### Group Feedback and Processing
- Each group provided two rounds of feedback on another group’s standards based on coherence, focus, and specificity.
- Summary of feedback in tables below.

### Standards Writing
- Each group responds to feedback and refines standards based off feedback.

### ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Overall Middle School</th>
<th>6th – World Regions and Cultures</th>
<th>7th – Contemporary Global Studies</th>
<th>8th – U.S. History and Civic Ideals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| -Good connections to anchors  
-Good progression  
-What is a “cultural universal”? This is a problematic phrase from a scholarly standpoint and I’m struggling to see how its use is intended in this document  
-Too many standards in K-3? | -1 to 1 anchor standards ratio creates a loss of purpose for anchor standards in general  
-Some standards are repeated multiple times—reduce redundancy | -Evaluate human-environment interconnections  
-Revise standards to the grade-level theme | -Behavioral science standards need to go deeper to build on elementary  
-Many concepts within one standard—pairing down and focusing the concepts would be helpful | -Like how interdisciplinary these standards are.  
-How are the 8th grade standards different from high school U.S. history (especially if a district teaches it again in 9th grade?) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Good scope and content</th>
<th>Not every SS subject area needs to be covered in each class. The course title tells a great deal about what the focus of the class should be. Select standards are not true to course descriptions</th>
<th>Do you need “economic organizations” in the standard “analyze civic and political institutions” Lacking sufficient content Focus on this theme/course is not clear. Is it understanding ancient civilizations? Describing the modern-day world? Geography and climate of the modern world?</th>
<th>Overall the standards represent what is essential for students to learn, but they are not focused enough.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td>-At times the standards are too specific. Some identify a specific artifact or assignment like “make a map”. - Artifact or assignment specific grain size is too small -Great examples provided</td>
<td>-Standards are too broad, lacking content</td>
<td>-Overall the standards represent what is essential for students to learn, but they are not focused enough.</td>
<td>Some standards are too broad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Usability

- Some of the standards that are repeated at every grade level and seem too big
- Structure is usable, sometimes wording is awkward and/or confusing
- Multiple sentences in the same standard with different tasks make it difficult to use.
- Use verb other than "tell". Maybe explain, identify, describe?
- Very accessible, solid examples and clear language.
- Confusing that the anchor standards change from grade to grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>U.S./World History</th>
<th>Economics and Financial Literacy</th>
<th>High School Geography</th>
<th>Iowa History</th>
<th>Behavioral Science</th>
<th>Civics and Govt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>Most standards appear to</td>
<td>A couple of &quot;exchange and markets&quot; could fit</td>
<td>Great connections to history, culture, govt. and econ.</td>
<td>Make Iowa standards for each anchor</td>
<td>Psychology connection to anchors is not</td>
<td>Some of the terms may need to be defined, i.e.,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Focus | Concern that many standards repeat what students are asked to do in elementary and middle school grades rather than requiring more complexity  
-Not enough content to be meaningful to guide teachers | Add standards that broaden focus from free market  
-Is there enough connection to global economy | Does the terminology get in the way of teachers/students knowing what’s expected  
-For a behavioral science connection need to change focus to social psych—larger group focus  
-2nd & 3rd grade could be switched  
-Econ and govt will be hard to get into the course | Good focus on sociology, but not psychology  
-Some standards are wordy—where it says “identify and analyze” just say “analyze” | One standard references political socialization, but I wonder if the concept of developing political identity warrants more attention?  
-Same IA History standard is listed multiple times  
-This represents a lot of things to cover in 16 weeks.  
-Depth of some standards seems unwieldy  
-Are topics exhaustive? Do I have to teach them all? Can I substitute? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>Usability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Consider diversifying verbs  
- Grain size too broad for most of the standards | Each standard should measure one thing.  
- Structure will be easy for teachers to translate into a curriculum  
- Could use more guidance on how to translate into curriculum  
- Very "employ" is used: what does this mean? |
| - Standards are appropriately specific  
- Good balance between overall economic principles and personal application  
- Financial literacy may be too broad compared to econ standards | - 8th grade standard is tough to read.  
- Easy to translate into curriculum  
- Broadness helps with usability |
| - Diversify verbs  
- Use verb "understand"  
- Add "suggested concepts and skills" to each standard for clarity | - 6th-8th seem to be specific  
- What is the meaning of THEMES in, "Utilize critical thinking skills to guide an in-depth study of themes within behavioral sciences" |
| - IA standards connected to Geo  
standards 1 and 2 are too broad to be usable  
- Too broad in terms of specific Iowa examples | - Good specificity on sociology, but not psychology  
- Research skills seem like a lot  
- The listing of examples in nearly every standard may make using them problematic  
- The multiple tasks, thought processes, and concepts in each standard would make assessing student mastery difficult |
| - Listing specific vocab/concepts may provide too narrow of a focus | - Good usability  
- Is the bottom section necessary? Research skills seem like a lot ||