

Transitioning to the California's New Common Core ELA Standards
Agenda for Study Session #2:
Comparing 1997 and 2010 Common Core Standards for Reading & Speaking/Listening
(60 Minutes)

- Review the 5 Study Sessions and the Plan for Session #2—2 minutes
See bottom of this agenda for the content of the 5 sessions.
Guiding Question: What's the big idea again? Where are we in the plan?

- Review Handout 3a (Codes) and a Few Example Comparisons—5 minutes
Guiding Questions: How is Chapter 3 organized? What do these shadings mean?

- Review Worksheet 3a and Handout 3b (page numbers)—2 minutes
Guiding Question: What should we think about and record as we analyze the comparisons?

- Study 2010 and 1997 Comparisons for Reading—30 min.
*Guiding Question: For the Reading domain of the 2010 standards...
What's the same? What's similar, but more rigorous? And, what's new?*

- Study 2010 and 1997 Comparisons for Speaking & Listening—15 minutes
*Guiding Question: For the Speaking and Listening domain of the 2010 standards...
What's the same? What's similar, but more rigorous? And, what's new?*

- Debrief Across Grade Levels: What's the same, similar but more rigorous, and new?—5 minutes (if time allows)
Guiding Questions: What did other grade level groups find as they studied the Reading and Speaking and Listening domains?

- Preview the focus for the CC Study Session #3—1 minute
Guiding Question: What will we be doing at our next Common Core Study Session?
Same comparison study tasks for Writing and Language.

Common Core ELA Study Sessions

~~Study Session 1: Overview—Why is this happening?~~

Study Session 2: Comparing 1997 and 2010 Standards—Reading and Speaking/Listening

Study Session 3: Comparing 1997 and 2010 Standards—Writing and Language

Study Session 4: Analyzing via Jigsaw of the Step-Ladder Versions of the Standards

Study Session 5: Sharing Our Analysis of the Step-Ladder Versions of the Standards

Transitioning to the California's New Common Core ELA Standards
Agenda for Study Session #2:
Comparing 1997 and 2010 Common Core Standards for Reading & Speaking/Listening
(60 Minutes)

*** * * Facilitator Notes * * ***

- Review the 5 Study Sessions and the Plan for Session #2—2 minutes

See bottom of this agenda for the content of the 5 sessions.

Guiding Question: What's the big idea again? Where are we in the plan?

Notes and/or Explanations

- Recommendation: For this session, participants should be organized by grade level, and in pairs within each grade level (for odd numbers, pairs and a triad). You might want to prepare the room with table tents and assigned pairings ahead of time so as to minimize the time it takes to get participants organized and seated.
- Review the five session series: Why this is happening? (Session 1), 1997 and 2010 Comparisons (Sessions 2-3), and Step Ladder versions of the standards (Sessions 4-5).
- Remind participants of what was studied in Session #1: Why this is happening?
- Say something like..."Within the context of the research, the Talking Teaching researchers analyzed the relationship between California's old standards (1997) and the new ones (2010 Common Core). Together with teachers at each grade level, they coded standards that were the same in both versions, standards that were similar but more rigorous in the Common Core, and standards that were completely new in the Common Core. In this session and the next one, we will have the opportunity to study those comparisons for our respective grade levels. In this session, we'll look at Reading and Speaking and Listening, and in the next session we'll look at Writing and Language."

- Review Handout 3a (Codes) and a Few Example Comparisons—5 minutes

Guiding Questions: How is Chapter 3 organized? What do these shadings mean?

Notes and/or Explanations

- Recommendation: It's best to make copies of Handout 3a for all individuals. Handout 3a is in the Study Guide on page 17 but because during the session participants will be turning to the pages with their standards, a copy of Handout 3a allows them to examine the handout and their standards at the same time.
- Review the upper portion of Handout 3a and the description of the codes...
 - Same
 - Similar, but more Rigorous
 - New
 - Removed
- Review one example of each coding category for one specific grade level. Facilitators should feel free to use examples from the grade level they are most familiar with, or use the following from Grade 5.

Say something like..."Let's turn to page 60-61, 5th grade Reading Standards, just so we can look at this all together first. The 1997 Standards are on the left hand side (page 60) and the 2010 Standards are on the right hand side (page 61) to allow for side-by-side comparisons. If you turn the page, you will see the exact same layout for the 5th Grade Writing Standards. Turn the page again, and you'll see the same layout for Language. And one more time, and you see the same layout for Speaking and Listening. This will be true for any grade level you are reviewing today." Then review the following examples:

Same:	2010 Reading Lit standard 5 and 1997 Literary Response standard 3.7
Similar but more rigorous:	2010 Reading Info standard 7 and 1997 Reading Comprehension standard 2.1
New	2010 Reading Lit standard 6
Removed	1997 Literary Response 3.6

As you review examples, help participants notice the parentheses at the end of the 2010 standards that reference the related 1997 standards, and also the parentheses at the end of the 1997 standards that reference the related 2010 standards.
- NOTE: Don't belabor the study of the examples. Just move through them. Participants will develop a stronger and stronger grasp of the coding across the session.

- Review Worksheet 3a and Handout 3b (page numbers)—2 minutes

Guiding Question: What should we think about and record as we analyze the comparisons?

Notes and/or Explanations

- Distribute Worksheet 3a and Handout 3b (both are included in this packet).
- Using Handout 3b, ask participants to find the page numbers for the Reading standards for their grade level and then to turn to those specific pages in their Study Guides.
- Review Worksheet 3a. You might say something like, “As you and your partner study the standards, jot down notes about that which is the same, that which is similar but more rigorous, and that which is new. The worksheet is a space for you to record your observations.”

• Study 2010 and 1997 Comparisons for Reading—30 min.

Guiding Question: For the Reading domain of the 2010 standards...

What’s the same? What’s similar, but more rigorous? And, what’s new?

Notes and/or Explanations

- Ask participants to focus first on just the Reading Literature Standards (i.e., just the first 10 standards).
- As pairs study the comparisons, facilitators should rove about and assist any one that is having difficulty navigating and/or interpreting the codes.
- When all (or virtually all) pairs have finished studying the Reading Literature standards, review the process with the entire group: Is everyone understanding the coding scheme? Answer any questions that arise, and then move participants on to the Reading Informational Text standards.
- Tell participants that as they finish their review of the Reading Informational Text standards they can move on to the Foundational Skills (grades K-5).
- Facilitators should announce time remaining with 10 minutes left in the segment, 5 minutes, and 2 minutes.
- Just before moving on to Speaking and Listening, ask pairs to put a star next to 1 or 2 items they jotted down for Reading that they think are most significant. Participants will be asked to refer to these items during the Debriefing portion of the session.

• Study 2010 and 1997 Comparisons for Speaking & Listening—15 minutes

Study Guide Chapter 3

Guiding Question: For the Speaking and Listening domain of the 2010 standards...

What’s the same? What’s similar, but more rigorous? And, what’s new?

Notes and/or Explanations

- When all (or virtually all) pairs have completed their review of the Reading standards, ask participants to move on to Speaking and Listening,
- As pairs study the comparisons, facilitators should rove about and assist as needed.
- Just before moving on to the Debriefing portion of the session, ask pairs to put a star next to 1 or 2 items they jotted down for Speaking and Listening that they think are most significant.

• Debrief Across Grade Levels: What’s the same, similar but more rigorous, and new?—5 minutes (if time allows)

Guiding Questions: What did other grade level groups find as they studied the Reading and Speaking and Listening domains?

Notes and/or Explanations

- Ask pairs to review the items they starred for Reading, then open the floor for observations: Would anyone like to share the observations you made about the Reading standards, specifically the items you starred? After discussing Reading, move on to discuss Speaking and Listening.
- NOTE: This segment is optional. If there is not time to do this debrief, then you can do it at the end of Session #3.

• Preview the focus for the CC Study Session #3—1 minute

Guiding Question: What will we be doing at our next Common Core Study Session?

Same comparison study tasks for Writing and Language.

Notes and/or Explanations

- Just explain that Session #3 is a continuation of Session #2, moving from 1997 and 2010 comparisons for Reading and Speaking and Listening into the other two domains: Writing and Language.
- Remind participants to bring their Worksheet and Handouts (perhaps place them inside their Study Guide) to the next Session.

3.4. Handout 3a—Notes on 1997 and 2010 Coded Versions of the Standards (p. 17 of Study Guide)

An Explanation of Codes and Shading

Same: 2010 and 1997 standards shaded in this fashion were analyzed as being the same or virtually the same. If you are currently addressing the particular 1997 standard, you should have no problem addressing the corresponding 2010 standard.

Similar but more rigorous: 2010 and 1997 standards coded in this fashion were analyzed as being related to one another, but the 2010 version while similar is more rigorous. If you are currently addressing the 1997 standard, you will need to consider and work towards the added demands and expectations of the 2010 standard. For those standards coded as similar but more rigorous, we underlined words and phrases that we thought distinguished the 2010 version from the 1997 version and are the basis for greater rigor. We also included the word "Rigor" in the parentheses following the 2010 standard along with the corresponding number of the similar 1997 standard.

New: 2010 standards that are not shaded (they are on white background) are new. Our analysis did not find a similar and related 1997 standard that would fulfill the criteria for being either the same or similar/more rigorous. In such cases, we include "CCCS 2010" in the parentheses following the standard to indicate that it is unique to California's 2010 Common Core Standards. Note: By new, we do not mean that the standard will be wholly new for teachers; only that it is new to the state standards for that grade level. In fact, teachers may find standards in the 2010 Common Core that we coded as "new" that are in their current curriculum and that they have been teaching, but that simply are not in the 1997 standards.

Removed: 1997 standards that are not color-coded (they are on white background) are no longer included in the 2010 standards for the particular grade level. We did not find a similar or related 2010 standard that would fulfill the criteria for being either the same or similar/more rigorous. Note: We have not yet checked all such 1997 standards to see if they now reside in another grade level within the 2010 standards.

Additional annotations

Boldface: Boldface wording within the 2010 standards were **added by the state of California when they adopted them in the summer of 2010**. States do have license to add or modify the Common Core State Content Standards, but they must retain at least 85% of the original in order to officially adopt the Common Core standards.

Asterisk *: Asterisks were inserted in the language convention standards in the original Common Core to indicate specific standards that have to be address at all or almost all grades levels: As students increase their command of the language and use it with greater sophistication, the convention has to be revisited and studied again.

[TBD]: This abbreviation stands for To Be Determined and is used in cases where we have yet to finalize the comparison of the 2010 standard to the standards from 1997.

An important note about the coding of the standards: *The coding of the 1997 and 2010 standards were first completed by the authors of the Study Guide. They then piloted the codings for each grade level with groups of teachers from that grade level. As the pilot work ensued teachers provided feedback and codes were discussed and refined. The coding for each grade level have been reviewed and refined several times, but they are most certainly imperfect. As the document is reviewed from location to location, there will be differences of opinions about particular pairs of standards and whether they are truly the same or more rigorous. Such discussions are productive and informative as they contribute to studying and learning the 2010 standards. The purpose of the coding of the 1997 and 2010 standards is not to produce a perfect and definitive cross-year analysis, but rather to provide a means for teachers to study the new Common Core standards in relationship to the standards they currently know and use.*

3.5. Worksheet 3a: Studying the 1997 & 2010 Standards **Grade:** _____ **Pair:** _____

Directions: After you review and compare the 2010 and 1997 standards in each domain, synthesize what you and your partner observed so that you can communicate it to others. For each domain below, try to write 1-2 complete sentences responding to each of the following questions: What is the same? What is similar but more rigorous? What is new to the standards at this grade level? *NOTE: For now, try to capture what you are observing as you study the standards and hold off on describing implications (needed changes in curriculum and instruction). We will get to that later.*

Reading
Writing
Language
Speaking and Listening

Handout 3b: Studying the 1997 vs. 2010 Comparison Standards:

Study Guide page numbers for grade level standards

Grade Level	Reading	Writing	Language	S&L
Kinder	20, 21	22, 23	24, 25	26, 27
1 st	28, 29	30, 31	32, 33	34, 35
2 nd	36, 37	38, 39	40, 41	42, 43
3 rd	44, 45	46, 47	48, 49	50, 51
4 th	52, 53	54, 55	56, 57	58, 59
5 th	60, 61	62, 63	64, 65	66, 67
6 th	68, 69	70, 71	72, 73	74, 75
7 th	76, 77	78, 79	80, 81	82, 83
8 th	84, 85	86, 87	88, 89	90, 91
9 th /10 th	92, 93	94, 95	96, 97	98, 99
11 th /12 th	100, 101	102, 103	104, 105	106, 107