**What’s NOT in the Common Core State Standards?**

Several significant areas of the ICAS document were not addressed in the CCSS:

Habits of Mind, Technology, the Reading-Writing Connection (especially as it applied to non-fiction work in all disciplines), and the expectations for English Language Learners. “Habits of Mind” has become a widely adopted term and the attitudinal expectations they express were important to the authors.

**So ESL is not mentioned?**

No. The Sacramento County Office of Education noted, though, that

 Linguists and experts in English learner educational issues were involved in the

 development of the CCSS for English language arts. These individuals assisted in shaping

 the standards in general, and had a significant impact on the language and vocabulary. The developers of the CCSS have expressed an interest in creating English language development (ELD) standards. <http://www.scoe.net/castandards/multimedia/common_core_faq.pdftandards>

**Where did these new standards come from?**

Insiders familiar with the creation of CCSS mused that “California didn’t meet a standard it didn’t like. The explanation below helps to understand how the standards themselves are uneven in terms of specificity and emphasis. The ICAS document was not generated on the basis of any emerging “national standards,” but rather reflected pedagogical research and considered experience, coupled with the advice and comments of faculty across the state and our own national presentations. (Emphasis is added below.)

 The law required that 21 representatives be appointed to the Academic Content Standards Commission (ACSC) to develop academic content standards in language arts and mathematics. Eighty-five percent of the standards recommended by the ACSC were required to be from the CCSS, and fifteen percent could be added by California to ensure the rigor of the standards.

**Do the CCS Standards continue to privilege literature as opposed to other non-fictional essays, research or texts?**

Yes. While CCSS offers several examples are given of historical documents (speeches, the
Constitution, etc.) and one to Mathematics. Otherwise, the “Science and Technical Subjects” promised in the title are entirely absent.

 The standards mandate certain critical types of content for all students, including classic myths and stories from around the world, foundational U.S. documents, seminal works of American literature, and the writings of Shakespeare. The standards appropriately defer the many remaining decisions about what and how to teach to states, districts, and schools. Document written by the Core Standards Initiative, <http://www.corestandards.org/assets/KeyPointsELA.pdf>

At the same time, although not explicit in the document itself, other sources suggest that the teaching of writing (and reading?) is a responsibility of all faculty. ICAS called for such interdisciplinary, cross-curricular approach in its document (see pp. 26, 35, and the entire “Strategies for Implementation” section). Perhaps future work in the DoE will make clear how such instruction and support will occur, especially in grades 11-12 and how this apparent contradiction between texts to be taught and disciplinary approaches will be resolved.

 The responsibility for implementing the literacy standards in grades six through twelve is expected to be shared between the ELA teachers and the teachers in other content areas. The literacy standards complement the content standards in those disciplines.

 <http://corestandards.org/assets/Appendix_A.pdf>