in earlier grades for the students to successfully master the standard at the depth of knowledge needed for testing.
Our current standards are understandable but they lack clarity when compared to the former standards. In the old standards, grade level parameters were more clearly defined. This was

Question 5 Comments - ELA
the big improvement when we moved to GPS from QCCs. Under the QCCs everyone taught every part of speech every year. The GPS gave us a clearly defined portion of that skill to teach. The Language Progression Chart is less defined and to be helpful needs to be front and center not an after thought. We need to understand how these standards move children forward and how the grade levels relate to one another. Also, text complexity and reading level need to be addressed. When higher Lexiles were dictated, we were unprepared with strategies and materials to move students to higher levels in reading. I already see people moving away from the rigorous texts and back to the more comfortable selections. We need support for stretching our students' reading levels or we will never reach the levels we are asked to read for the CCRPI.
The standards are too "wordy." Simply tell me what it is that I am supposed to teach my students and allow me to do that.
My concern is if developmental levels of small children are taken into consideration. They can learn but not always retain from year to year.
Standards need to be in place to build upon. Standards should focus to have students ready for college or transition to the real world jobs.
They are adequate at this time.
Some type of writing accommodation needs to be implemented for SPED students and others who can dictate but have a lot of difficulty writing legibly.
I feel the number of standards needs to be edited and make it to the same number throughout the grades from K to 5.
The minute changes that were made, seemed okay, however, what was not addressed was the disconnect in the order in which some of the standards are taught. Students are being asked to master standards that require skills that have yet to be introduced (this is a within grade-level problem). Rigor is important, but the foundations must be appropriately established first.
The standards are difficult to understand. Nothing much was changed or revised. For the 4th and 5th grade, the standards are vague and difficult to interpret or asses. They need to be written in simple clear language so that any parent is able to understand what they mean.
The ELA standards diminish the study of classic literature, which is the only evidenced-based method of cultivating good readers. Furthermore, we pass on our culture and our values through literature, not through dry nonfiction. The standards' emphasis on nonfiction "informational text" is supported by no -- zero -- evidence of the efficacy of such an approach. In general, the Common Core ELA standards (essentially identical to the "new" GA standards) are designed for utilitarian workforce training, not true education -- and there's no evidence they'll accomplish even this minimalist training. Why are we not using the pre-CC Massachusetts standards if we want demonstrated quality?
I see that rigor is required, however I do not feel that all of the content is completely age/developmentally appropriate.
I would like to see a document created that shows a sample student product or activity that demonstrates proficiency for each standard
I like the wording being more specific for what the student needs to know.
The wording of the revised standards is more direct and to the point.
1) What does "with prompting and support" mean that phrase is open to very wide interpretation which could affect the assessment across grade levels. provide examples. 2) what are grade-level phonics? I have asked instructional coaches repeatedly and no one seems to know which phonics skills are for each grade level. Exact ones would be extremely beneficial in order to be positive that they are taught. 3) Again, Exact high frequency words, common digraphs, irregularly spelled words etc. per grade level would be extremely beneficial in order to make sure there are no gaps in the teaching. 4) why bother to list a standard, for example ELAck4w, in the K std, when it says doesn't begin until 3rd grade, it would be less confusing if it was simply left off k-2 list. 5) 1st grade writing std - conventions - "what are determiners"?
I appreciate that they are more concise and less wordy.
The current standards are too advanced for struggling below level student. I'm not including Special Education students in this comment. I'm referring to the 2-3 year behind student who struggles to read.
I disagree with the use of "appropriate language" instead of "formal / technical language" in the

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Middle School ELA standards. I believe, based on several years of experience in both North and South Georgia counties, that middle schools are shirking their duty of using technical language and complicating matters immensely for high school teachers. I have many students in high school who enter high school with faulty definitions of plot, tone, mood, protagonist, antagonist, etc.
Too much for the lower grades to teach when they are not coming with enough skills to build on from previous grade.
I wish they were more depth and attention given to history and background of literature.
Education should not be about narrowing the focus of a child's interest but rather encouraging children to explore, create, and imagine a world that is better than the one we are leaving to them.
Teacher Keys places too many restrictions on teachers for them to be effective teachers.
The revised standards explain the expectations of the students more clearly, thus, allowing ALL a better understanding.
My only concern is the grammar standard. As an adult, I can't think of many situations that require me to identify grammar topics. While I realize the importance of the parts of speech and other grammatical structures, does this need to be specified in the grade level standards?
Standards are excessively verbose. We have forgotten that we simply teach reading and writing. It does not take 3000 words to describe the specific knowledge and skills we are striving to develop at various grade levels. In fiction, we teach plot, setting, character and theme. In both prose and poetry, we teach figurative language and craft. In non-fiction, we teach rhetoric. For all reading and writing we teach conventions. Finally, we teach students how to interpret and present non-written text through speaking, listening AND viewing. Those statements comprise fifty words. I would suggest that we only need about five hundred words to clearly, concisely and specifically state what should be covered. Along with this we would need lists of specific elements that would comprise a minimum at various grade levels (e.g. personification in 6th grade, symbolism in 7th, metaphor in 8th).
Sending this out the afternoon before the deadline makes it pretty difficult, actually impossible to review and absorb with any clarity. I am hoping it was not done deliberately in order to keep anyone from making a full examination. The way it was done does not allow for one.
I am concerned about what my child is learning and what is called "acceptable" for children at such a young age. There are too many test involved around every corner for children of such a young age. I do not see things listed that I believe to be age appropriate or that will help my child better than other programs in the past to be ready for the future. Rigor belongs in morgues, not schools and education. Teachers are being set up to fail with a flawed system and my child is not a guinnie pig for anyone to test a theory out on when their future is the one at stake. There is no room for those who are "gifted" or who may have an issue with learning in this program. My child is not being allowed to be a child and things that are learned through this new education standard are degrading.
I don't see enough of a difference to justify making the changes. A lot of work and money making all of the changes to grading, tests, report cards, etc. for such minor changes.
Several standards are redundant, and some are ambiguous and need rewording.
MATH Kindergarten Standard of MCCK OA 2 asks children to "solve addition and subtraction word problems, and add and subtract within 10, e.g., by using objects or drawings to represent the problem." These young children cannot read yet. That portion of the standard should be deleted unless it is clear that the teacher is reading and explaining the word problem to them. The teaching of the standard algorithm for addition and subtraction is not mentioned in the standard. Children should at least be exposed to the standard algorithm within this context even though it may not be time for them to actually write it or learn it yet. Kindergarten Standard of MCCK.CC.5(a) asks children to "identify and be able to count pennies within 20 (use pennies as manipulatives in multiple mathematical contexts)." This standard does not go far enough and pennies are the only mention of money at this grade level. Kindergarteners in Georgia have formally learned more about money than this. Please add in this standard that teachers should provide children with the opportunity to identify coins by name and value and to enjoy learning opportunities that would allow them to make trades of equal value using combinations of pennies, nickels, and dimes. This should also appear in Grade 1 standards as well, at MCC1.NBT.6. It is too late to do this in Grade 2, although MCC2.MD.8 could be a

Question 5 Comments - ELA
<p>review of these things. Grade 1 Standard - MCC1.OA.6: "Add and subtract within 20" is how this begins, but the strategies such as "counting on; making ten (e.g., $8 + 6 = 8 + 2 + 4 = 10 + 4 = 14$); decomposing a number leading to a ten (e.g., $13 - 4 = 13 - 3 - 1 = 10 - 1 = 9$); using the relationship between addition and subtraction (e.g., knowing that $8 + 4 = 12$, one knows $12 - 8 = 4$); and creating equivalent but easier or known sums (e.g., adding $6 + 7$ by creating the known equivalent $6 + 6 + 1 = 12 + 1 = 13$)" suggests certain pedagogy in the classroom that has led to all sorts of confusing classroom activities with number charts, lattice charts, and any number of time consuming and time wasting work sheets and student collaborations. This standard does not require only knowing addition and subtraction within 20, as a content standard should, it insists on knowing four specific ways to add and subtract. In other words, it dictates pedagogy in a way that crowds out other, better instruction options, such as teaching the standard algorithm, which is the one thing that should be written here, but is not. Grade 1 Standard - MCC1.OA.2: "Solve word problems" Children in the first grade are still learning to read. Unless it is clear that the teacher can read and explain the problem, children may be unfairly evaluated not on their math skills but on whether they could read and understand the word problem. Grade 1 Standard - MCC1.NBT.4 Although this standard has been refined and improved, the improvement did not go quite far enough. How are first grade students expected to explain their reasoning? In many Common Core math examples given on video presentations, these exercises of "reasoning" are quite entertaining, but not good learning examples. It should be clear that children should not be expected to write down any reasoning at this early age when explaining math. It should also be clear that any "math talks" when children explain their reasoning that any faulty reasoning should be quickly corrected by the teacher. Children should not be expected to learn by trial and error in a frustrating discovery process. In addition, it should be clear that it is the correct answer that matters, not the reasoning. This same comment on "reasoning" holds for standard MCC1.NBT.6. Grade 2 Standard - MCC2.NBT.7 has certainly been improved, but it would be better to actually state that children will become comfortable with the standard algorithms for addition and subtraction. In addition, as in Georgia's previous standards, it should be included that students will learn that multiplication is repeated addition. Furthermore, they should learn to use the multiplication grid to determine a product of two numbers to further reinforce the concept to get them ready for multiplication in Grade 3. Conversely, they should also see the relationship between repeated subtraction and division to get them ready for division. Grade 3 Standards should include students learning multiplication tables by memory. They should begin this memory work in Grade 3 and be expected to have it fully accomplished by the end of Grade 4, all the way to 12×12. These are just to name a few.</p>
<p>I believe that these revised standards are another huge step in the right direction for Georgia education</p>
<p>Why ask for comments on changes that should have been present when the standards were first issued?</p>
<p>Get rid of COMMON CORE! Go back to the old curriculum and add new items about history. Children are our Future, if we continue with Common Core; we all will not have a future!</p>
<p>HORRIBLE! Misaligned and obviously designed by someone with no knowledge of children.</p>
<p>The standards are still not developmentally appropriate!!! PLEASE allow a group of child psychologists to explain to you how damaging these standards are to a child's development. You simply cannot push standards down the pipeline to 5, 6 and 7 year olds and expect them to meet them. Kindergarten children need to LEARN how to learn. They need to develop a sense of pride and self confidence. This horrific word "rigor" only creates self doubt and sadness in my students. We are ruining a generation and they will pay the price through emotional and behavioral problems as they get older. Please take a stand and do what's right. Say NO to CC\$. Stand up to the venture-philanthropists and the likes of David Coleman and Pearson. Do not allow them make their billions off the backs of our children.</p>
<p>Poorly written, designed and constructed. Will set kids back.</p>
<p>I would like to see the standards of applying literature to modern circumstances and literary works added back into the set standards for high school courses.</p>
<p>There is too much emphasis on informational text and not enough emphasis on literature. Too much peer collaboration and not enough individual responsibility.</p>
<p>I removed my child from a Gwinnett public high school today due to these standards. I will</p>

Question 5 Comments - ELA
continue to fight against these standards and against the overabundance of testing.
As a former educator, and one of the main reasons for stepping away from education, are the common core standards. I believe many of the standards are not developmentally appropriate and were written by individuals with NO early childhood education/development background. I especially dislike the "rigor" of the non-fiction reading and dissection of what has been read. I believe the standards have been designed in a way that the joy of reading is taken away from children. I also strongly disagree with the "rigor" of the writing standards and what will be expected of children to be able to write in elementary school.
Many of these standards are developmentally inappropriate. They were written by people with little to know experience or knowledge of early childhood education or development. In addition, they remove all the joy associated with reading, thereby sucking the life out of learning. These standards are currently why I now homeschool my children.
We have far too many standards which just ensures the continuance of constant and unnecessary testing and evaluation of both students and teachers.
I want No more common core. I do not want any more influence from the state or federal government as to how my child is taught or what he is taught. I want this government out of our lives.
Please make sure that if these standards are accepted, they will align to the GA Milestones.
Rigorous
Outside of ditching the whole silly Common Core concept, this is the best we can hope for if we're not able to go back to the old QCC.
Please define how many sight words are expected for students in K. Many districts have different expectations. When we get kids from other districts, they do not know many. We require 220 of the dolch sight words of all kindergarten students. Please add maybe a minimum for ea. 9wks or end of the year. Maybe we wouldn't have the gap of knowledge from new students.
ELACC7L1 is not clear on which conventions to teach. The standard mentions clauses, dangling/misplaced modifiers, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. This standard is too broad.
I believe that the proposed revisions provide clarity to the standards. However, I am not confident that these changes are the types of changes needed. While the emphasis on process rather than facts is a welcome change in the CCGPS, I fear that they are not appropriate for elementary level students at all and lead us away from what we already know about how very young students learn. If these standards must stay, the proposed revisions are fine, but certainly do not really change anything about the horrible learning environment they are creating.
We need to start over with practical, viable expectations and without so many contradictions between our rhetoric and our actions.
I am greatly displeased at the sheer amount of skills students are expected to master. There are too many to allow adequate time for mastery. Moreover, many of the skills for grades 6-8 are too mature for children this age. They are not cognitively ready as an age group for many of these standards.
The standards are very clear and provide vertical alignment from one grade level to the next.
The English Language Arts standards are rigorous.
The "gray" area of how to cover and what to use in covering the material is often overwhelming. I also teach math, and you always know exactly what to cover and how to do it. ELA is not like that, so I'm often spending too much time figuring out whether to use current event magazines, textbooks, novels, etc. and there's not enough extra time to put everything together in order to use some of all of that.
I taught when we had whole language, and this is what we are going back to. That was thrown out. We use grammar to teach parts of sentences and how to put sentences together. Students have to have a good foundation with grammar in order to write better sentences. I looked back at writing my students did twenty years ago when we taught grammar and how to set up paragraphs for an essay. Those students' writing is far more advanced than students today. The key was that we had grammar books that had super sentences that they saw everyday. The sentences we had with each lesson were themed with something from history. Those sentences were on higher lexile levels. The students read every day. The students

Question 5 Comments - ELA
<p>modeled what they saw every day. Teachers are spending countless hours trying to find items to teach the standards when the information is out there for us to use. It should not be this way. It takes hours to study the information that we are teaching, hours to find information to use in the classroom, and then hours to plan. We have a small system, and we do not have all of these curriculum people to help us. Teachers are drowning in all of this. The standards were thrown at us without time to prepare. No one even came to the individual systems to provide training on how and what we were supposed to do with these standards. What makes things even worse is that the standards are based on ELA including reading, writing, and grammar being taught as one class. The state provides more funding for schools that separate them. Now, why is that the case? We teach the classes separately, so when I try to find things to use, it is very difficult because everything is based on them being taught together. This was not well thought out or thought through. Teachers should be involved in all of this. We are the ones implementing this in the classroom. Things sound great in a perfect world, but there are many more things in the classroom that have to be considered. Someone who is not in the classroom has no idea if these things can physically be done by one teacher. I wish the state would provide more examples of paired texts and short texts for us to use in classrooms. It takes hours to find this.</p>
<p>There aren't significant changes. I see that some items are removed from one standard and shifted to another, and that the words within standards have been edited to decrease the number of words in the standard. Honestly, I don't see the big deal, and wonder how many hours were/are being spent to "modify" standards, and how much money is being spent. We don't let anything stay the same long enough to find out if it's working. We've changed standards four different times in under 10 years. It's ridiculous.</p>
<p>The Kindergarten standards are the only ones I looked at since that is as high as my students could possibly achieve but several of these standards, such as those concerned with reading are still way out of reach for my students. The committee that works on this need to consider creating standards for students with special needs based on cognitive levels instead of grade/age level. This would be a more accurate and realistic program for both students and teachers with in the special ed. department to work on to help these students succeed.</p>
<p>There are still far too many standards for real mastery to occur. Though the middle school standards are, for the most part, age-appropriate, the introduction of those concepts in elementary school is not. We still have many students who come into middle school not able to recognize a complete sentence or identify parts of speech. Elementary teachers should be focusing on these basic skills instead of being forced to introduce more advanced concepts before most students are ready. Then more students will come to us prepared to move forward. As of now, we are spending much of our time reteaching what flew past them at warp-speed through elementary school.</p>
<p>These standards do not take into consideration the students rising who have not mastered prior concepts. Students who are not SPED and are 2-3 grades behind are frustrated and more at risk for dropout because of the difficulty.</p>
<p>Common Core ELA standards are well focused and provide rigor.</p>
<p>There are too many standards per grade level for teachers to dig deep enough and allow students time to master standards. Instead they are just able to skim the surface.</p>
<p>The "revisions" only had a few word changes and added a comma...very vague. They may define what students need to know, but not clearly. Revisions should match the rigor of the GA Milestones.</p>
<p>Kindergarten has too many standards that teachers are required to teach. We should be required to teach a foundation for learning based on developmental appropriate skills. Not a foundation for first/second grade standards.</p>
<p>I really did not see much revision.</p>
<p>Acceptable</p>
<p>Why does a 1st grader need to produce digital writing. It may be a good activity, but why should it be a "standard"? Audio Recordings in 2nd grade? Again, it may be a good activity, but why a standard? Very happy to see cursive writing in the standards.</p>
<p>More resources are needed to support standards and testing.</p>
<p>Standards are sometimes vague</p>
<p>I think that the concentration at the elementary school level should be more developmentally</p>

Question 5 Comments - ELA
appropriate. A good, strong foundation must be in place BEFORE it can be built upon. We are asking students to perform higher-level tasks and rigorous assignments when many of our student cannot read. If we want to become a more literate nation, then the foundational skills must be the point of concentration during the primary years - PK - 3. I really believe that public education is moving in a direction that will cause our students to fall further and further behind. How can you require students to perform higher level tasks and thinking when they lack basic skills?
I have no comments. The standards are acceptable and should be easy to follow.
The following standards, ELACC2RF4-d and ELACC3RF4-d, were shifted to the Fluency standards in the revision. However, I think it was more appropriate as a Decoding and Phonics standard.
I'm not sure they are necessarily structured or written where students can effectively participate or go into certain workplace environments. The standards are more college readiness based versus really ensuring that students who are going to industries that are not as rigorous are prepared. For some students, for what they aim to do in life, they may be too rigorous/ don't 'address the workforce they are going into which frustrates the students and teachers who are trying to teach them. Also, the standards may not address that the standards have changed over the course of time for certain students in certain grade levels. Kid who entered in at the beginning of CCGPS are fine, but those who have been taught using GPS and now CCGPS may have gaps in their educational process that may be an issue.
While I agree that the standards are rigorous and prepare students for the next level in their education, I think that we need to include more remediation in every grade until the students who were in Kindergarten when CCGPS was implemented are the only ones being held accountable for full mastery of these standards. Many students are struggling with the standards because their foundation in each concept area is weak.
Too vague and open to interpretation! Rearranging the order of the words didn't change this.
While I like the generic nature of the standards, I would much prefer specific standards, much like the social studies ones.
Revision of the language clarifies the intent of the standard in each case.
The standards need to be more specific as to what students are expected to know and understand. A clear indication of literary terms that should understand and know by the end of the course and for testing would be helpful. Also, the grammar skills that students are expected to have at each grade level is too vague. Under ELA teachers were given specific guidelines as to what grammar concepts student should know per grade level. This would be helpful. Overall for high school the standards are too vague. Also, for 11-12 grade standards, students are taking American Literature and British Literature, but there is no distinction for British Literature in the standard. Instead, you indicate that students are to read US History documents. However, this is not conducive to a British Literature class. In British Literature, students will read documents that refer to British Literature. However, these documents are not alluded to within the standards.
I would like less ambiguity. I want to know EXACTLY what is expected of my students. Ex: affixes: which ones? The list is long.
I would like for historical documents to be removed. These should be covered in the history classes. The course title includes the word "literature." I believe the course should focus on literature, not historical documents - especially when most fiction is not connected to historical documents.
Education and curriculum should be based on locality, not nationality.
I think there should be examples given for the standard to make sure the standard is clear. Not all the standards are unclear but I feel that some are unclear as to what needs and can be taught. An example might clear up any misunderstanding.
While I still feel like we have too many standards (I'm a huge supporter of Mike Schmoker and the points about simplicity and reducing the number of standards in favor of fewer standards that are higher quality that he makes in his book Focus), I know that CCGPS is a huge step in the right direction. I taught under the QCCs, the GPS, and now I'm teaching Common Core standards and the laser focus of the standards are improving. I do appreciate the flexibility that we have as teachers in how we get our students to the point of mastery. There is enough room for interpretation and individual decision making on a classroom-by-classroom basis. I'm also

Question 5 Comments - ELA
appreciative that we have the same standards for 9-10 and the same standards for 11-12. If we want our students to really develop their skills and master the concepts, we're giving the ample time and opportunity to accomplish those tasks. The revisions take out some of the "fluff" language that makes it easier for the students to understand what their goals consist of and how they need to get there.
ELA is pretty clear.
The ELA standards were introduced all at once with very vague language. The interpretation, specifically for the language standards can be fairly broad.
The clarifications that were made will provide clearer adherence to the Standards
Why not include the DOK level of the standard?
Unlike the math, ELA units are much more difficult to follow and therefore i question if they are being used as much, needs to be in a daily lesson format i have been very disappointed in the ELA and i don't understand why our state has not addressed this sooner
Keyboarding skills, research skills and basic grammar need to be stressed.
These standards should be in very simple and to the point for parents to understand. In our school system you have some parents that can't read and need things explained in very simple form for them to understand. The state of Georgia should not just assume because in UPPER Atlanta students do very well that all community can do that well. They will eventually get there but they will need to go at a slower pace.
I'M GLAD TO SEE THAT THE WORD BOOK WAS REMOVED AND REPLACED BYB THE WORD TEXT SINCE STUDENTS ARE REQUIRED TO READ VARIOUS INFORMATIVE MATERIAL.
There are too many standards in first grade. We are trying to teach too much, too soon. We need an area of concentration, such as nouns and verbs and master these completely.
The changes should be easy to incorporate.
The standards for ELA are too broad and too numerous. In a standards based classroom, it is nearly impossible to assess these standards and elements and to interrupt what specific skills and at what levels these skills should be taught and assessed. For example, there is one grammar element that included phrases and clauses, in which there are no specific types of clauses and phrases included. Since there are over 15 types of clauses and phrases in the English language this element is ambiguous and unrealistic. The same problem arises in numerous ELA standards, when we are given examples per e.g. - examples but not exhaustive lists. This is problematic when deciding in a limited time frame which areas to teach and assess. ELA standards should be objective rather than subject to interpretation. Each standard and element should be specific and able to be assessed. When compared to other subject area standards at the middle grades level, ELA is unable to follow the teaching and assessing based on standards due to the complexity, ambiguity and shear number of standards.
They are able to be applied to real-life situations.
Yes, I totally agree with the revised ELA standards as written.
Standards seem well coordinated.
The ELA standards are very well written, but can tend to be overwhelming to teachers and students.
Students must learn to write in cursive to endorse a check.
It does not take into account students with disabilities
There are few changes. How much did this cost?
The concepts are more geared toward student learning and preparation for the next level. The design is aimed at students' ability to retain, maintain, and connect.
Much better than before!
CCGPS standards have gaps and the tasks are not always acceptable for low income schools because we do not have the resources needed to complete them. There are also skills in writing, phonics, and grammar that is not be taught that should be continued as standards or still taught early on.
If testing is going to be done via computers, students need to be taught typing outside of the classroom. The curriculum cannot be taught in the length of time given if typing must also be done.
The order in which some of the standards are introduce need to be modified. Mastery of the

Question 5 Comments - ELA
needed skills to master the standards is not present when the standard is introduced and re-teaching/mini-lessons are often needed prior to the standard at hand.
I am pleased to see that British, world, and multicultural literature now has a place in the standards.
Provide lesson for each standard
As long as ANY standards initiative is inseparable from standardized testing, it is a Trojan horse. End Georgia's perpetuation of standardized testing's stranglehold on our schools, our students, and our teachers!
It all looks fine to me.
Some of the language in the standards is ambiguous or difficult to understand or just plain unclear. The tests (standardized, benchmarks, local, state, etc.) we currently are required to administer do not follow the standards.
ELA5RL6: Describe how a narrator or speaker's point of view influences how events are described. What points of view are not clear? This needs to be clearer. ELACC5RL4: Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative language such as metaphors and similes. "Such as" does this mean it is only metaphors and similes? ELACC5L4: Use common, grade-appropriate Greek and Latin affixes and roots as clues to the meaning of a word (e.g., photograph, photosynthesis). Common? There are a million of these. This needs to be clearer. I could go on but I do not have the time.
The ELA standards are misleading in fact and are fractured in reality. For the most part, these ELA standards are woefully lacking in preparing students for the realities of life and are not conducive to critical thinking. These standards are a pigeonhole approach to a broadly diverse constituency. ELA standards will stunt the very growth they attempt.
Students are not mentally ready for some of the skills presented in 2nd grade.
They are complicated, time consuming and difficult to explain to parents.
The ELA standards are age appropriate and easy to teach. They are easy to intertwine and teach multiple standards together. They are also easy to use across the curriculum.
I agree with making changes to the statements, as a parent I feel like the school does not prepare our kids for college and we need to go back to the basics of managing money most kids graduating high school does not even know how to manage a bank account
Of particular concern was that there were no changes to the 5th grade standards.
Please consider also revising ELACCKRI6. Include the phrase, "with prompting and support" at the beginning of the standard. Also, consider revising ELACC5RI6 to include the term (perspective) placed after the words "point of view." Teachers confuse point of view in this standard to mean 1st and 3rd person point of view as it is commonly referred to in literary texts and not first/second hand accounts. Note the vertical alignment of this standard from 4th grade forward.
More "student friendly" for their own comprehension/understanding
The wording of the standards for 11-12 is more specific. Thank you.
I like the addition of the words in kindergarten "with prompting and support"
Quite honestly, I think there are too many standards to cover, especially if you want them covered in depth, and if you want students to really master them. The students I serve do not share any basic background knowledge, about 25% are on grade level with reading skills, comprehension, and writing, and most are struggling significantly in some area of their lives - financially, with mental illness, parent in jail, parents divorcing, custody issues, parent's new girlfriend/boyfriend, abuse - mental, physical, and emotional, grandparents dying, parent dying, etc. All those are a part of life, but at the same time, every one of those things affect the kids significantly, and that causes an interruption in their learning.
I think the standards are well written and reflective of high standards. However, adoption/implementation is always a question considering the range of commitment and resources the districts provide towards professional development.
Happy about the revisions. Seem to be better aligned to grade levels.
One-size does not fit all. ELA standards based on projected lexile levels penalize those students who are behind the standard lexiles projected for each grade level. There are no provisions to accommodate students who have no intention of attending a college or university.
I am pleased to see the clear progression from the beginning of the school career up to this time.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
The standards are very generic and teachers are left up to interpret them which then puts them at odds with the administrators. Ex: ELAcc4r14: Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including those that allude to significant characters found in mythology. i.e. Herculean. This is the standard... so what am I supposed to do... which words and phrases am I supposed to teach? Should I teach an entire two week unit on mythology or just some phrases and words? Who knows? And because I make a choice to teach in depth for a week or more, I am then in the hot seat! This happens constantly! I like the idea of a common core, but it needs to be more specific. And don't get me started on the Frameworks that were handed down... in my county (McDuffie) if we waver one tiny mm from the frameworks... we are subjected to an interrogation. From what I was told, the Frameworks are supposed to be a guideline... not the gospel. Sigh....
Kindergarten and lower grade standards need to be in more kid friendly terms if we are going to be required to post them and state them to our students.
Some are out of reach for young students and are setting them up for failure due to the fact that they can't master them.
I disagree with the adoption and implementation of them without the inclusion of plans for modifications and remediation for students who need them.
More mandates that encourage students to read.
The standards are too broad and need to be clear and focused. Skills should be taught separately first semester and integrated into reading and writing second semester.
Some of the language standards are developmentally inappropriate for the age of the student (especially for elementary students). The content is too difficult and some standards have too many elements (i.e. verbs) for students to adequately master the content.
The standards seem to be the SAME as they are now. ...changing a few words or rearranging the words within a standard does not change what the standard is asking students to do.
I believe the writing standards are better aligned and more appropriate for implementation than the reading standards.
The standards are vertically aligned but as standards in general-they need to continue to streamlined what needs to be taught at each grade level.
The language is still vague as far as enduring understandings
I believe my confusion as to specific definitions is primarily a matter of personal interpretation. Sometimes I feel that I - as a professional educator - interpret the standards a bit differently than test writers, and this often leads to confusion. Some resources that have been created are helpful, but because some standards are open to interpretation - and I do appreciate the freedom and creativity this allows me - there is often a slight mismatch between my interpretation and those of test writers.
Standards are written in language that is parent friendly making objectives clear and precise.
I am glad to see the standard addressing inappropriate grade level words changed.
The revisions seem to be minor and do not really affect the content of the standards.
Very concise and much more specific!
They are so similar to what was published previously; there is very little improvement.
I feel that the revisions were needed.
The common core standards seem to have many words. Is there anyway to define what the students should know with less words and examples? Simplification would help the teachers make sure that the lowest learners are learning what they need to learn in order to be successful in life.
The specificity in the revisions will definitely be beneficial to teachers.
The Revised ELA Standards are indeed rigorous. To be implemented with fidelity our stakeholders must continue to ensure that every student is able to access the standards regardless of their current performance level. Differentiated, personalized instruction is essential to helping our students engage and find meaning in the work.
They should be in kid friendly language.
I am a Senior Marine Instructor for Marine Corps Junior ROTC.
Standards are not developmentally appropriate. They are unclear and do not provide students with a strong foundation needed for academic success. There are too many gaps in the curriculum.

Question 5 Comments - ELA
I appreciate the clarification.
Too wordy and complicated.
Standards are vague and cover too much material, Example collective nouns- there are hundreds of collective nouns.
The rewording of the two 7th grade ELA revised standards makes them more understandable. Some 8th grade standards that were marked appeared to be exactly the same. We appreciate the efforts being made to include teachers on all parts of Milestone and standard implementation.
The standards are too wordy and may difficult for students and parents to interpret. The amount of material expected to be covered per year is also too much.
These revisions do support increased reading ability.
I'm not an ELA teacher. I have no knowledge of the content.
I don't agree that 3rd grade students are reading for the writing as far as maturity is concerned.
The emphasis on informational text has caused a de-emphasis on literature. Informational text is read in other classes and should not cause Language Arts classes to eliminate literature.
Identify the better way to test students of disability differently than with the general population on their ability level to show growth.
We need to be able take daily classwork average as a grade for each standard. Alone with summative assessments.
I think the standards are developmentally appropriate.
It appears that some standards are not developmentally appropriate for certain age groups.
Standards were outlined in a clear and manner.
As someone whose mother, grandmother, and aunt all taught high school English, and as an English major myself, I am appalled by the ELA standards. They are in no way rigorous. They diminish the importance of literature, and they will not prepare students for college and career success. I sit on dissertation committees at the University of Georgia, and I am already shocked by students' lack of writing and grammar skills. Common Core ELA Standards set the bar even lower. I know is by design (no matter what the proponents espouse), and I wholeheartedly oppose this damaging effort to "transform" our children's education.
The constructed response expectations are too rigorous for elementary level students. The expectations are for them to be able to write like a 7th or 8th grader.
The conventions standards are somewhat vague as far as expectations for testing. For example: "Demonstrate command of the conventions of Standard English" leaves a lot of question as to what exactly will the students be expected to know. There have been questions in the past asking about gerunds, transitive verbs, direct objects, pronouns, etc. These are not specifically mentioned in the standards.
The revisions seem to promote clarity of the existing standards.
Children need to begin learning letters on a computer keyboard. By fifth grade, they should be able to type a short paper in a reasonable amount of time. One page, double-spaced, 2 class periods of 45 minutes each. The students have the technology. They learn to abuse it before they learn to use it.
They seem to be dumbing down our students.
The standards are too wordy and are still unclear for our students and parents to understand.
Standards need to be grade level appropriate!!
The ELA standards are aligned well; however, the expectations are developmentally inappropriate grades 3-5.
PRETTY GOOD
The standards are too rigorous for 4th grade students. So rigorous until we are further confusing them causing them to not be as successful as they could be.
They are very similar. Honestly, I would just like to have the same standards for a few years :)
This is a long time coming and much needed adjustment
There are way too many standards at the Kindergarten level. Many of those standards are not necessary or developmentally appropriate for 5 year olds.
They need to be more specific. Teachers should not have to guess will this be tested on or not
The standards are written above what a student should be working on. We are placing more

Question 5 Comments - ELA
and more information on students at an early age. Kids are not allowed to be kids.
I like the fact that the newer standards are clarified with examples that can help with the understanding of the standard.
Proposed changes are minimal and make no significant improvement. The standards are still too broad.
It appears to me that many of our standards are adopted for ESOL purposes, which in my opinion, is not acceptable. Students, including my own recent graduate, leave school not knowing how to tell time, figure our time zones, write thank you notes, or appropriate correspondence. They are not taught how to fill out job applications or scholarship applications. We need to once again focus entirely on our students so that they aren't only competitive with other countries, but can co-exist and be an adequate contributing citizen in the US. Yes, our standards are simplistic enough, but even with vertical alignment, some re-teaching has to occur before we can expect them to know what a progressive verb is... if they don't even remember what a verb is. Also, it would be most helpful to have a source/text/site that incorporates each of the standards and elements as they are expected to be taught. Scrounging for resources each and every day does not always ensure that best practices are being followed and that all students in the state of Georgia are getting the same level of instruction.
Kindergarten standards were good
The only standard that would be difficult to implement would be the publishing and producing from the Internet. Our school has limited computer/printer access, and our students do not have keyboarding skills.
The new revised standards offer a clearer understanding for our students.
Revisions are okay.
The change in the standards seems to be a little more understandable.
The revised ELA standards are appropriate to instructional/learning needs and acceptable for implementation.
1. Confused with Kindergarten revision of KRF3c: Since this element is listed as a phonics standard, it implies that a student would be reading the words that they are distinguishing sounds that differ. However, there is not an element that explicitly states that the Kindergartener will be reading simple CVC words. Could that be added to help clarify the intention of this portion of the standard? 2. The same standard carried to 1st grade to include blends and digraphs. Element b could say READ regularly spelled one-syllable short and long vowel words simple CVC and with blends and digraphs. 3. Using different verbs ("b" says decode and "f" says read) is confusing. I interpret this to mean read the words so if that is correct - could the elements be consistent or an explanation given as to the different expectations. 4. In 1st/2nd grade, the RF3 standard about two-syllable words: I need clarification regarding the difference of the two. If the mention of long vowels in the 2nd grade 2 syllable word standard indicates the open syllable words like bacon, hotel, etc. Then perhaps the 1st grade standard should be specific to the closed syllable words like cotton, kitten, plastic, etc. 5. Will there be a suggested number of irregularly spelled words expected to be learned at each grade level K-3?
More training needs to be in place for teachers
K-5 teachers appreciate the clarifications to the standards. First grade teachers agree with the shift to fluency. They would like to see more unified assessment from the state to ensure the standards are being tested as needed. Often the standard content presented does not match the assessments. For example, some standards state "uses, or understands", so there is uncertainty of how to assess and whether it should be tested in written format, student application, or through observations.
It would be nice to have the depth of knowledge written with each standard. As teachers, we spend a lot of time determining the depth of knowledge for each standard. This would be something great for teachers to have.
I do not believe that the drive to only textual learning is conducive for modern society. It is the automation of society, that does not create a clear understanding of the human condition.
The revised standards clarified what students should be expected to do.
Some of the standards are above students' maturity level.
The wording is the only thing that changed for our grade level. I do believe that the students are

Question 5 Comments - ELA
expected to do too much for the time we have.
I do not believe all of the standards are developmentally appropriate.
I was asked to complete this survey and given only one evening to examine the standards.
The 2nd grade standards do not seem much different.
The wording is the only thing that seemed to change. I feel like the students have way too much to learn in the time frame we are giving. They can not develop a comprehension of what they are learning.
Do these standards help elementary students become life long readers (and therefore learners)? I want my students to learn to enjoy reading by finding what interests they have and identifying with a character. Then my desire would be to take what interests they have and teach from that. I feel that there are too many standards for children to learn and that we spend all year drilling these standards for a test. Also, thank you for removing modal auxiliaries from the K-5 standards.
Many standards are vague. The content goes deep which is good, but there are still so many it is difficult to address each standard as much as I think is needed.
I would like for a fluency expectation to be given. For example, second graders will read with a fluency rate of 106 words correct per minute. This would help eliminate confusion or any subjectivity as to whether or not a student has mastered the standard.
ELA Standards are great concepts for the students.
They are an improvement from the former standards, but they still need some revision.
I think that the standards should be reviewed by English language arts teacher and the creators of the test so that we can all be on the same page with what we expect the students to be able to do based on the standards and testing.
Difficult to respond to this survey because the standards appear to be written the exact same way. Would love to provide feedback if the changes were clearer to me.
The only standard that I question is teaching cursive in 4th grade
It would be nice to have all the books needed that are listed in the course map to use.
ELACCKRL7 and ELACCKRI7 are the same. Is that intended? ELACCKRF4 Read with purpose and understanding and sight word knowledge should be separate. ELACCR110 - Read informational text.... Narrative should be included.
I think 12RL4 could be restructured to specify device and effect as this is something they are asked to do with poetry on multiple summatives.
Please don't make the curriculum, or what is expected of the students, easier. Also, the kids need more reading requirements, not suggestions or contests. Allow the students to struggle (with available help). It's OK and builds character, problem solving skills, independence and confidence. Provide kids with more active time (PE every day instead of 2 days a week), MUSIC options in elementary school (band, orchestra, choir), and more art classes. Stop trying to shorten the school year. Go back to the NUMBER grading system instead of the current system. I want to know my kid has a 94 in English or Math, because a "P" does not allow me to judge the specifics of his understanding.
I still feel as though the standards are too vague.
I believe the revised English Language Arts Standards will cater to all students in order to increase academic achievement and attendance.
Several of the standards are too broad. They need state specifically what they want us to teach.
There needs to be more time for students to writing concepts such as descriptive, persuasive, and informational writing.
The standards that we have for our elementary students are too high and include information that is dated for our students today. The majority of students feel unsuccessful from the first day of school.
Writing standards remain too open-ended and a more specific grading process should be included.
Not a lot of difference in the grade level I teach
The standards are too vague. I would rather have more standards and the standard be more specific, than the way they are proposed.
* The standards the not clear and laid out. The standards need to be based on a more definitive

Question 5 Comments - ELA
scale. The standards should be more precise as to what it's measuring.
Fed ed is unconstitutional. Teaching to the test sets children up to be unable to think for themselves and figure things out. Critical thinking isn't memorization. Our schools were fine. Parenting needs to be reinforced and teachers, for the most part are awesome. Socializing needs to take a backseat to learning. it's the other way around now. Very sad. CC "curriculum" is a crime.
These standards are TOTALLY unrealistic for kids to achieve; they are also totally unrealistic for teachers to cover. A joke.
ELACCRL2: Adding and/or creates redundancy. The original word "or" was a better choice, since "theme" can be considered synonymous to "central idea. Why do you need "and?"
Use more kid-friendly terminology
Need to place focus back on basics in the 1-3, individualized work not group think. In the middle grades and upper grades focus should be on reading complete novels ex., classics.
I've noticed a decrease in the ability for students to correctly use conventions in their writing. The focus on ideas is important, but I feel the lack of emphasis on conventions will hinder progress as students enter college. The expectation that students write and communicate clearly is vital to success in academic studies and meeting career goals.
It is a moral and social imperative that our children be given the education that will prepare them to compete on an international stage. Our collective and individual progress depends on it.
We are tired of being stupid.
Revised?
The more simplified language of the revisions will be helpful in more effective implementation.
Not all standards are clear!! It is not clear as to how in-depth to go into on certain standards.
Technology and language skills should be laced in together as they are necessary for research and comprehension.
The wording is only somewhat different. The changes aren't that big of a deal.
As a former middle school English teacher, I believe that the revised ELA Standards, while by no means the solution to all of our state's educational challenges, is a critical step in the right direction.
I am disappointed that no revisions were made to the fifth grade standards.
In ELA, Common Core splits teaching time between informational and literary texts to about 50%-50% in K-8 and 70%-30% in 9-12. This is a pedagogical/curricular directive that has no peer-reviewed study to back up this shift in focus. Common Core inappropriately expects second graders to know how to use adverbs and adjectives in ELACC2L5. This should be delayed to at least the third grade. Common Core standards do not promote the study of American literature except in a couple of standards in 11th and 12th grades. This should be corrected, and Georgia writers included as appropriate. Common Core ELA standards clearly ask for reading to understand and use information through the grades. However, they do not clearly distinguish modes of organization (e.g., chronology) from structural (or textual) elements of an expository text (e.g., introduction, conclusion), do not progressively develop informational reading skills from grade to grade, and omit such important concepts as topic sentences for paragraph development. For example, children should be able to identify and write topic sentences by third grade. Yet ELACC3R18 does not mention topic sentences (which it should) and ELACC3W2 also does not require students to write a topic sentence (which it should). The Thomas B. Fordham Institute, a Common Core proponent, was quite clear when it stated that Georgia's previous ELA standards were better than Common Core standards. Fordham stated, "The Georgia K-12 ELA standards are better organized and easier to read than the Common Core. Essential content is grouped more logically, so that standards addressing inextricably linked characteristics, such as themes in literary texts, can be found together rather than spread across strands. The high school standards include a course devoted to "reading and American Literature," which provides a greater number of more detailed and rigorous expectations that address the importance of reading American literature. Georgia also more clearly specifies genre-specific writing expectations, and better prioritizes writing genres at each grade level." Therefore, my overall comment on the ELA standards is why doesn't Georgia go back to its superior ELA standards rather than expecting less of students? Why don't we increase expectations on what students should read in American

Question 5 Comments - ELA
<p>literature rather than going to an unproven formula for integrating informational texts into ELA? There is no peer-reviewed scientific information that shows students will learn to read better or be more motivated to read or learn more if they are exposed to informational texts. However, there is evidence that an English curriculum with a heavy emphasis on literature does prepare students for college. According to Dr. Sandra Stotsky, in grades K-3, the various objectives related to phonics and word analysis skills do not include the need for students to apply these skills both in context and independent of context to ensure mastery of decoding skills. This does occur in grades 4 and 5 so that students are expected to read accurately unfamiliar words "in context and out of context," but elementary teachers also need this same guidance. Dr. Sandra Stotsky pointed out the following problems with Common Core in its vocabulary standards. Although they "highlight specific figures of speech and rhetorical devices, they do not teach use of glossaries for discipline-specific terms, or words that must be taught (e.g., foreign words used in written English that do not appear in an English language dictionary). Common Core leans heavily and incorrectly in many cases on use of context to determine the meaning of unknown words. For example, it is difficult for students to interpret correctly a literary, biblical, or mythological allusion in context, as in ELACC7L5, 'Interpret figures of speech (e.g., literary, biblical, and mythological allusions) in context,' if they have no knowledge of the texts that have served as the basis for these allusions and if the reading standards do not point to some of these significant texts, authors, or events." By comparison, she pointed out that Georgia's previous vocabulary standards were "part of the reading/literature strand and through grade 8 spelled out dictionary skills (e.g., 'ELA6R2.d. Uses reference skills to determine pronunciations, meanings, alternate word choices, and parts of speech of words.'). They identified the groupings students should be taught (e.g., 'ELA7R2.c. Identifies and explains idioms and analogies in prose and poetry,' 'ELAWLRL5.c. Identifies and understands foreign terms that appear in works originally written in a language other than English.'). And they pointed to the sources of word meaning in grade 10 ('ELAWLRL5.b. Uses knowledge of world mythologies to understand the meanings of new words,' and 'ELA10RL5.b. Uses knowledge of mythology, the Bible, and other works often alluded to in literature to understand the meanings of new words.')." According to Dr. Sandra Stotsky, when examining the writing requirements, "the sub-strand on 'argument' confuses argument with expression of opinion in the elementary grades and with persuasive writing throughout. There is no scholarship to support the three 'types' of writing proposed by Common Core and thus this strand badly misinforms English and reading teachers throughout the grades. There is also nothing on the use of established or peer-generated criteria for evaluating writing or written presentations."</p>
<p>It is quite intense. It seems like a lot of information for a teacher to fit into a day and accomplish by the end of the year. However, the lessons are necessary for students to learn. The question is just how will the teacher get to the completion all of the requirements and get the students to all be on the same level at the end of the year prepared for the next grade level?</p>
<p>These standards are more complicated than it has to be. Each child learns at their own pace. I have seen my children struggle with the standards that are now common core standards. Children get frustrated and no longer want to do this. Common Core is not a smart move!</p>
<p>Most standards are NOT age appropriate. They do not account for the uniqueness of students. They are dictatorial and do not give teachers the flexibility to meet the needs of all students.</p>
<p>Please make sure the standards are not vague. The standards should be clear and concise so teachers are sure what needs to be covered.</p>
<p>I do feel that we should specify what type of guidance and support can be given to the student.</p>
<p>This is definitely an improvement and work done is highly appreciated. However, there are still some more standards that should be revised in order to establish clarity and eliminate ambiguities.</p>
<p>P.55 - ELACCL9-10R19:Do not add Roosevelt's Four Freedom's speech. Not a seminal U.S. document & thought by many to be a justification of his liberal New Deal projects.</p>
<p>We don't need any MULTI-CULTURAL literature in ENGLISH L.A. ElaCC11-12RL9. page.62. - gives less time for foundational works of AMERICAN literature.</p>
<p>More on the Constitution - not just the Preamble and do not minimize this by adding more international / multicultural or British.elacc11-12RI9 on page 63. I need more room?????</p>
<p>Common Core inappropriately expects second graders to know how to use adverbs and</p>

Question 5 Comments - ELA

adjectives in ELACC2L5. This should be delayed to at least the third grade. In grade 3, at ELACC3L2, commas in addresses and in dialogue are mentioned, but the use of commas to denote a series of items is not presented, but should be a grade 3 standard. In grade 3, ELACC3SL6 should also require students to identify the subject-predicate relationship in sentences. In grade 4, ELACC4L1(f) asks students to "produce complete sentences, recognizing and correcting rhetorically poor fragments and run-ons." This standard should be moved down to grade 3, where this work should begin, and continue in grade 4. In grade 3, ELACC3SL5 appears to be a waste of valuable class time. Making an audio recording is not a skill that a third grader needs. This takes time away from the basics. There are other similar things like this in the elementary grades that should be eliminated. In grade 4, children are expected to keyboard well enough to type one page of text with ELACC4W6. Though many children can do this who have computers at home and who text on a phone, this is not a necessary skill at this age. Again, this focus on technical aspects of human development takes time away from learning the basics. It is rather like getting the cart before the horse. Focus first on the basics. Sixth grade is plenty soon enough to ask for keyboarding skills. Up to that time, children should continue to work on their handwriting skills and not short circuit that fine motor skill of using one's fingers to hold a pen and write. In fact, educators should reexamine this focus on technology in the classroom, especially in light of the fact that many high-tech leaders in California send their own children to private schools that forbid the use of technology of any kind in the classroom. What does their research show that they do not share with the public? They are perfectly content to make plenty of money off the backs of taxpayers for all the bells and whistles of wired classrooms, but they do not want to expose their own children to the same practices. The book, *The Digital Invasion*, touches briefly on this subject, but it should be explored in-depth before we become totally technology dependent in our schools.

Overall, Common Core Standards often exceed cognitive readiness and are so broad they are too open for interpretation.

The Thomas B. Fordham Institute, a Common Core proponent, was quite clear when it stated that Georgia's previous ELA standards were better than Common Core standards. Therefore, why should these standards be "acceptable" when we know we previously had better standards? Why should Georgia's student be cheated out of a better ELA foundation simply due to Georgia getting on the Common Core bandwagon to follow the rest of the states over the cliff? Fordham stated, "The Georgia K-12 ELA standards are better organized and easier to read than the Common Core. Essential content is grouped more logically, so that standards addressing inextricably linked characteristics, such as themes in literary texts, can be found together rather than spread across strands. The high school standards include a course devoted to "reading and American Literature," which provides a greater number of more detailed and rigorous expectations that address the importance of reading American literature. Georgia also more clearly specifies genre-specific writing expectations, and better prioritizes writing genres at each grade level." Therefore, my overall comment on the ELA standards is why doesn't Georgia go back to its superior ELA standards rather than expecting less of students? Why don't we increase expectations on what students should read in American literature rather than going to an unproven formula for integrating informational texts into ELA? There is no peer-reviewed scientific information that shows students will learn to read better or be more motivated to read or learn more if they are exposed to informational texts. However, there is evidence that an English curriculum with a heavy emphasis on literature does prepare students for college. In ELA, Common Core splits teaching time between informational and literary texts to about 50%-50% in K-8 and 70%-30% in 9-12. This is a pedagogical/curricular directive that has no peer reviewed study to back up this shift in focus. Common Core standards do not promote the study of American literature except in a couple of standards in 11th and 12th grades. Common Core ELA standards clearly ask for reading to understand and use information through the grades. However, I agree with Dr. Sandra Stotsky that they do not clearly distinguish modes of organization well enough (e.g., chronology) from structural (or textual) elements of an expository text (e.g., introduction, conclusion), do not progressively develop informational reading skills from grade to grade, and omit such important concepts as topic sentences for paragraph development. For example, children should be able to identify and write topic sentences by third grade. Yet ELACC3R18 does not mention topic sentences (which it should) and ELACC3W2 also does not require students to write a topic sentence (which it should). According to Dr. Sandra Stotsky, in grades K-3, the various objectives related

Question 5 Comments - ELA

to phonics and word analysis skills do not include the need for students to apply these skills both in context and independent of context to ensure mastery of decoding skills. This does occur in grades 4 and 5 so that students are expected to read accurately unfamiliar words "in context and out of context," but elementary teachers also need this same guidance. Dr. Sandra Stotsky pointed out the following problems with Common Core in its vocabulary standards. Although they "highlight specific figures of speech and rhetorical devices, they do not teach use of glossaries for discipline-specific terms, or words that must be taught (e.g., foreign words used in written English that do not appear in an English language dictionary). Common Core leans heavily and incorrectly in many cases on use of context to determine the meaning of unknown words. For example, it is difficult for students to interpret correctly a literary, biblical, or mythological allusion in context, as in ELACC7L5, 'Interpret figures of speech (e.g., literary, biblical, and mythological allusions) in context,' if they have no knowledge of the texts that have served as the basis for these allusions and if the reading standards do not point to some of these significant texts, authors, or events." By comparison, she pointed out that Georgia's previous vocabulary standards were "part of the reading/literature strand and through grade 8 spelled out dictionary skills (e.g., 'ELA6R2.d. Uses reference skills to determine pronunciations, meanings, alternate word choices, and parts of speech of words.'). They identified the groupings students should be taught (e.g., 'ELA7R2.c. Identifies and explains idioms and analogies in prose and poetry,' 'ELAWLRL5.c. Identifies and understands foreign terms that appear in works originally written in a language other than English.'). And they pointed to the sources of word meaning in grade 10 ('ELAWLRL5.b. Uses knowledge of world mythologies to understand the meanings of new words,' and 'ELA10RL5.b. Uses knowledge of mythology, the Bible, and other works often alluded to in literature to understand the meanings of new words.'). According to Dr. Sandra Stotsky, when examining the writing requirements, "the sub-strand on 'argument' confuses argument with expression of opinion in the elementary grades and with persuasive writing throughout. There is no scholarship to support the three 'types' of writing proposed by Common Core and thus this strand badly misinforms English and reading teachers throughout the grades. There is also nothing on the use of established or peer-generated criteria for evaluating writing or written presentations." Overall in ELA, there does not appear to be any guiding principle for teachers in the types of reading materials they use in the classroom. Teachers should seek out ELA materials that inspire students, that will help them understand the moral flaws and moral strengths of mankind that have been consistent through the ages from one culture to another so students can gain insight into the human condition, but most of all, educators should choose material that would help American students appreciate their common cultural background. Material should have a unifying influence and not a divisive influence. Significant literary works of Western Civilization and particularly those that are part of our American cultural history can help provide that broad base of American identity so that our youth will be better prepared to become self-governing citizens of our nation. Is anyone aware that the primary architect of Common Core ELA, David Coleman, has limited classroom experience? It appears that he never actually became a teacher, but after his student teaching he decided not to enter the classroom. He also had no experience in standards prior to this effort in Common Core.

I am very impressed with CCGPS

I believe that clarity between grade levels is important.

So far, this is my first year working with the new ELA standards, everything seems to be aligned and working well.

The reading, writing, and listening/viewing/speaking standards are very clear, rigorous, and user-friendly for teachers, students, and parents. However, the grammar and mechanics standards are very general (basic grammatical and mechanical concepts necessary for writing). Many teachers are not sure how in-depth grammar instruction should be (useful grammar in the context of reading, writing, and speaking only or also including terminology/memorization of terms such as the specific types of pronouns). The grammar/conventions standards need to be more specific. I feel that all the other standards have moved us in the right direction to prepare students for post-secondary education and the real world/employment. As a teacher, I feel the new standards have helped me to grow and develop (i.e.- with literature circles and more in-depth types of writing such as argumentative essays using ethos, pathos, and logos).

Question 5 Comments - ELA

ELA comments: FOCUS ON LITERACY! Return the focus to classic literature and jettison the requirement for informational texts. This departure from the classic stories that we all learned growing up is not supported by research and there is nothing to indicate that it will motivate children to read and improve literacy. In ELA, Common Core splits teaching time between informational and literary texts to about 50%-50% in K-8 and 70%-30% in 9-12. This is a pedagogical/curricular directive that has no peer-reviewed study to back up this shift in focus. Common Core inappropriately expects second graders to know how to use adverbs and adjectives in ELACC2L5. This should be delayed to at least the third grade. Common Core standards do not promote the study of American literature except in a couple of standards in 11th and 12th grades. This should be corrected, and Georgia writers included as appropriate. Common Core ELA standards clearly ask for reading to understand and use information through the grades. However, they do not clearly distinguish modes of organization (e.g., chronology) from structural (or textual) elements of an expository text (e.g., introduction, conclusion), do not progressively develop informational reading skills from grade to grade, and omit such important concepts as topic sentences for paragraph development. For example, children should be able to identify and write topic sentences by third grade. Yet ELACC3R18 does not mention topic sentences (which it should) and ELACC3W2 also does not require students to write a topic sentence (which it should). The Thomas B. Fordham Institute, a Common Core proponent, was quite clear when it stated that Georgia's previous ELA standards were better than Common Core standards. Fordham stated, "The Georgia K-12 ELA standards are better organized and easier to read than the Common Core. Essential content is grouped more logically, so that standards addressing inextricably linked characteristics, such as themes in literary texts, can be found together rather than spread across strands. The high school standards include a course devoted to "reading and American Literature," which provides a greater number of more detailed and rigorous expectations that address the importance of reading American literature. Georgia also more clearly specifies genre-specific writing expectations, and better prioritizes writing genres at each grade level." Therefore, my overall comment on the ELA standards is why doesn't Georgia go back to its superior ELA standards rather than expecting less of students? Why don't we increase expectations on what students should read in American literature rather than going to an unproven formula for integrating informational texts into ELA? There is no peer-reviewed scientific information that shows students will learn to read better or be more motivated to read or learn more if they are exposed to informational texts. However, there is evidence that an English curriculum with a heavy emphasis on literature does prepare students for college. According to Dr. Sandra Stotsky, in grades K-3, the various objectives related to phonics and word analysis skills do not include the need for students to apply these skills both in context and independent of context to ensure mastery of decoding skills. This does occur in grades 4 and 5 so that students are expected to read accurately unfamiliar words "in context and out of context," but elementary teachers also need this same guidance. Dr. Sandra Stotsky pointed out the following problems with Common Core in its vocabulary standards. Although they "highlight specific figures of speech and rhetorical devices, they do not teach use of glossaries for discipline-specific terms, or words that must be taught (e.g., foreign words used in written English that do not appear in an English language dictionary). Common Core leans heavily and incorrectly in many cases on use of context to determine the meaning of unknown words. For example, it is difficult for students to interpret correctly a literary, biblical, or mythological allusion in context, as in ELACC7L5, 'Interpret figures of speech (e.g., literary, biblical, and mythological allusions) in context,' if they have no knowledge of the texts that have served as the basis for these allusions and if the reading standards do not point to some of these significant texts, authors, or events." By comparison, she pointed out that Georgia's previous vocabulary standards were "part of the reading/literature strand and through grade 8 spelled out dictionary skills (e.g., 'ELA6R2.d. Uses reference skills to determine pronunciations, meanings, alternate word choices, and parts of speech of words.'). They identified the groupings students should be taught (e.g., 'ELA7R2.c. Identifies and explains idioms and analogies in prose and poetry,' 'ELAWLRL5.c. Identifies and understands foreign terms that appear in works originally written in a language other than English.'). And they pointed to the sources of word meaning in grade 10 ('ELA WLRL5.b. Uses knowledge of world mythologies to understand the meanings of new words,' and 'ELA10RL5.b. Uses knowledge of mythology, the Bible, and other works often alluded to in literature to understand the meanings of new words.')." According to Dr. Sandra

Question 5 Comments - ELA
Stotsky, when examining the writing requirements, "the sub-strand on 'argument' confuses argument with expression of opinion in the elementary grades and with persuasive writing throughout. There is no scholarship to support the three 'types' of writing proposed by Common Core and thus this strand badly misinforms English and reading teachers throughout the grades. There is also nothing on the use of established or peer-generated criteria for evaluating writing or written presentations."
Teachers are teaching to the Test! Kids are not learning! They are confused! When Teacher teaches, they are not covering what goes on the test! GRADE PERCENTAGES SHOULD BE SET BY THE STATE; NOT BY THE TEACHERS. One teacher at one school sets her test percentages at 65 percent while others set at lower percentages! GRADE PERCENTAGES SHOULD BE ACROSS THE BOARD FOR EACH CLASS/GRADE!!! Every Child should have the same percentages; do not favor one child or class over the other! STUDENTS SHOULD NOT GRADE TESTS/Quizzes!!! Teachers should be held accountable for sitting on their butts at their desks and not teaching and making it enjoyable for students to learn! Our Children are the Future! We keep going in this direction then they won't have a future!
My son has been in public school since kindergarten. He still cannot spell correctly, since they did the words your way. My older son did phonics at a private school in kindergarten, and has never had a problem with spelling. I think we need to get back to the basics so the kids have a firm foundation.
Too much emphasis on informational text. The study of great literature that our students can relate to and understand does not seem to be a priority. Many average and below average students are struggling with the rigorous reading material.
I would like for the standards to focus on basic skills In k-2. I don't think students should leave second grade without being able to write an essay on assigned topic, read on 2.0 or above reading level, know basic addition and subtraction facts, and solving 1-2 step word problems. If they can't do this they should spend their day improving such assignments. Science and social studies topics are only learned through reading and writing assignments. Once the students can complete the basic skills mentioned above, then they should progress to the standards in their grade level. We rush students and expose then to many standards when they need to master the basic skills first.
The standards are not developmentally appropriate. The standards in place should be taught to students that are several grades higher. Each grade level should be allowed to go into more depth.
The standards are so board in ELA. You could cover several standards with one activities.
Continued training would be helpful
As a 2nd grade teacher, the proposed changes clarify the standards that were already in place. However, I feel that what we expect from them is too rigorous when they don't have the foundational skills needed to meet what the standard is asking them to do. For example the multiple shades of meaning standard, ELACC2L5, is difficult for our students to master when they don't come having an extensive vocabulary. It is extremely difficult for them to understand the differences in the meanings when they are so small.
The amount of standards that are expected to be covered and mastered before the end of year testing is overwhelming. There is not enough time to spend on each standard for mastery because of the amount of standards that there are to cover, plus the extra things that we have to teach that aren't even part of the standards (response to literature and comparing paired passages for example). Students are not developmentally ready for several of the things that they are expected to do.
I would like to see elements of the common core standards explained as explicitly as they were with Georgia Performance Standards. The general standards are subject to many interpretations for inexperienced teachers, and they are challenging for inexperienced teachers who have not attended college within the last decade.
Kindergarten level includes to much. Children enter not knowing letters ir write even their name correctly. These same children are expected to write sentences the first nine weeks.
Revised standards are clear, however, they are not really aligned with the grade level specific textbooks.
I think the standards are to rigorous for the kindergarten students. They are developmentally ready for some of the concepts.

