

MINUTES
Approved by the Committee
Idaho Content Standards Committee
Wednesday, December 02, 2020
1:00 P.M.
Room EW42
Boise, Idaho

Cochair Marshall called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.; a silent roll call was taken.

Members in attendance: Cochair Representative Gary Marshall and Representatives Dorothy Moon, Ryan Kerby, Paul Amador, and John McCrostie; Cochair Senator Steven Thayn and Senators Lori Den Hartog (via video conference), Jim Woodward, and Dave Lent; and LSO staff Elizabeth Bowen (via vc) and Jennifer Kish. Absent: Senator Janie Ward-Engelking.

Attendance of audience members was not recorded.

NOTE: Presentations and materials distributed to members are posted to the Idaho Legislature's website: <https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2020/interim>; and copies of those items are on file with the Legislative Services Office located in the State Capitol.

After opening remarks by both cochairs to thank the committee members, staff, and volunteers to the subject review committees, Cochair Marshall called upon committee members to give a brief overview/update of the work accomplished by the review committees.

SCIENCE

- Rep. Moon reported that a review of life science occurred November 25th. She had concerns with the alignment due to the absence of teacher and parent volunteer members during the discussion. Rep. Moon felt that the science group was not truly rewriting the standards as instructed. She hoped that feedback during future meetings would assist in tightening the rewritten standards.
- Sen. Den Hartog served on the science grades 3-5 subcommittee. She noted that the legislative intent was at the forefront of discussions by the review members. Sen. Den Hartog applauded the facilitators' effort in assisting the members to make their own conclusions.
- Sen. Woodward served on the life science groups early in the process. He reported that he had no concerns with that group's report.

MATH

- Sen. Lent served on the math grades 3-5 subcommittee. He acknowledged that the math rewrite efforts went well and remarked that it may be attributed to the fact that math was more objective than the other content areas.
- Rep. Kerby served on the high school math subcommittee. He communicated with members of all the math subcommittees and felt that all had made a great effort to ensure that the legislative intent was incorporated into the new standards. The math committees reviewed other states' standards and decided to base Idaho's standards on Massachusetts' model. Additionally, the groups stole the best ideas from other states and reworked the content to provide clear standards and examples. Rep. Kerby surmised that, after the public hearings, the committees would need some assistance to make the K-12 math standards language more consistent across the grade levels.

ELA

- Rep. McCrostie served on the ELA grades 3-5 subcommittee. He reported that his group also took the legislative directive seriously during its discussions. He also noted that there was a good

representation of parents, educators, and community members within the group and he felt that the final product met the goals issued to the review committee.

- Cochair Thayn served on the ELA grades 6-8 subcommittee. He noted that the committee initially looked at other states' standards but ultimately decided to stay with Idaho's standards and rework them. He reported that the committee did not remove many standards, did not add any new ones, and clarified existing examples when possible; therefore, his grades' standards looked very much like the original standards.
- Cochair Marshall served on the high school ELA subcommittee, which consisted of only four individuals. He reported that the group worked diligently to simplify and consolidate the standards and surmised that the group's standards looked very different from other ELA groups. He was concerned that the ELA group did not move away from the original common core standards and surmised that there was much work yet to accomplish with that group's content standards. He lamented that the ELA groups should have reviewed the career and college readiness anchors before attempting to rewrite the standards.

At 1:45 p.m., Cochair Thayn began his presentation [Standards, Content, and Curriculum](#) accompanied by the handout [Core Knowledge Sequence](#). Cochair Thayn noted the relationship of standards to content to curriculum and how each was a building block to the success of educational instruction. He suggested providing reference materials, such as the Core Knowledge Sequence, to assist educators and parents. He felt that instructional materials that were coherent, sequential, and interrelated were beneficial for complete learning. Cochair Thayn noted that standards were just one part of the educational process; the content of the textbooks chosen for instruction was paramount to align with a state's standards. Cochair Thayn remarked that it was the Legislature's duty to oversee the public educational system as stated in the Idaho Constitution, [Article IX, Section 1](#).

- Rep. Kerby noted that, over the years, the Legislature has tried to strengthen and rewrite the standards, but had been told that curriculum and instruction were not within its purview. He questioned whether the suggestion was for the committee to be involved in the curriculum. Cochair Marshall commented that his desire was for the standards be written in a manner that encouraged teachers to approach instruction from multiple avenues, not for the Legislature to dictate the curriculum. Cochair Thayn felt that it was not out of the Legislature's purview to provide resources with the standards; it was a mechanism for better resources rather than identifying a curriculum.
- Sen. Lent noted that this discussion moved the committee into the next agenda item: the end product. He proposed that student achievement should be the top of the pyramid and that it takes the standards as the building blocks to support that pyramid. Sen. Lent surmised that it was the Legislature's responsibility to ensure that those standards were clear. He noted that the interruption of the educational system by COVID-19 provided an opportunity to take a new direction with educational instruction. He added that the other key portions for success were the planning of professional development for educators and providing tool kits and better communication to parents.
- Rep. McCrostie agreed that professional development was important to the success of the standards. He reported that his ELA review committee felt there were too many standards but that there was a crux on the simplification of the standards versus the clarity.
- Cochair Thayn summarized that committee members supported a strategy for implementation of the standards, coherent language among the grade levels, fewer standards (possibly), and identified resources or a tool kit made available to parents and teachers.
- Cochair Marshall proposed that the standards be re-evaluated with the perspective of *what* is learned from each standard.
- Rep. Kerby remarked that it may not be possible for the content areas to be formatted alike; however, the language should be consistent among the content area's grade levels.

At 2:40 p.m., Cochair Marshall moved the discussion to the process and timeline discussion. He remarked that the curriculum review process occurred every six years and that the content standards review was linked to the curriculum review, though there was not a guideline in statute how it should occur. He commented that the [timeline](#) submitted by the department of education was not provided for in rule or statute. Cochair Marshall felt that sticking with the proposed timeline would not get the desired results for rewriting the core standards.

- Rep. McCrostie noted that his review committee used multiple states for reference because the standards were very similar among the states and, possibly, that's because the information that kids need to know doesn't change much.
- Rep. Kerby inquired how sweeping the changes to the standards needed to be. He reminded the committee that Idaho students were within the 14th-20th band for NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Process) scores for math, which was better than most states. He felt that all three subjects had put in a good effort to get the needle moving and it was not necessary to restart the process.
- Sen. Lent agreed that standards couldn't be reinvented, since they were "standards" after all. He submitted that it was worth putting in an effort on the standards that would improve students' assessments.
- Cochair Marshall summarized that the study committee had done as much work as possible within the time limit and remarked that the responsibility would now move to the germane committees.

With no further business, the committee was adjourned at 3:02 p.m.