		2. Please comment about the organization of the Science				
	Survey Question	Standards.		I		• • • •
Addressed	Comment #	Public Comment	Actionable Yes/No	Item Addressed	Suggested Changes	Committee Notes
		he physical layout of the standards is efficient and easy to read,				
		8th grade teacher, and I will use 8 PAULI 4 as an example. The key				
		concents say Concents taught in 7 E1112 4 and wavelength				
		amplitude speed frequency. If I go back to 7 E1112.4 it tells me				
		Concepts taught in 6 F1111 6 and hydrologic cycle So then I				
		again have to go further back to 6 F1111 6 just to read. Extension				
		of those taught in 4.P4U2.1. 4.F1U1.5. So AGAIN I have to dig				
		deeper just to find out what I'm teaching in that 8th grade				
		standard. I find this tedious and unnecessary. I understand that				
		the standards are supposed to build off of each other, however it				
		is frustrating to have to continue to search for the concepts. If the				
		concept would be listed next to the standard from the previous				
		grade level(s) I think it would be much easier for teachers to deal				
		with.			within the progression of the standard,	
	16		Yes	Organization	include previously built upon concepts	format showed by Brea laid this out nicely
		I like the order of which they are presented and that there are				
	31	fewer standards to cover to focus on mastery.	No			
		Why on earth have you removed references to evolution and the				
	33	big bang theory???	No		not organization related	
	38	I like that they are similar to NGSS.	NO No			
	40	The draft of the new standards are subtracted will work.	INU			
		Ine urail of the new standards are extremely watered down and				
1		iess ciear as to the learning goar required of each standard.	No		not organization related	
	44	The National science education standard are better	No		not organization reidleu	
	43	They are easy enough to follow	No			
	47	They are easy to read - i appreciate how they are segmented by				
1	56	sub-discipline	No			
		Some Earth science topics (HS) students coming into high school				
	61	may not have prior knowledge to build on.	No			
	66	They're okay	No			
	69	N/A	No			
		Were better before the 'green' areas added by the BOE. Let actual				
		scientists and science teachers write the standards, not				
	80	bureaucrats and laymen.	No			
	82	Organization is fine.	No			
		It is confusing for those reading it when looking at what needs to				
		be learned over the course of a science curriculum rather than				
		individual courses (i.e. biology vs. chemistry).				
	88		No			curriculum related
	93	I was able to read this honsense fairly easy.	No			
	100	I ney are not scientifically accurate	No			already present/surrisulum related
	100	These are well organized but cometimes repetitive	No			aready present/curriculum related
	105	I am not hanny with the changes made by Superintendent	NU			
	113	Douglas	No			
	114	organization is fine	No			
	116	key concepts	No	1		
		The standards are organized fine. I am wondering if we will be	1			
		given a curriculum to use so that I can teach these new standards?				
1	119		No			up to LEAs
	123	I would go Life, Earth, then Physical	No			up to LEAs
	124	They are easily understood.	No			
		Pretty straight forward on the majoritysome strands I question				
1		and wonder exactly what we are supposed to teach.				
L	140		No			
		The first section that describes the standards and 3-dimensional				
1		learning is done well. The standards are written and organized in				
		a coherent manner. The piece that leads to confusion and				
		inaccurate science are the key concepts, which in what I know				
		about concepts are not even concepts but vocabulary words that				
	4.47	may or may not align to the standard. I would like to see these	No			replaced by learning progression document
	143	Key concents need to be removed as they are not concents but				replaced by real filling progression document
		rather vocabulary and often not even related to the standard				
1		Additionally, it clearly states that the job of the Arizona				
		Department of Education is to write standards NOT curriculum				
1		The key concepts are the job of the school district and classroom				
1	145	teacher.	No			replaced by learning progression document
		The standards themselves are organized well but the connection				
1		to other academic disciplines does not make sense.				
	150		No			
1		The graphic models of cross cutting are too cumbersome and dis-				
	152	jointed.	No			
	154	I like the grade level organization	No			

	The Board of Education's Internal Review of the Standards does				
	not take into account the flow of strands from grade level to grade				
	level. This continuity was in the original standards created by the				
	committee of professionals before Diane Douglas teek them for				
15	internal review	No			
15,	The estual standards are well associated and easy to read. The	No			
	The actual standards are well organized and easy to read. The				
	document itself has some very confusing sections, especially the				
	connections to other academic disciplines (not well connected)				
	and the Key concepts. The addition of the Key Concepts column				
	does not meet accessibility requirements. Placing the coding for				
	each standard in a table cell makes it difficult for districts to				
	capture coding and text of the standards without a lot of				
	reformatting. Please make the document accessible and more				
	user friendly for districts by eliminating the tables. Also, I'm				
	unclear of the color coding. Core ideas are colored yellow/orange				
	but so is physical science. SEPs are color coded blue but so is earth				
	science. Crosscutting concepts are color coded green but so is life				
	science. Is there a reason for using these colors in two different				
	ways? This is very confusing.				
				within the progression of the standard,	format showed by Brea laid this out in a more coherent
165		No	Organization	include previously built upon concepts	manner
	The document is too long and repetitive. Trying to go over it in a				
	reasonable length of time is very stressful. There seems to be a lot				
	of jargon. When I studied science in Arizona, we weren't				
	subjected to any of that. This really looks like Common Core in				
	some ways and Common Core needs to be repudiated				
165	······································	No			
168	Standards are easy to read.	No			
	The presence of key concepts makes is confusing: are those the				
	performance objectives? I thought this was just about standards.				
	not performance objectives. I think these should be eliminated				
	They were not in the original version of the standards. It is also				
	confusing as to where the standard number originates, in the				
	individual grade levels they are numbered sequentially from				
	nhysical science, through Earth and Space and on to Life				
	sciences this is a hit confusing			within the progression of the standard	format showed by Brea laid this out in a more coherent
171	stereesthis is a bit comasing.	No	Organization	include previously built upon concents	manner
	The standards profess to outline what the students need to know	No	organization	······································	
	understand and do by the time they complete high school and at				
	the same time they then provide of 27 standards, pope of which				
	cay aputhing about what the student people to 'know, understand				
	ar do' to be proficient at that standard. Bather the standards are				
	of uo to be proncient at that standard. Rather the standards are				
	about constructing ongaging ovaluating doveloping atc. So				
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So,				
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that				
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents?				
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the				
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read thermor are they going to wait for				
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom?				
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a				
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their			"Understand" is a very low level	
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom.			"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing,	
	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom.			"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing"	
177	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom.	No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 179 179	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because as tudent can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized	No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 175 180 180	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow.	No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 177 180 181 181	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand.	No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 175 180 181 181	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly	No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 175 180 181 182 183 183 183	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly it is very organized and easy to read	No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 177 181 181 182 184	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and easy to read. They are easier to read because of the Key Concepts. Without the	No No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 175 180 181 182 184	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and the east of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are	No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 177 180 181 181 182 184	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 175 181 181 182 184	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and easy to read They are easing to read of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to tead to undustand ties as to what we are suppose to tead to undustand ties as to what we are suppose to tead to undust they concepts helps give me lideas as to where to go with my students education.	No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 175 180 181 182 182 184 184 184	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and because of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts is hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts helps give me ideas as to where to go with my students education.	No No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 177 184 181 182 184 184 184 184 184 185	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easive to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and easy to read. They are easier to read because of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts helps give me ideas as to where to go with my students education.	No No No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 175 180 181 182 182 184 184 186	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and the east of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts without the hey are easy to read out the sub time complicated. They are easy to read but to having the key concepts written in. If	No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
172 177 186 186 181 182 184 184 184 185	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read They are easier to read because of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts is hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts helps give me ideas at to where to go with my students education. The Ideas don't seem new but more complicated. They are easy to read due to having the key concepts written in. If you don't keep in the key concepts there written written in. If you don't keep in the key concepts there will be way too much	No No No No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 177 180 181 182 182 184 184 185	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and easy to read. They are easing to read of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ides as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts helps give me ideas as to where to go with my students education. The ledes don't seem new but more complicated. They are easy to read leve to having the key concepts written in. If you don't keep in the key concepts there will be way too much	No No No No No No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 175 180 181 182 182 184 184 184 185	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and because of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to or students. The key concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to og with my students education. The ideas don't seem new but more complicated. They are easy to read due to having the key concepts written in. If you don't keep in the key concepts understand incomplexed. Inconsistency between grade levels, schools, districts. All teachers need to be teaching the same key concept and not keep it just a	No No No No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	
177 177 180 181 181 182 182 183 184 185 185	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom.	No No No No No No No No No	Standard Standard/Key Concepts	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	will be present within the learning progression document
177 179 180 181 182 184 184 184 185 185 185 185 185 185 185	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. They are easite to read because of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts without the ideas as to where to go with my students education. They are easy to read due to having the key concepts written in. If you don't keep in the key concepts they concepts written in. If you don't keep in the key concept me will be way too much inconsistency between grade levels, schools, districts. All teachers need to be teaching the same key concept and not keep it just a broad concept.	No	Standard Standard/Key Concepts	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	will be present within the learning progression document
177 177 186 188 188 188 187 187 187 187 187 188 188	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and easy to read They are easier to read because of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts is hand to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts helps give me ideas as to where to go with my students education. The Jardes don't seem new but more complicated. They are easy to read due lowing the key concepts helps give me ideas don't seem new but more complicated. They are easito re rade key concept swritten in. If you don't keep in the key concept shous, districts. All teachers need to be teaching the same key concept and not keep it just a broad concept. The diagram is clear and easy to follow.	No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	will be present within the learning progression document
177 177 184 181 182 184 184 184 185 185 185 185	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and userstand. A lot more simple and easy to read They are easito to read beau of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts helps give me ideas as to where to go with my students education. The lideas don't seem new but more complicated. The big key to read, its concept shelps give me ideas as to the eaching the same key concept and not keep it just a broad concept. The diagram is clear and easy to follow. It is user friendly and I like the key concept portion that gives actual examples of what the standard entalis. It would be more	No No No No No No No No No No	Standard	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	will be present within the learning progression document
177 175 180 181 183 183 184 184 185 185 185	about constructing, engaging, evaluating, developing, etc. So, because a student can construct a model of something does that mean they know and understand what the model represents? And just curious given the length of the standards, are the teachers actually going to read themor are they going to wait for someone to provide them with materials to use in the classroom? Seems like a lot of time and money has been spent on creating a document that can't be used directly by a teacher in their classroom. Really well organized The Original standards has a sequential flow. They are easy to read and understand. A lot more simple and easy to read. Kid friendly It is very organized and easy to read. They are easier to read because of the Key Concepts. Without the key concepts its hard to understand ideas as to what we are suppose to teach to our students. The key concepts without the flow are easy to read due to having the key concepts written in. If you don't keep in the key concepts there will be way too much inconsistency between grade levels, schools, districts. Al teachers nonsistency between grade levels, schools, districts. Al teachers need to be teaching the same key concept and not keep it just a <i>broad</i> concept. The diagran is clear and easy to follow. It is user friendly and like the key concept portion that gives actual examples of what the standard entails. It would be more comprehensible if visual examples were included.	No No No No No No No No No No	Standard Standard/Key Concepts	"Understand" is a very low level Bloom's, whereas "constructing, engaging, evaluating, and developing" are a much higher level of thinking	will be present within the learning progression document

	The standards feel too broad for me to completely absorb them at				
	this point. In previous years in reviewing other standards, specific				
	example were given for types of activities or questions that we				
	would do with the students, thereby clarifying exactly what we are				
	expected to teach. These feel more broad-based and I fear I may				
101	not translate them correctly.	No			
153	L do agree that it is visually pleasing and easy to read however.	NO			
	do feel that the Big Ideas might be difficult to teach and interpret				
	across grade levels for appropriate scaffolding				
193	across grade levels for appropriate searroraing.	No			
	The 14 core ideas and that they're the same for all grade levels.				
195	5	No			
	Like the 14 core ideas behind the science itself and they are the				
196	same for all grade levels.	No			
197	7 Easy to read.	No			
206	Much easier to read than previous standards	No			
200	Easy to read yes, but too complicated!! The coding system is a	<b>W</b>	C		no changes needed, too complex to rename, will take time to
208	The energiastics is fine but the energiastics of the content itself	res	Coding/Organization	none	adjust and get used to
210	The organization is line, but the organization of the content liser	No			
210	Organization is easy to read, can be searched to find key words	NO			
212	2	No			
	As Director of a clinical laboratory, having a dual major BS degree				
	in both Chemistry and Biology, I would like to see Arizona adopt				
	the Next Gen Science Standards that are already in use in many				
	states. We need to inspire our young people (especially female				
	students) to condider STEM careers.				
215	5	No			already present
	Key concepts should not be hyperlinked, but explicitly stated so				
	standards can be printed out and easily accessed by teachers.		Standards/	will be addressed within the	
218	S The standards and a second standards and	No	Organization	progression document	
215	These is the potential mission and clear.	NO			
	respect to the 14 core ideas resulting from internal non-vetted				
	changes to the standards statements Reviewing the document				
	we have noted that, in both Kindergarten and 3rd grade physical				
	science standards, statement changes shift the standards' focus				
	from physical science to life science, resulting in the physical				
	science import being lost. These changes break the learning				
	progressions of the core content as well as vertical alignment				
	between grade levels. It is possible that other significant				
	alignment issues may be present yet not recognized.				
220		No			
330	It is organized, but it does not seem like 40 minutes per day is	Ne			un de LEAn
22*	The standards for science is limited and similar to what we already	NO			up to LEAS
	teach. However, 40 minutes a day is not realistic in today's				
	classroom, where we teach math for 90 minutes, FLA for 60-90				
	minutes. Computer Science for 30-60 minutes a day as well. This				
	does not include classes like PE. Music. and Art.				
225	5	No			up to LEAs
	You are also assuming that the younger grades are teaching at				
	least 60 minutes everyday of science. Which we know is not the				
226	case. So who will take up the slack?	No			up to LEAs
227	They are well organized.	No			
	I like the general organization of the standards. I think it is helpful				
228	to divide science into 3 general categories.	NO			
232	Our team thought that the organization allows them to be	NU		+	
	navigated through easily, but the connection between				
	Development and use in the model and key concepts need to be				
235	elaborated on more.	No			
	Easy to read and understand general concepts, but very broad and				
	lacking specific objectives and terminology students will be				
	expected to master. How well are these standards aligned to				
	future standardized science tests (AIMS, AZMerit)? Because of the				
	vast changes in the sequence of concepts/topics, I am concerned				
	that there will be huge gaps in transition from the old standards to				
	the new.				
238	S	NO			UP TO LEAS
	understand standards. Lake really like the embedded humenistic				
	within the document to bring you to other standards that were				
242	referenced within a standard.	No			
242	The science standards are clear and easy to read.	No		1	
			1		

	Very easy to read. I can see the asking of students to critical think.				
	My concerns how testing will take place for 8th grade. They can't				
	use the current 8th grade state standard. Does not fit.				
24	6	No			
	I like the way that standards are shown based on the last time that				
	they were taught and how you can go back to the grade level				
	where they were taught to determine what it was that was				
24	8 taught.	No			
24	9 Well done on the organization	No			
	I do not believe the 7th grade standards should include physical				
	science standards. They should continue to focus on Earth and				
	Space. 7th grade students are not ready to learn about inertia and				
	forces. 8th graders struggled with the concept. 7th graders do not				
	learn about moving variables, so learning about f=ma would be				
	difficult to understand for them. The AZMerit has around 30% on				
	physical science, so they should continue to focus mainly on this in				
	their strigrade year, which will be a better transition for high				
	placed with the rest of the standards and does not flow well				
	placed with the rest of the standards and does not now well.				
25	0	No			
	The distribution of the standards visual (chart) is very helpful and				
25	1 explains the standards very well.	No			
	Some of the standards are too broad an I am confused as to what				
	8th grade will be responsible to teach in order to have a successful				
	testing session. There are parts that are explicit.				
25	2	No			
	They are far too complicated. They remind me of the ILLP				
	standards. Why does the state feel the need to overcomplicate				
23	5 rather than simplify things.	No			-
2.	The integration of content from other previous grade level	NO			
	standards should mention whether correlating math standards		Standards/	present in the Connections to Other	
	7 will be taught as well.	No	Organization	Academic Disciplines document	
25	1 yes organized	No			
25				will be present within the learning	
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by		Standards/		
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine.	No	Standards/ Organization	progression document	
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation	No	Standards/ Organization	progression document	
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being	No	Standards/ Organization	progression document	
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by SADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 intertwined.	No	Standards/ Organization	progression document	
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to	No	Standards/ Organization	progression document	
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by S ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to anvigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old between for brand of the work is that developed neares the set of the set of	No	Standards/ Organization	progression document	
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by S ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to anvigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or this uris un to my intercentation of the	No	Standards/ Organization	progression document	
25	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to anvigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/	progression document	
22	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be include?	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document	
22	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           SADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being           1 intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am mising? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           4           The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not	No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning	
225 266 267 277 277 277	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included? The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document	
22 26 26 21 21 21 21 21	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old arcicon state Standard's Istnere a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included? 4 The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts to standard is the standard is more before the standard is more of the standard is the standard	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/	progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning	
22 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to anvigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being           1 intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be include?           I         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was statached to.	N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 266 266 277 277 277 277 277 277 277	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           In The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key	N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
22 26 26 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being           1 intertwined.           The link under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old arcinon state standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           Image:         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was S attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for standard seem in appropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of	No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to anvigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being           1 intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           4         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for the grade level listed and uncepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the	N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning compression document	
	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be include? 4 The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to. Some standards sociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.	N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included? The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to. Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.	No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being           1 intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old arcicona State Standard Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           4         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           1 agree. Lan read them and understand what is included, even if 1 2 do not agree with what is included.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be include?           I         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards some inappropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary asociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           1 agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if 1 do not agree with what is included.           8 Bay to follow	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 266 267 277 277 277 277 277 277 277 277	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I agene. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I 2 do not agree with what is included.           8 Easy to follow The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 2 cross cuting ideas when teaching.	No No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 226 226 227 217 217 227 227 227 227 227 227 227	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           4         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 standard seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           1 lagree. Lican read them and understand what is included, even if 1 7 do not agree with what is included.           8 lassy to follow           The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 266 266 277 277 277 277 277 277 277 277	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be include?           I         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary asociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I 2 do not agree with what is included.           8 Easy to follow           9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.           10 the standards or of no help in teaching. Standards and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I 2 do not agree with what is included.           8 Easy to follow           The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cuting ideas when teaching.           The tandards are easy to read. Key concepts are questionable on have more details on what specifically students are being asked to	No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old arkitoat State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included? 4 The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to. 5 standard seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. The yappear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing. 1 agree. I can read them add understand what is included, even if I do that are easy the made. Key Concepts are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching. The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching. The standards ree easy to read. Key concepts are questionable on 1 seven is tandards or no help in teaching. Standards need to 1 have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 266 266 277 277 277 277 277 277 277 277	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           SADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding; the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard in on. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be include?           I         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary asociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I 20 don tagree with what is included.           8 Easy to follow           The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.           The standards or of no help in teaching.           The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for a were details on what specifically students are being asked to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to a konce.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Aricona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be include? The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to. Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary sociated with the standards and key in light schedule. If do not agree with what is included. Beavy to follow The standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cuting ideas when teaching. The standards are easy to read. Key concepts are questionable on key concepts are not actually concepts. Standards have been fill do not agree with what is included. Beavy to follow The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cuting ideas when teaching. The standards are easy to read. Key concepts are questionable on have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included? 4 The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard twas 5 stated to. 5 standard seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing. 1 agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if 1 do na tagree with what is included. 6 Easty to follow The help school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching. 11 design school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching. 12 do not agree with what is included. 12 key to is general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to 13 key to is general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to 14 key. 16 is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to 14 key. 16 is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to 15 key to is so general? I am guessing what is included. 16 is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to 16 allow it is so general? I am guessing what is included. 17 is one to this on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know. 18 is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to 2 know.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 226 227 227 227 227 227 227 227 227 227	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refro to standard is no. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be include?           I         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards some inappropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary asociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if 17 do not agree with what is included.           8 Easy to follow           The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.           The standards or of no help in teaching. Standards need to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.           I kis so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be unwrapping it differently with different expectations. How will I know what will be assessed since it is so general? I am guessing what is included.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           SADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           Ine key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards steem inappropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary asociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I rage. I. can read them and understand what is included, even if I 2 do not agree with what is included.           8 Easy to follow           The hip school standards are easy to understand and allow for 2 know.           It is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be unwrapping it differently with different expectations. How will kindow what will be assessed since it is so general? I am guessing what is included.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           SADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding; the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           IT The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 standard seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I do na tagree with what is included.           I The standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.           The standards are as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.           It is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be unavapping it differently with different expectations. How will know what will be assessed since it is so general? I am guessing what is included.           I That's good. Seems to proceed in an orderly, sequential fashion.         That's good.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           S ADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           I         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary asociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if 1 7 do not agree with what is included.           8 asy to follow           The kis pachool standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.           The standards are asy to read. Key concepts are questionable on several standards or of no help in teaching. Standards need to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.           I kis so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be umvrapping it differently with different expectations. How will know what will be assessed since it is so general? I am guessing what is included.<	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to analyzet with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included? The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to. Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary sociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing. I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I 2 do not agree with what is included. Beaver with what is included. Beaver with what is included. The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching. The standards are deasy to read. Key concepts are being asked to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know. It is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be unwrapping it differently with different expectations. How will I know with lifform the expectations. How will I know with with other short specifically students are being asked to 2 know. It is so general? I am guessing what is included. That's good. Seems to proceed in an orderly, sequential fashion. 7 k standards for science are foundational and can be taught in a 9 developmentally appropriate scope.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           SADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding; the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 standard seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           1 agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if 1 2 do na targee with what is included.           1 The standards are easy to anderstand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.           1 The standards are easy to an d.Key concepts are questionable on several standards or of no help in teaching. Standards need to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.           1 Is so general, as a teacher 1 am not sure what 1 am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be unavapping it differently with different expectations. How will know what will be assessed since it is so general? 1 am guessing what is included.           1 That's good. Seems to proceed in an orderly, sequential fashion.         I X standards fo	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           SADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding; the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being           Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that I am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           I         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary asociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           1 agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if 1 7 do not agree with what is included.           8 asy to follow           9 cross cutting ideas when teaching.           11 The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas or on help in teaching. Standards need to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.           1 K is og eneral, as a teacher 1 am not sure what 1 am supposed to be doing with it. Each district wilb te unvarapping it differently with different expectations. How will 1 know what will be assessed since it is sog general? 1 am guessing what is included.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Aricon State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included? The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to. Some standards somewhere that and standards somewhere that and standards some with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem inappropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing. I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I 2 do not agree with what is included. Be and to fandards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching. The standards are due to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to know. If is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be unwrapping it differently with different expectations. How will I know with With Be assessed since it is so general? I am guessing what is included. That's good. Seems to proceed in an orderly, sequential fashion. 7 K standards for science are foundational and can be taught in a 9 developmentally appropriate scope.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           SADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding; the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           IT         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 standard what should be included?           IT         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 statached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary associated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I 2 do not agree with what is included.           I The standards are easy to a Key concepts are questionable on several standards or of no help in teaching. Standards need to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.           I is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be unarvapping it differently with different expectations.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 246 267 277 277 277 277 277 277 277 277 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by           SADE, the organization seems to work fine.           They are easy to navigate with the coding; the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined.           The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Arizona State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included?           I         The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concepts. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to.           Some standards seem inappropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. They appear more as a list of vocabulary asociated with the standards. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing.           1 agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if 1 7 do not agree with what is included.           8 asy to follow The his shool standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching. The his fandards are easy to read. Key concepts are questionable on several standards or of no help in teaching. Standards need to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know.           1 kis good. Seems to proceed in an orderly, sequential fashion. 7 1 K standards for science are foundational and can be taught in a 9 developmentally appropriate scope.           0 I would like to se a better havour of the standards.           Once Lunderstood the system,	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	
225 26 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	With the exception of the Key Concepts column that was added by 5 ADE, the organization seems to work fine. They are easy to navigate with the coding, the color differentiation between science domains, and the inquiry standards being 1 Intertwined. The links under Key concepts include but are not limited to: to are helpful, but refer to standard is not. Does it mean the old Aricon State Standard? Is there a list of standards somewhere that 1 am missing? Or its just up to my interpretation of the standard what should be included? The key concepts seem to be more of a vocabulary list and not concept. Some of these key concepts are highly inappropriate for the grade level listed and unrelated to the standard it was 5 attached to. Some standards somewhere that and standards somewhere that and standards some where as a list of standard seem inappropriate for grade level and the. Key Concepts are not actually concepts. This makes the 6 standard seem irrelevant and confusing. I agree. I can read them and understand what is included, even if I 2 do not agree with what is included. Beaver with what is included. The high school standards are easy to understand and allow for 9 cross cutting ideas when teaching. The standards or of no help in teaching. Standards need to have more details on what specifically students are being asked to 2 know. It is so general, as a teacher I am not sure what I am supposed to be doing with it. Each district will be unwrapping it differently with different expectations. How will I know with limk and the standards. Once I understood the system, it was a mirror of reading ELA 1 standards are presente or an amore of reading ELA 1 standards are presented in a way that is easy to understand. B 1 sho to 1 datgories. It might be more manageable if we 2 made the categories more broad.	N0 N	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization	progression document will be present within the learning progression document	

31	These are not what the committee created	No			
	They do not address the number of days required to teach the				
	standards, only the number of hours per day they should be				
21	thught	No			Lip to LEAs
31	laught.	NU			OP to LEAS
31	The key concepts are easier to understand	No			
	Organization is very clear, however the numbering system needs				
	clarity			combine the Core Ideas for Knowing	
	ciurty.		Steadeda / Cadiaa /	Colores table with the same that has the	
			stanuarus/ couing/	science table with the page that has the	
31	5	No	Organization	Coding for the Science Standards	
	Standards are easy to look at it, but they are not necessarily easy				
32	to understand	No			
	The levent of the standards are easy to read and fellow through				
	The layout of the standards are easy to read and follow through.				
32		No			
	They are broken down into a format that is easier to understand.				
32		No			
	The standards are easy to read and understand. I would like to				
	The standards are easy to read and understand. I would like to		Shared and a f	All has a second and the state of the second	
	see links that enable further explanations and examples.		Standards/	will be present within the learning	
32	5	No	Organization	progression document	
	The coding is a bit confusing. Without using the key at the top a				
	code such as 2 P1112 1 is hard to understand. I know it's 2nd				
	code sach as 2.1 102.1 is hard to understand. T know it s 2.1d			and the first state of the stat	
	grade, Physical Science (P), and it's the first one of 8 (because of			combine the Core ideas for Knowing	
	the 1 at the end), but the 1U2 in the middle just makes for a lot.		Standards/ Coding/	Science table with the page that has the	
33	1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	No	Organization	Coding for the Science Standards	
22	They were very easy to read	No	1	-	
	Middle school students should overlass and an af asian state				
	whome school students should explore one are of science in	1	1	1	
	depth. Everything in science builds on something done previously.	1			
	For instance, introducing atomic structure in fifth grade and then				
	waiting until 8th grade to combine atoms leaves too much time				
	fas students to forget the structure. Each science BUILDC				
	for students to forget the structure. Each science Boltos.				
	Allowing students to have the time to explore a subject in depth				
	will allow for retention.				
34		No			
	Estandards seem out of place and not well aligned. Cause and				
	Satahuarus seem out or place and not well alighed. Cause and				
	effect as a main category to teach does not make sense and will				
	leave your teachers scrambling to make sense of that standard				
	and how to teach it. Its too vague. IT looks like all you did was				
	shuffle a few 7th grade standards to 6 grade and few of 8th grade				
	shame a few vin grade standards to o grade and few of our grade				
	to 7th The problem with this is, and especially for 8th grade, the				
	standards you moved are vital to get students ready for HS. YOu				
	took physics out of the question and students need it in 8thfor HS.				
	Dropping it to 7th and not having an adequate replacement is not				
	and answeb. It has been replaced with Wayss. Wayss is such a				
	good enough. It has been replaced with waves. Waves is such a				
	minor concept that it just dont make sense on why you would				
	teach that at 8th grade. Waves can be taught in 7th grade. Teache				
	hin on Standards of geological rock column in *th grade is out of				
	place since 7th grade teacher about Earth history Vou also				
	place since 7 th grade teaches about Earth history. Fou also				
	chopped out anything about the periodic table that is needed for				
	HS.	1			
		1	1	1	
34		No	Standards	1	present in HS P1112 1 6 P1112 3 8 P1112 1
54.	to an an ab lite the binarchine left to sight energy of the track.			1	p. com
	i very much like the hierarchical left to right arrangement. I initially	1			
	though that the breadth of content was lacking because several	1			
	concepts did not appear represented in the left-hand broad	1			
	descriptions, but they do show up in the right-hand detailed	1	1	1	
	descriptions. They wording of the broad extensions should be	1	1	1	
	descriptions. They working of the broad categories should be		1	1	
34	clarified to avoid this.	NO			
34	I feel verbage is not consistent in areas of key concepts	No			
	Easy to understand if one is familiar with NGSS. PD will need to be				
	provided on how to read and use standards in planning lossons	1			
	provided on now to read and use standards in planning lessons.		1	1	
34		NO			UP TO LEAS
	Excellent overview of the crosscutting concepts, practices & core	1			
	ideas/3D learning. Appreciated the appendix to refer to for more	1			
34	indenth investigation	No			
	There is an little left of the suscent standards. This is the shore		1		
	There is so little left of the current standards. Things have been	1	1	1	
	moved or deleted. What happened to the Next Generation	1			
34	Science Standards?	No			already present
	I hope it includes specific vocabulary that should be used in each		Standards/	will be present within the learning	
	standard	No	Organizatio -	prograssion document	
35	stanuaru.	NO	organization	progression document	
35	Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate.	No			
	I like that they are organized into grade level groups. It makes it				
	easier to see the changes and the progression from one grade	1			
	level to the end of the sector of the bullet but it would also be the sector of the	1	1	1	
1	never to the next. I know it's pulky, but it would also be nice to see	1	1	1	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	a document that tracks each standard from K to 12.				

	I have strong reservations regarding the key concepts, columns				
	These refer to the content taught, and limit now the standard can				
	be applied. Even though it says include but not limited to				
	teachers and parents still may see this as a list of content required				
	to mactor the standard. If they are truck meant to be suggestions				
	to master the standard. If they are truely meant to be suggestions				
	on how to apply the standard, they should be in a completly				
	separate document. This could be developed by PLC's or districts				
	in the form of curriculum mans etc		Standards/	will be present within the learning	
25	in the form of curriculum maps etc.		Standard3/	win be present within the learning	
354		No	Organization	progression document	
	The codes make sense and include a using standard in each				
355		No			
	The standards are easy to read and understand from one grade				
	The standards are easy to read and understand from the grade				
	level to another. The coding of the standards are understandable.				
356		No			
	The standards organized in a table format make it was to read, but				
	the mass amount of intruductory information make it hard to				
	the mass amount of introductory information make it hard to				
	follow and make connections between grade levels.				
358		No			
	I like how the areas are organized into the 3 sciences. It is great				
	that the core ideas for knowing and the core ideas for using				
	that the core ideas for knowing and the core ideas for using				
	science are embedded through out the standards.				
355		No			
	The standards are organized in a way that makes them easy to				
	road. The wording of the standards is not elected to the 14	1	1		
	reau. The wording of the standards is not clear as to what should	L.			
360	be taught.	NO			
362	Organized in a readable manner	No	1		
	The Standards are easy to read. I like how they were grouped by				
	type of Crience. The grouping was similar arrest and it.	1	1		
	cype of science. The grouping was similar across grade levels, so		1		
363	the consistency is wonderful!	No			
	They are not well-written and many of them still require much				
	interpretation. The standards are randomized and completely				
25	interpretation. The standards are randomized and completely				
364	unorganized over middle school grade levels.	NO			
	The standards for my specific grade level are easy to read, but				
	leave a lot of questions about what content to cover. The				
	inclusion of the 2d idea of crosscutting concents, sore ideas and				
	inclusion of the su idea of crosscutting concepts, core ideas and				
	science and engineering practices created a beautiful theory, but I				
	feel like it is difficult to know what that will look like in the				
365	classroom	No			
	Standards are consise, articulation both above and below makes				
	Standards are concise, and contacton both above and below makes				
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation				
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to				
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concents section, when it refers				
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers				
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that				
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, ne-teach, or just for				
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed.		Standards/	will be present within the learning	
366	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed.	No	Standards/	will be present within the learning	
366	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed.	No	Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document	
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate.	No No	Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document	
366	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1.	No No	Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document	
366	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3Us. P2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 312 rade. Once there, key concepts	No No	Standards/ Organization	will be present within the learning progression document	
366	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K 29.1. A teacher would need to double immo	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/	will be present within the learning progression document	
366	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3Us. P2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 15 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump	No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization (222	will be present within the learning progression document	
366	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K-P21. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade.	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon	
	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3Us. P2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 315 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade.	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 367	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K-P21. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge	No No Yes	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 369	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3Us. P2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 315 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge export as well as a flow neoraction.	No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 367 366 373	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P21. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective.	No Yes No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 367 368 373	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 151 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective.	No No Yes No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 367 366 373	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P21. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science	No Yes No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 367 373	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 315 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not	No No Yes No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 367 366 373	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessalik contained in Chem or Physica	No Yes No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 367 373	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 315 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Tings like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics.	No Yes No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	
366 367 367 373 375 376	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics.	No Yes No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting
366 367 367 373	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 151 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics.	No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting
366 367 367 373 373 374 377 377	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other.	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting
366 367 367 372 376 376	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concept staught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 151 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other.	No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting
366 367 367 373 374 377 377	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, ne-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other.	No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting
366 367 367 372 374 377	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 151 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines [Earth and	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting
366 367 367 373 375 377 377	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, ne-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Look at 3UsP2U.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines [Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ]	No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life
366 367 367 373 374 377 377 377 377	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 15t grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines [Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ]	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 366 373 377 377 377 377 377	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, ne-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and fourso lume around	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 373 374 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 37	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 315 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A tascher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. There seems to be a good flow and the standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. There is a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines [Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ]	No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 368 373 374 377 377 377 388 388 388	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular	No No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 373 374 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 37	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concept staught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 315 grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. They long offlow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines [Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well.	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 368 373 376 377 377 388 388 381	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 3t grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K-P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standard. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well.	No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 369 379 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 37	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concept staught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest howing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. tendsation the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school slangement as well.	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 373 374 377 377 377 387 387	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K-P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standard. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather	No No No No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 375 377 377 377 377 377 387 388	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concept staught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest howing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. tendsation the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school standards a well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standards.	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 368 373 376 377 377 377 388 381 381 381 381 381	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 3t grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K-P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standard. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the ford disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standard.	N0 N0 Yes N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 373 374 377 377 377 377 387 388 388 388	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47: the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Veritical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standard.	No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 368 373 373 376 377 376 377 377 378 381 381 381 381 381	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U1.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U1.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K-P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standard. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standard. The addition of three dimensional learning and cross cutting	N0 N0 Ves N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 373 377 377 377 377 377 387 388 388	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1.1 reacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47: the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a dood flow mand the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standard. The addition of three dimensional learning and cross sutting concepts are a great way to help students get a deep	No No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organizats/ Progression 	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 368 372 373 374 376 377 377 378 381 381 381 381 382 382 382 383	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standard. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Veritical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standard. The addition of three dimensional learning and cross cutting concepts are a great way to help students get a deep understanding of scientific concepts.	No No No No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 373 376 377 377 377 377 377	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, net-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines [Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ] Earth and Space jump around Vertical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school slagment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standard. The addition of three dimensional learning and cross cutting concepts are a great way to help students get a deep understanding of scientific concepts.	No No No No No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 373 373 374 377 377 377 377 377 377 37	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user friendly, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, re-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines (Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. ) Earth and Space jump around Veritical alignment is presented well, along with cross-curricular references into ELA and Math for high school alignment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standard. The addition of three dimensional learning and cross cutting concepts are a great way to help students get a deep understanding of scientific concepts.	No No No No No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document  create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62
366 367 367 373 376 377 377 377 377 377	sense, like the 3-D visual model but it needs more explanation (titles, arrows), needs to be more user finedhy, how to use it to make connections. Under the key concepts section, when it refers to concepts taught in previous grade levels in relationship to that standard, is the purpose for review, net-teach, or just for awareness that the groundwork was laid? Clarification is needed. Overall, they are good and developmental appropriate. Look at 3UsP2U.1. Key concepts suggest including 1.P2U.1. Teacher must look back to 1st grade. Once there, key concepts suggest knowing K.P2.1. A teacher would need to double jump into 2 grade level to fully understand the intentions of 3rd grade. The standards should make sense both from a level of knowledge aspect as well as a flow perspective. I enjoy that there essential and + standards. It doesn't make sense however to put the discipline area in the physical science standards. Things like energy and waves may fit in both and not necessarily contained in Chem or Physics. There seems to be a good flow and the standards seem to build on each other. On page 47- the front introduction of the High school standards, there should be a discussion of the four disciplines [Earth and Space, Biology, Physics, and Math for high school signment as well. The Science Standards are written in a way that is specific rather than vague which makes it easier to teach directly to the standard. The addition of three dimensional learning and cross cutting concepts are a great way to help students get a deep understanding of scientific concepts. The standards are more specific and easy to acress. The standards are more specific and easy to implement.	No No No No No No No No No No No	Standards/ Organization Standards/ Organization/ K12 Progression	will be present within the learning progression document create some kind of grade level vertical alignment for concepts that build upon one another	refer to cross cutting already present: Physical pg. 48, Earth and Space pg. 55, Life Sciences pg. 62

No. thouse states the Add place scales for Scales and Place Scales of Scales and Place Scales in Scales in Scales and Place Scales in Scales and Place Scales in Scales and Place Scales in Scales in Scales and Place Scales in Scales in Scales and Place Scales in Scales						
Image: second		We should restore the ASE (Association for Science Education)				
Image: Contrast and approximation         The image: Contrast and approximation of the contrast and the contrast and the contrast and the contra		standards description of evolution because it is scientifically				
Image: Control of the standard of the standar	408	accurate and appropriate.	Yes	Standards		take it up with Life Science
Inform they should be local and allower of other Coles and a second	410	No major issues	No			
Specific in present         Yes         Model of Second Sec		I think they should be listed in a different order. Cells and				
Image: space of the s		organisms (elements & macromolecules of living organisms)				
Image: Section of the section of t		should come first, then genetics, evolution, & ecosystems.				
At The for a face     So.     So.       At the form of the second process of the form of the	415		Yes	Standards/ Progression		Up to LEAs
No. Second and the second comparison of the data with the data with the second comparison of the data with the second comparison of the data with the second comparison of the data with the	424	They're fine	No			
Image: Control of the standard and metal me		No organizational scheme with please everyone all of the time,				
File the overal expension of the Select Statistics, but having been can be committee signaling the provide both results in a use (Cital) state that we were to and particular as depiction because the statistics as a statistic the statistics is a checkle, rather than ending Signar connections between the meeting? These does not stat the scalar due to the statistics is a checkle by the connections as advise at the file connection meeting? These does not stat the scalar due to the statistics is a checkle by the connections as advise at the file connection meeting? These does not stat the scalar due to the statistics is meeting? These does not stat the scalar due to the statistics is meeting? These does not stat the scalar due to the statistics is meeting? These does not stat the scalar due to the statistics is meeting? These does not stat the scalar due to the statistics is meeting? These does not statistic as a state at the meeting? These does not state scalar due to the statistics is meeting? These does not state scalar due to the statistics is meeting? These does not state scalar due to the statistic new deal for come of them inteach of them to as atter new deal for come of them inteach of them to as atter new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach of them to as atter new deal for come of them inteach and the come states new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for come of them inteach and them the statistic new deal for the new state and them the statistic new deal deal	430	but it was easy to read and find information.	No			
besits of the comparison of the data frame and a set of the data. List of the data frame and the comparison of the data frame and the data frame a		I like the overall organization of the Science Standards, but having				
inclusion by the parameter of the Boy Concept section. It was because the parameter of the Boy Concept section. It was because the destination of the statustic to a section of the statustic to		been on the committee originally responsible for the draft, I am				
ispectically stand that we were to avoid profession by low fits submit to be standing the second s		confused by the appearance of the Key Concepts section. It was				
brittle the transport to use		specifically stated that we were to avoid performance objectives				
deciding, shorter with a making lager connects between the decis, robust prior to be shorter in the shorter of the metricy? These of an exist at the second to bis metricy (the last time is sep reset).         Standardy/ Degidation         With be preset within the learning progression document.           desite         48         Image: Standards at the second at low of a standards of the stand		because that encouraged teachers to use the standards like a				
des. including to compts seems to under the field. Were the second to be meeting (br in sec		checklist, rather than making bigger connections between the				
Image: black added by the convertice as a whole at the find commutes         No         Organization         Will be present within the learning           Image: black added by the commutes and black added by added		ideas. Including key concepts seems to undermine this idea. Were				
meeting? These did not exit at the scored bust meeting the distance of the score of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of the score of the score of the score of the distance of the score of		these added by the committee as a whole at the final committee				
Image: standards         Standards/ bit field bit standards from 'n any bit would allow de organization         Standards/ organization         will be greater util the learning progression document           433         bits field bit the standards are standards from 'n any bit would allow the dist is provided bits field bits and the standards are standards are standards with the dist is provided bits field bits and the standards are standards are standards with the dist is provided bits field bits and the standards are standards are standards with the dist is provided bits field bits fiel		meeting? These did not exist at the second to last meeting (the				
Address     No     Organization     progression document       Address     Desing and metanger of concepts.     No     No		last time I was present).		Standards/	will be present within the learning	
It early test is the standards flow in a way that would allow deep     No.       431 Jubic and massary of corrects.     No.       432 Jubic and The standards exact would allow deep     No.       433 Jubic and the standards exact would allow deep     No.       431 Jubic and the standards exact would allow deep     No.       431 Jubic and the standards are standard from the stand	431		No	Organization	progression document	
Image: State		I don't feel like the standards flow in a way that would allow deep				
Add Degratations fine.     No       Add Degratations fine.     No       Ide how you we the far Concept and how you are we have deal if the how you we the far Concept and how you are a failed we deal if or one of them its stude of the fail statute of the failed we have assuming that means it's perty open ended, but not sure.     No       Add     Add     No       Add Deal of that's very helpful, as is the Toos latement at the how of that's very helpful, as is the Toos latement at the how     No       Add Deal of that's very helpful, as is the Toos latement at the how     No     Ideal of the failed how helpful have how helpful have how the statistic concert is the torthor for the too how the statistic concert is the torthor for how the statistic concert is the how how the how the how the how how how the how	433	thinking and mastery of concepts.	No			
Image: Constraint of the Constraint of Constaint of Constraint on Constraint of Constraint on Constraint on C	435	Easy to read. Please include exact vocabulary required.	No			
I like how you have the Key Concepts and how you can see where the scalading status percensus, Could have be all tiltement detail for some of them stated of refer to standard in the them stated in the them stated of refer to standard in the them stated in the the stated of refer to standard in the them stated in the stated of refer to standard in the them stated in the stated of refer to standard in the them stated in the stated of refer to stated in the state in the stated in the intervent in the stated in the state in the stated in the intervent in the stated in the state in the stated in the intervent in the stated in the state in the stated in the intervent in the stated in the state in the stated in the intervent in the stated in the state in the stated in the intervent in the stated in the state in the stated in the intervent in the stated in the intervent in the state in the stated in the stated in the intervent in the state in the stated in the stated in the intervent in the state in the stated in the stated in the intervent in the state in the stated in the stated in the intervent in the state in the stated in the state in the state in the state in the state in the state in	437	Organization is fine.	No	1		
detail for some of them issued or effect to submit any missed or effec		I like how you have the Key Concepts and how you can see where				
detail for some of them instead or feel to standard m       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard m       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard m     No       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard m     No       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard m     No       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard memory     No       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard concet     No       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard concet     No       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard concet     No       detail for some of them instead or feel to standard concet     No       detail for some of the standard and energe of some of the standard concet     No       detail for some of the standard and energe of some of the standard concet     No       detail for some of the standard and energe of some of the standard concet     No       detail for some of the standard conce<		the scaffolding was taught previously. Could there be a little more				
Addition         Saming that means it's pretty open ended, but not use.         No         Addition           Addition         Addition         No         Addition           Addition         No         Addition         Addition		detail for some of them instead of refer to standard 1'm				
Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.     No     Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.       Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.     No     Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.       Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.     No     Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.       Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.     No     Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.       Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.     No     Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.       Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.     No     Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.       Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.     No     Image: Control of the standards are still a bit confusing.       Image: Control of the standards and feel that they will be easy to be and the still a bit confusing.     No     Image: Confusing are still a bit confusing.       Image: Confusing and and analyst configuration.     No     Image: Configuration and and are still a bit confusing.     No       Image: Configuration and and are still a bit configuration.     No     Image: Configuration and and are still a bit configuration.       Image: Configuration and and are still a bit configuration.     No     Image: Configuration and are still a bit configuration.       Image: Configuratin and and are still a bit configuratin and are still a bi		assuming that means it's pretty open ended, but not sure.				
Additional set of the standards are still bit confusing.     No       The use of dust's very helpful, as it ho cos statement at the No     No       Additional set of the standards are divided by grade level in the Division Dart II block only at K-21.     No       Additional set of the standards are divided by grade level in the Division Dart II block only at K-21.     No       Additional set of the standards are divided by grade level in the Division Dart II block only at K-21.     No       Additional set of the standards are divided by grade level in the Division Dart II block only at K-21.     No       Additional set of the Standards are divided by grade level in the Division Dart II block only at K-21.     No       Additional set of the Standards are divided by grade level in the Division Dart II block only at K-21.     No       Additional set of the Division Dart II block only at K-21.     No       Additional set of the Standards are more detail     No       Additional set of the Standards are more detail     No       Additional set of the standards and for the three with the easy of the standards are more set than previous only intergration. They are unch one age appropriate.     No       Additional and much of the content in a grade level seens and and and are division.     No       Additional and much of the content in a grade level seens and and and on a division.     No       Additional and much of the content in a grade level seens and and and are division.     No       Additional and much and are divided and on a diver and and	449		No			
Image: Sever helpful, as is the focus statement at help     No       Image: Sever helpful, as is the focus statement at helpful and sever helpful and the focus statement at helpful and the focus statement at helpful and the sever helpful and thelpful and the sever helpful and the sever helpful and the s	451	Wording of the standards are still a bit confusing.	No			
Image: Constraint of each grade level.     No       Image: Constraint of like how the standards are divided by grade level and then we are given a breakdown of how the standards constraint in the Distribution Chart (1 looked only if k-2).     No       Image: Constraint of like how the standards are divided by grade level and then we are given breakdown of how the standards constraint in the Distribution Chart (1 looked only if k-2).     No       Image: Constraint of Constrain		The use of charts is very helpful, as is the focus statement at the				
Add     Containing redundant.     No       Image: Second	453	beginning of each grade level.	No			
I very much solike how the standards are divided by grade level and then we are given a breakdown of how the standards connect in the bisthubition Chart (Lioked only at K-2).     No       455     455       460     like how they are detailed and even provide key concepts     No       461     Vood alite to base seen more data (Mod alite to base seen more data)     No       462     Vood alite to base seen more data (Mod alite to base seen more data)     No       463     Observing ander - Entral and Space (Mod alite to base, Seen more data)     No       464     Seense, Eighth grade - Physical seence.     No       464     Seense, Eighth grade - Physical seence.     No       464     Seense, Eighth grade - Physical seence.     No       467     Its previous ones. They are much more age spectropriste.     No       468     Or to tacherts to follow and understand.     No       469     Its be structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy 470     No       473     Its be structure of the standards are level seens random and unrelated making it difficult to textu units.     No       473     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seens random and unrelated making it difficult to textu units.     Prerequisitios for standards are binger.       474     No     Its and are are are are and much of the content in a grade level seens random and unrelated making it difficult to textu units.       474     No	454	Occasionally redundant.	No			
and then we are given a breakdown of how the standards connect in the bistribution Charl (loaded only at k-2).     No       445     460     like how they are detailed and even provide key concepts     No       461     Would like to have seen more detail     No     Image: Constant Con		I very much so like how the standards are divided by grade level				
a     in the Distribution Chart (I looked only at K2).     No       4400     Itike how they are detailed and even provide key concepts     No       4410     Itike how they are detailed and even provide key concepts     No       4411     Would like to have seem more detailed     No       4411     Would like to have seem more detailed     No       4411     So the standards go together     No       4411     So the standards make more     No       4411     Itim an kindegraphic tacker- and these standards make more     No       4411     Itim an kindegraphic tacker- and these standards make more     No       4411     Itim the previous ones. They are much more age appropriate.     No       4421     So the standards and feet that they will be easy in the standards and feet that they will be easy in the standards and feet that they will be easy in the standards and feet that they will be easy in the standards in the standards.     No       4431     They kew a lot of room for interpretation. They also do not allow for tostchers to allow and uncretated making it difficult to test units.     No       4432     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and uncretated making it difficult to test units.     No       4432     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random adve for the new standards are vague and lead     No       4433     Itime this grade. Mout of thant thay key also the advery and revel seem		and then we are given a breakdown of how the standards connect				
455     No     No       466     Would like to have seen more detail     No       461     Would like to have seen more detail     No       463     Stoth grade should be life Science, Seventh grade - Earth and Space     No       464     Science, Eight node the standards go together     No       465     Science, Eight node the standards make more sevent market and these standards make more sevent may a standards make more sevent may a standards make more sevent may a standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards within the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards within the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards within the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards within the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and uncleade making it difficult to text on us.     No       407     They keew a lot of orn for interpretation. They also do not allow to for text or the standards within the standards within the standards that they will be easy to the standards.     No       407     They standard a maxing it difficult to text on us.     No     Precedules for the standards and the context in a grade level seems trandards within the to med fhe new standards are ugue and lead <t< td=""><td></td><td>in the Distribution Chart (I looked only at K-2).</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>		in the Distribution Chart (I looked only at K-2).				
Image: Constraint of the content in a grade level seems randed being where the content in a grade level seems randed being where the content in a grade level seems randed set of the rest standards are ranged level seems random and understands. No     Image: Content in a content in a grade level seems random and range reserve random and understand. No       Image: Content random and range	455		No			
461     Would like to have seem more detail     No       463     Doesn't quite explain how the standards go together     No       464     Skt grade should be life Science, Seventh grade - Earth and Space     No       464     Skt grade should be life Science, Seventh grade - Earth and Space     No       467     Iam a kindergarten teacher and these standards make more sense than previous ones. They are much more age appropriate.     No       467     A67     No     Image: Science, Image:	460	I like how they are detailed and even provide key concepts	No			
463 Doesn't quite explain how the standards or genether     No       463 Doesn't quite explain how the standards or genether     No       464 Science, Eighth grade - Physical science.     No       475 Doesn't quite explain how the standards make more steep starts than previous ones. They are much more age appropriate.     No       476 Doesn't quite explain how the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to the standards and feel that they will be easy to to form of in therpretation. They also do not allow to the costent in a grade level seems random and uncelestands.     No       470 for teachers to follow and undestand.     No     Up to LEAs       473     They (seval difficult to teach units.     Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex, Seitmology is target in the stitt arget allow units.     Prerequisites for standards are reasing.       474     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unceletard making the about earthquakes.     No       474     In the stitt grade, but noting else about earthquakes.     No       475 to interpatation.     No     Present in standards are dispute and the do not indicate what the current format. They would be of more use where the current format. They would be of more use where the current format. They would be of more use where the current format. They would be of more use where the current format. They would be of more use where the standards are dispute and the grade state of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples shoud to be spelled out and include the grade stitt of yout to	461	Would like to have seen more detail	No			
Adda Science, Egine fraged-Physical science.     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and these standards make more sease than previous ones. They are much more age appropriate.     No       Add7     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and these standards make more sease than previous ones. They are much more age appropriate.     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and these standards and feel that they will be easy to follow and understand.     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and these standards and feel that they will be easy to follow and understand.     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and the standards and feel that they will be easy to for teachers to implement unit based instruction.     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and they do not allow for teachers to implement unit based instruction.     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and they do not allow for teachers to implement unit based instruction.     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and they do not indicate what the standards are vague and lead they for teachers to implement units agade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units.     No       Image: A kindergarten teacher and so broad they do not indicate what the standards are vague and lead they follow and understand and order to all and so broad they do not indicate what the standards are vague and lead they exercise the standards and other academic disclines are wordy and not particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the current format. They would be of more use where the current format. They would be of more use where the tall unnecessary key concept's science is sciented to allow	463	Doesn't quite explain how the standards go together	No			
Add Science, Eighth grade - Physical science.     No       I are a kindergarten teacher and these standards make more sense than previous ones. They are much more age appropriat.     No       Add Sp na     No       I like the structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy     No       I like the structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy     No       I like the structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy     No       I like the structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy     No       I reg leave is to for onfo rin therpretation. They also do not allow for teachers to follow and understand.     No       I reg leave is to for standards reg missing. Les Selenology is taget to reachers to standards reg missing. Les Selenology is taget to reachers to standards reg missing. Les Selenology is taget to reacher to the rew standards are vague and lead     No       I reg very broad     No     Present in standards within the diff is expected to be taught.       I reg very broad     No     No       I reg very broad     No     Integration.       I reg very broad     No     Integration.       I would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological fiels of the very throad.     No       I reg very broad     No     Integration.       I reg very broad     No     Integration.       I reg very broad     No     Integration.       I reg very broad     No		Sixth grade should be life Science, Seventh grade - Earth and Space				
I am a kindergarten teacher and these standards make more sense than years on the year much more age appropriate.       No         467       No       I like the structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy at 2010 for teachers to follow and understand.       No         478       They leave alot of room for interpretation. They also do not allow for teachers to implement unit based instruction.       No       Up to LEAs         473       Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units. Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex. Steinnology is taught in the Stir grade, but nothing else about carthquakes.       No       Up to LEAs         474       No       No       present in standards are missing. Ex. Steinnology is taught in the Stir grade, but nothing else about carthquakes.       No       present in standards within the for the regulation.         474       I do not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead to structure the sequected to be taught.       No       Present in standards within the stander due to do not indicate what to interpretation.         476       Interpretation.       No       Interpretation.       No         477       They were officult to read and so throad they do not indicate what to interpretation.       No       Interpretation.         477       They were words due to particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use whore the loogical facts of the seare inclowing the present in biological facts of there	464	Science, Eighth grade- Physical science.	No			
Addition     No     No       Addition     Addition     No       Addition     No     Present in standards within the       Addition     No     No       Addition     No     Present in standards within the       Addition     No     No       Addition     No   <		I am a kindergarten teacher and these standards make more				
1402     NO     No       1403     Ilike the structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy (470) for teachers to follow and understand.     No       1404     They leave a lot of room for interpretation. They also do not allow for teachers to implement unit based instruction.     No       1473     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units. Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex. Seismology is taught in the Bit grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     No       1474     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units. Prerequisites for standards are may and lead At 14     No     Present in standards within the very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units. Prerequisites for standards are may and lead At 25 to interpatation.     No     Present in standards within the No       1474     Ido not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead At 55 to interpatation.     No     No       1477     They were withficult to read and so brad they do not indicate what At 66 is respective to be taught.     No     No       1477     They are very broad     No     No     Image: At 140       1480     theorem and searchards and other academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the At 160 unnecessary key concept's section is currently located.     No       1480     there being only 2	100	sense than previous ones. They are much more age appropriate.				
1400 nd       No       No         11 like the structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy that the standards and understand.       No         11 They leave a lot of room for interpretation. They also do not allow for teachers to implement unit based instruction.       No         11 They leave a lot of room for interpretation. They also do not allow for teachers to implement unit based instruction.       No         11 Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and uncleated making it difficult to teach units.       No         11 Perequisities for standards are missing.       Lip to LEAs         12 Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and uncleated making it difficult to teach units.       Perequisities for standards are missing.         12 Perequisities for standards are missing.       No       Option         13 do not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead       No       Perequisities for standards and so broad they do not indicate what         14 do not think that some of the new standards and other academic disciplines are wordy and on trajectual in their current format. They would be of more use where the       No       No         14 do not for discusted and ther academic disciplines are wordy and on the preticularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the       No       No         14 do not mean standards and other academic disciplines are wordy and on the preticularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the	467		NO			
Inter the structure of the standards and ret that they will be easy     No       4120 for teachers to follow and understand.     No       473     They leave a lot of room for interpretation. They also do not allow for teachers to implement unit based instruction.     No       473     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units. Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex. Seismology is taught in the 8th grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     No       474     On to think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No       474     Io not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No       475     Io interpretation.     No       476     is expected to be taught.     No       477     They are wery broad     No       477     They are wery broad     No       477     They are wery broad     No       478     Line standards and other activity useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the current format. They would be of more use where the current format. They would be of more use where the standards for the grade should not refer you to the standards for the grade should not refer you to the standards for the grade should not refer you to the standards for the grade should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.       1     Very general and so broad the top to the standards and conter for you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced. <td>465</td> <td>na</td> <td>NO</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	465	na	NO			
1/10     Indicates of undow and understand.     No       1     They leve a lot of rom for interpretation. They also do not allow for teachers to implement unit based instruction.     No     Up to LEAs       4/73     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units. Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex. Seismology is sught in the 8th grade, but nothing lese about earthquakes.     No     present in standards within the       4/74     id on ot think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No     present in standards within the       4/75     id not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No     No       1     id on ot think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No     No       1     they were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what drop is expected to be taught.     No     No       4/75     to interpatation.     No     No     No       1     drop is expected to be taught.     No     No       4/76     is expected to be faught.     No     No       1     drop is expected to perform a structury useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the drop would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of drop is expliced on and include the grades that they were introduced.     No     Image: Should be spelefic topic scorered in a standard, the examples should be spelefie torand include the grades that they were introduced. The exa	470	I like the structure of the standards and feel that they will be easy	N			
Interpreter a bit of norm for metry factation. Interpretation. Interpretation. Interpretation.     No     Up to LEAs       473     No     Up to LEAs       473     Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units. Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex. Seismology is taught in the Sth grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     No     present in standards within the fide about earthquakes.       474     No     Present in standards are vague and lead     No       475     to interpatation.     No     Present in standards within the fide about earthquakes.       476     is opected to be taught.     No     No       1     They were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what concepted to be taught.     No     No       2     477     They are very broad     No     No       3     They are very broad     No     No     Interpretation.       481     Uncepts are unrentificated.     No     No     Interpretation.       1     Woold like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of No     No     Interpretation.       2     When giving examples of the specific topic scovered in a standard, the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     No       491     Oh     No     No     Up to LEAs       4	470	The large a lat of your facility statute.	NO			
In reacting of inplement with dated instruction.     No     Up to LEAs       Very general and much of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units. Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex. Seismology is taught in the 8th grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     No     present in standards within the       474     No     No     present in standards within the       475     ido not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead 475 to interpation.     No     present in standards within the       476     No     No     No     No       477     They were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what 476 is expected to be taught.     No     No       477     They are very broad     No     No     No       478     The sections describing links between standards and other academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the 481 unnecessary key concepts' section is currently located.     No     Image: Concepts' section is currently located.       499     Ok     No     Image: Concepts' section is currently located.     No       491     When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out an include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     No     Image: Concept section format include the grades that they were organized fine but they are so broad and can be		for teachers to implement unit baced instruction				
Image: Constraint of the content in a grade level seems random and unrelated making it difficult to teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       Prerequisites for standards are missing. EX. Seismology is taught in the 8th grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     No     Image: Constraint of teach units.       474     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       474     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       474     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       474     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       474     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       474     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       1     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       1     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       1     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.     Image: Constraint of teach units.       1     Image: Constraint		to teachers to implement unit based instruction.	No			Lin to LEAs
Image: Construction of the Content in a grade feed seems         in and unrelated making it difficult to teach units.         Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex. Seismology is taught         in the Sth grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.         474         ido not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead         475 to interpatation.         They were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what         476 texpected to be taught.         No         477 They are very broad         1         478 to interpatation.         No         1         477 They are very broad         No         1         1         477 They are very broad         1         1         1         1         1         1         2         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4         4	473	Very general and much of the content in a grade lovel coome	NO	1		
Intervention and the back instant of the read units.     Preceduists for stratandras are missing. E. X. Seimology is taught in the 8th grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     No     present in standards are missing. E. X. Seimology is taught in the 8th grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     present in standards are missing. E. X. Seimology is taught in the 8th grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     present in standards are missing.       474     i do not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No     present in standards within the 1000 missing.       475     i do not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No     No       476     is expected to be taught.     No     No       477     They are very broad     No     No       477     They are very broad     No     No       477     They are very broad     No     No       478     the section describing links between standards and other academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the biological facts of     No       481     uncecssary key concepts' section is currently located.     No     No       493     Ok     No     No     No       491     Ok     No     No     No       492     Ok     No     No     No       493     Other being only 2 genders. Male and female.     No     No		random and unrelated making it difficult to toach units				
In the equation is station to a terms and ensage. Location by the length in the Bit grade, but nothing else about earthquakes.     No     present in standards within the present in standards within the id on ort think that some of the new standards are vague and lead A75 to interpatation.     No     present in standards within the No       Image: Image		Prerequisites for standards are missing. Ex Seismology is taught				
In the outgrade, out iteming ese avoid earinguates.     No     present in standards within the       ido not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No     no     no       475     to interpatation.     No     no     no       They were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what     No     no     no       476     to interpatation.     No     no     no       477     They are endificult to read and so broad they do not indicate what     No     no     no       477     They are very broad     No     no     no     no       477     They are very broad     No     no     no     no       1     The sections describing links between standards and other     academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their     no     no       1     unnecessary key concepts' section is currently located.     No     no     no       1     would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of     No     no     no       1     would like to see an inclusion the reader shart     No     no     no       491     Ok     No     no     no     no       492     No     no     no     no       492     No     no     no     no       492		in the 8th grade, but nothing also about earthquaker.				
ido not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead     No     Present in standards within the       475     to interpatation.     No     No       They were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what     No     No       476     is expected to be taught.     No       477     They are very broad     No       The sections describing links between standards and other     No       academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their     No       current format. They would be of more use where the     No       481 unnecessary key concepts' section is currently located.     No       Very difficult of the sea on inclusion that pushes the biological facts of     No       491     Ok     No       When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     No       492     They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what     Up to LEAs	47/	in the out grade, but nothing else about eartiquakes.	No			present in standards within the "natural disasters"
Image: Construct and a state of the relation of the part of the state of the part of the state of the sta	47-	i do not think that some of the new standards are vague and lead		1		
They were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what       No         477       They are very broad       No         They are very broad       No         academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the       No         481       unnecessary 'key concepts' section is currently located.       No         I would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of       No         492       No       No         When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.       No         492       No       No         Up to LEAs       No       Up to LEAs	475	to internatation.	No			
1     1 <td>4/3</td> <td>They were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	4/3	They were difficult to read and so broad they do not indicate what				
477 They are very broad     No       The sections describing links between standards and other academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the 481 unnecessary key concept's section is currently located.     No       I would like to see an inclusion that purches the biological facts of 489 there being only 2 genders. Male and female.     No       491 Ok     No       492 Ok     No       When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.       492     No       Up to LEAs	476	is expected to be taught.	No			
The sections describing links between standards and other academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the 481 unnecessary 'key concepts' section is currently located. No     No       I would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of 489 there being only 2 genders. Male and female. No     No       When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced. 492     No       Up to LEAs     No	477	They are very broad	No			
academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their current format. They would be of more use where the 481 unnecessary key concept's section is currently located. No     No       I would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of 489 there being only 2 genders. Male and female. 491 Ok     No       When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced. 492     No       Hey are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what     No		The sections describing links between standards and other				
current format. They would be of more use where the 481 unnecessary key concept's section is currently located. I would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of 489 there being only 2 genders. Male and female. 491 Ok     No       491 Ok     No       491 Ok     No       492 When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.       492     No       They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what		academic disciplines are wordy and not particularly useful in their				
481     unnecessary 'key concepts' section is currently located.     No       I would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of 489 there being only 2 genders. Male and female.     No       491     Ok     No       491     Ok     No       491     When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     No       492     They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what     No		current format. They would be of more use where the				
I would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of 489 there being only 2 genders. Male and female.     No       491 Ok     No       When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     No       492     No     Up to LEAs	481	unnecessary 'key concepts' section is currently located.	No			
489     there being only 2 genders. Male and female.     No       491     Ok     No       When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     Volume       492     No     Up to LEAs		I would like to see an inclusion that pushes the biological facts of				
491 Ok     No       When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     No       492     Hey are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what     Up to LEAs	489	there being only 2 genders. Male and female.	No			
When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard, the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     Up to LEAs       492     No     Up to LEAs       They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what     Image: Comparison of the grade where the topic was introduced.	491	Ok	No			
the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced. No Up to LEAs They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what		When giving examples of the specific topics covered in a standard.				
they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     No     Up to LEAs       492     They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what     Up to LEAs		the examples should be spelled out and include the grades that				
standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.     No     Up to LEAs       492     They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what     Up to LEAs		they were introduced. The examples should not refer you to the				
492         No         Up to LEAs           They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what         Up to LEAs		standards for the grade where the topic was introduced.				
They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what	492		No			Up to LEAs
interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what		They are organized fine but they are so broad and can be				
		interpreted in many different ways. It's hard to know exactly what				
497 the standard is looking for No	497	the standard is looking for	No			

		I like how it is broken into different types of sciences. However, I				
		feel like there could be more explanation in some.				
	502		No			
		I like how it is organized by grade level and what the main focus is.				
	510		No			
		The standards are organized in a way that is easy to read and				
	512	understand.	No			
		The connection to student initiated higher thinking is great.				
	513		No			
		The organizational table made it easy to read each standard.				
	514		No			
		These are so similar to the NGSS standards. I can not understand				
		why Arizona funds such costly practices as rewriting CC and NGSS				
		standards, rather than just adopt a well researched, national				
	515	standard set.	No			
		I like the break down of affiliated terms with each topic. I would				
	516	like to see resource suggestions.	No			Up to LEAs
		I think this reorganization is detrimental to the education of				
		middle school science. The way in which these standards has been				
		grouped not only goes against the old standards but the current				
		next generation science standards, by choosing to ignore both and				
		create your own mess of a plan it is going to cause student gaps in				
		science content knowledge and ultimately be yet another barrier				
		that Arizona students are going to have to overcome. If you are				
		going to rearrange the standards either organize them based on				
		life, physical, earth or follow the guide of the next generation				
		science standards, and states that have successfully implemented				
		the standards ranking high educationally.				
	518		No			
		They are easier to read and understand than the previous				
	519	standards.	No			
	527	n/a	No			
		The organization of the standards are easy to read. Looking at the				
		essential vs plus standards for high school. I believe the				
		organization between what is essential and what is a Plus			within the progression of the standard,	format showed by Brea laid this out in a more coherent
	528	standard may need some adjustment	Yes	Organization	include previously built upon concepts	manner
		Standards are organized. I don't agree with grade level choice for				
	529	certain standards.	No			
		Too Many columns. Why are there the key concepts? This is not		Standards/	will be present within the learning	
	530	what was sent to ADE at the end of revisions	No	Organization	progression document	
		I like the way they're connected to other standards in an easy-to-				
	541	read chart.	No			
	550	Perfect	No			
	551	No comment.	No			
		The Science Standards are organized but it seems that the state is				
		removing chemistry classes and physics classes to create one				
	564	chem/phy class.	Yes			Up to LEAs
		The science standards are sufficient as they are. They should		1		
		never be amended such that the fact that evolution is a scientific				
	1000	ract and a bedrock for modern viology to stop being taught to	Ne	1		
	1000	children.	NU			
		I ney re missing key scientific language crucial to a fundamental		1		
	1001	understanding of biology and, by extension, the entirety of the	Ne	1		
	1001	Diological sciences.	NU			
		scientific standards should be based on scientific research and		1		
		nothing else. Replacing and watering down the proven science of		1		
		evolution is a disservice to our kids, a disservice to our teachers,				
		and a disservice to our educational body. STOP TRYING TO ERASE				
	1002	SCIENCE WITH YOUR PERSONAL RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.	Ne	1		
[	1002		NO			
	T003	Urganization is adequate.	NO			

		The science standards before editing were clear and concise, and				
		shawed as understanding of what makes as estimately advertise				
		showed an understanding of what makes an actionable education				
		goal. During the editing process an extra column was added to				
		each table of standards which consists of lists of terms. For				
		example, under space and science standards the following was				
		example, under space and science standards the following was				
		added: Weather, seasons, weather patterns, sun, temperature,				
		thermometer, clouds, types of precipitation. These lists are not				
		actionable goals but simply a bodgepodge of somewhat related				
		actionable goals but simply a nougepouge of somewhat related				
		terms. Further, sever guidelines were changed from being specific				
		and actionable to being vague to the point of being unhelpful to				
		teacher. For example: Investigate the properties of earth				
		teacher. For example, investigate the properties of earth				
		materials, design and evaluate suitable habitats for organisms				
		using earthmaterials, was changed to Obtain, evaluate, and				
		communicate information about the properties of earth materials				
		communicate information about the properties of earth materials.				
		The former has clear goals that suggests lesson plans: students				
		will explore the composition of different terrestrial environment				
		and evaluate whether and how they can support life. The latter is				
		and craitable whether and now arey can support mer the latter is				
		vague and suggests no specific lesson other than students do				
		something related to earth materials .				
	1			Standards/	will be present within the learning	
				Standarday	will be present within the realining	
	1004		NO	Organization	progression document	
	1	Too much 'eduspeak' & I needed more caffeine to get me through		1	1	
	1005	the whole document	No			
	1	The science standards create ways of avoiding teaching evolution	1	1		
		The science standards create ways of avoluing teaching evolution.			1	
	1006		NO			
	1	I believe all children should learn the effects fossil fuels have on			1	
1	1007	the environment.	No		1	
	1000	They are very well organized	No	1		
	1008	nicy are very well organized.	110			
1	1	Having everything relate back to the original 14 core concepts is a			1	
1	1	good overall organizational concept, but after that the language			1	
		and organization seems more vague and less concrete than in the				
	4000	and organization seems more vague and less concrete than in the				
	1009	2004/05 standards	NO			
		Please note that this is a continuation of my review. The system				
		gave a warning that I had only a few minutes left and advised me				
		to save. Thave not seen a save button, so am continuing this				
		where I left off with specific grade level comments. This was				
		already included. As a member of the Standards Committee. I am				
		anath, anather and with what was done in a slound assessment, ith sub				
		greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without				
		the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the				
		MAJOR changes and deletions made.				
	1010		No			
	1010	<ul> <li>A state of the second se</li></ul>				
		Evolution is the standard accepted by scientists. These are				
		scientific textbooks, maybe they should represent the best				
		knowledge we have today and not the dumbed down version the				
	1011					
	1011	creationists want to force upon us.	NO			
	1012	evolution defined and taught incorrectly	No			
	1013	It appears to be organized.	No			
	1	Light green font color shows noorly-should use a dark color like	1			
1	1	Shows pool with the store and	1	1	1	
	1	navy plur for edits.Key concepts listing of science standards often			1	
1	1	references science standardsconfusing, possibly circularto what		Standards/	will be present within the learning	
	1014	is a reader expected to refer?	No	Organization	progression document	
		The organization is fine, though I don't love that Physics and				
	1	Chemister are mined together when the other distribution is			1	
	1	chemistry are mixed together when the other disciplines have			1	
	1015	their own sections.	Yes	1	1	Up to LEAs
		In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall				
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout.	No			
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout.	No			
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of	No			
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the	No			
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional	No			
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of relizion in onullis schools	No			
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.	No	Standards (Contort		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.	No	Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism	No	Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the	No	Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution	No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution.	No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically	No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution, from the standards.	No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution, from the standards.	No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016 1017 1018 1019	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution, from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of	No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016 1017 1018 1019	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution, from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of	No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1015	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution, from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism it's not a science but a religion belief. This	No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution, from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism it's not a science but a religion belief. This is a science class, and science is what should taught.	No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution, from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism it's not a science but a religion belief. This is a science class, and science is what should taught.	No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content		
	1016 1017 1018 1019 1020	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution , from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism; and the weaking of the teaching of s a science class, and science is what should taught. Well organized	No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Positive		
	1016 1017 1018 1019 1019 1020 1021	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution , from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism it's not a science but a religion belief. This is a science class, and science is what should taught. Well organized	No No No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Positive		
	1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution , from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism It's not a science but a religion belief. This is a science class, and science is what should taught. Well organized I think the move to teach the periodic table in 6th is a good move	No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Positive		
	1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1021 1021	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution , from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism it's not a science but a religion belief. This is a science class, and science is what should taught. Well organized I think the move to teach the periodic table in 6th is a good move	No No No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Positive Positive		
	1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution , from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism It's not a science but a religion belief. This is a science class, and science is what should taught. Well organized I think the move to teach the periodic table in 6th is a good move Generally well organized but the changes regarding dogmatic	No No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Positive Positive		
	1016 1017 1018 1019 1019 1020 1021	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution , from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism it's not a science but a religion belief. This is a science class, and science is what should taught. Well organized I think the move to teach the periodic table in 6th is a good move Generally well organized but the changes regarding dogmatic evolution.	No No No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Ositive Positive Positive		
	1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022	In general, these are easy to read and I like the overall organization and layout. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the scientific fact of evolution It is wrong to miseducate our children & remove scientifically proven information, in particular evolution , from the standards. The inclusion of creationism, and the weaking of the teaching of evolution. Creationism It's not a science but a religion belief. This is a science class, and science is what should taught. Well organized I think the move to teach the periodic table in 6th is a good move Generally well organized but the changes regarding dogmatic evolutionism are a welcome change - LONG OVERDUE	No No No No	Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Standards/Content Positive Positive Standards/ Content		

				T		
		Diving instruction on different forces into different grades is less				
		biving instruction on unreferences into unreference grades is less				
1 1		efficient and prevents the ability to look at the foundational role of				
1		forces one significant problem comes from students				
		forees, one significant problem comes nom stadents				
		understanding the difference between mass and weight. The				
		further dividing of energy into different grades threatens mastery				
		further annuling of energy into an ereine grades en eateris mastery.				
		A deep understanding of the idea that work is the transfer of.				
		Energy and energy is the ability to do work assumes a				
1 1		Energy and energy is the ability to do work assumes a				
		foundational understanding of forces. Presenting kinetic energy				
		(1/2mvA2) in 6th grade will present a significant math barrier to				
1 1		(1/211V-2) In our grade will present a significant math barrier to				
		comparing stored energy to the energy of motion. The standards				
1 1		also lack a focus on the fact that all matter has properties. It is				
		also lack a locus on the lact that an matter has properties. It is				
		these properties that differentiate types of matter and link matter				
		to have use them to call a problems Chaminal hand to see				
		to now we use them to solve problems.chemical bond types				
		should remain in high school because the difference between				
		an infant and insis bands is bath while and anofar ad and ensures				
		covalent and ionic bonds is both subtle and protound and requires				
		a sophisticated understanding of subatomic particles and the				
		organization of the Periodic Table				
		organization of the Periodic Table.				
	1024		No	Standards/Content		Kinetic theory is presented in 6th grade without the mathematical
	1024		NO	Standards/Content		Kinede theory is presented in our grade without the mathematical i
		They are organized by grade and topic, then detail the learning				
	1025	objective Great	No	Bocitivo		
	1025	objective. Great.	NO	Positive		
		Some of the changed wording makes less sense that the previous	1	1		
		version and is confusing to understand. This appears to be in	1	1	1	
		version and is confusing to understand. This appears to be, in	1	1	1	
		some cases, a way to remove teaching some concepts.	1	1		
	1000		No	Negative	1	
	1026	2	INU	wegative		
	1027	This is not the issue.	No	Positive		
		The spiraling of concepts across mode lough helps study of	1	1		
		The spinaling of concepts across grade levels nelps students	1	1	1	
	1028	deepen understandings over time.	No	Positive		
	1000	The organization is excellent	No	Bositivo		
	1029	The organization is excellent.	NO	Positive		
T	1030	I have no objection to the general layout of topics	No	Positive		
		The standards do not a float the med of the order to the				
		The stanuarus up not reflect the work of the educators who	1	1		
	1031	worked for over a year to develop	No	Negative		
	1022	Only SCIENCE in Science along	No			
	1032	Uniy SLIENCE IN Science class!	NU			
	1033	Adequate	No	Positive		
		terespected.				
		Intelligent design is not science keep religion out of public schools				
	1034		No	Standards		
		The second offers of the second second second second second				
		The organization of the science standards gave a clear				
		presentation of the standards being put forth. They were well				
		presentation of the standards being particitin mey were wen				
	1035	done and easy to follow.	No	Positive		
		Properly tailored to the level of instruction at each grade level				
	4000	in openy tanorea to the level of hist action at each grade level.				
	1036	1	No	Positive		
		Listing the individual concents to be mastered by code, in the				
		Listing the individual concepts to be mastered by code in the				
	103/	cross reference chart is VERY confusing!!!!	No	Negative		
		Those writing these standards should be experts in science and/or				
		mose writing these standards should be experts in science and/or				
		education. At a minimum they should understand what the word				
		THEORY means in scientific terms Eq. Evolution is a confirmed				
		incontraneans in scientine termisteg. Evolution is a commed				
		scientic theory and understanding modern biology agriculture				
		selenne theory and anderstanding modern biology, agriculture,				
		genetics and human development is impossible without reference				
		genetics and human development is impossible without reference				
		genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory				
	1038	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory	No	Standards		
	1038	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory	No	Standards		
	1038	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science	No	Standards		
	1038	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail I marked	No	Standards		
	1038	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked	No	Standards		
	1038	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them In detail. It marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent	No	Standards		
	1038	spentics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific promest is to romfixing and	No	Standards		
	1038	I didn't intend your advantage of the state	No	Standards		
	1038	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content.	No	Standards		
	1038	section and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verblage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content.	No	Standards Standards		
	1038	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content.	No	Standards		
	1038 1039 1040	Sector of the se	No No	Standards Standards No		
	1038 	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standard Scommittee. I am greatly renergend	No No No	Standards Standards No		
	1038 1039 1040	I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with who thus done in a clean document the process.	No	Standards Standards No		
	1038 1039 1040	section and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verblage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original	No No No	Standards Standards No		
	1038 1039 1040	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the intelligent Design verbiage; since intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR	No No	Standards Standards No		
	1038 1039 1040	I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science spentics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verblage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the orginal Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR	No	Standards Standards No		
	1038 1039 1040	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made.	No No No	Standards Standards No Negative		
	1038 	sentices and human development is impossible without reference     to that established theory     ididn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science     Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked     Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verblage; since Intelligent     Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and     would affect the organization of the content.     Too much information presented in too little detail     As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned     with what was done in a closed process without the orginal     Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR     changes and deletions made.	No	Standards Standards No Negative		
	1038 1039 1040 1041	section of the standard section of the section of t	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1041	senetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same.	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1041	I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science spentics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verblage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. I non much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same.	No No No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042	senetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same.	No No No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standard since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042	section and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstition in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or areadiv restrict the	No No No No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards		
	1038 	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstitution in the form of intelligent design; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042	section of the standard section of the section of t	No No No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042	seentics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstition in the form of Intelligent design; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043	senetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standard's since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standard's Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories.	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043	seemics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR Changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories.	No No No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstituin in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among Competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them.	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1043	section of your and the section of t	No No No No No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1043	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstition in the form of intelligent desire. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1044	senetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them.	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1041 1043 1043 1044	seemics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR Changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstition in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects.	No No No No No No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1044	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstition in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standard's since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standard's Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects.	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045	seentics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent desiry; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. The draft is nonrigorous to the point of absurdity. Your religious Iobbysts are trying to manufacture doubt where no doubt	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045	senetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among icompeting theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. Ibed yrists are trying to manufacture doubt where no doubt	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045	seemets and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. The drift is nonrigorous to the point of absurdity. Your religious torebibly exists, Instead of encouraging students to doubt credibly exists.	No No No No No No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1044	senetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstition in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. The draft is noningroous to the point of absurdity. Your religious lobbyists are trying to manufacture doubt where no doubt credibly exists. Instead of encouraging students to doubt evolution, why don't you ask yourselves if you to doubt	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standard's since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standard's Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. The draft is nonrigorous to the point of absurdity. Your religious lobbyists are trying to manufacture glowalt where to doubt evolution, why don't you ask yourselves if you have ever doubted the existence of God or an all powerful intellinent creatrr. Who's	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1043 1044 1045	seemics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstition in the form of intelligent design; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. The draft is nonfigorous to the point of absurdity. Your religious lobyists are trying to manufacture doubt where no doubt credibly exists. Instead of encouraging students to doubt evolution, why don't you asky vourselves if you have ever doubted the existence of God or an all-powerful intelligent creator. Who's close methed encou	N0	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Negative Standards Standards Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045	senetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among icompeting theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. The draft is nonrigorous to the point of absurdity. Your religious lobbyits are trying to manufacture doubt where no doubt evolution, why don't you ask yourselves if you have ever doubted the existence of God or an all-powerful intelligent creator. Who's close-minded now?	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Standards Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1043 1043 1044 1045 1045	seemet before and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAIOR Changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious supersition in the form of intelligent design; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. The draft is nonrigent to disputify. Your religious Idby exists. Instead of encouraging students to doubt evolution, why don't you ask yourselves if you have ever doubted the existence of God or an all-powerful intelligent treator. Who's close-minded now? Written by professional science educators.	N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0 N0	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Standards Standards Standards		
	1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1044 1045	genetics and human development is impossible without reference to that established theory I didn't intend to comment on the organization of the Science Standards since I haven't examined them in detail. I marked Disagree due to the Intelligent Design verbiage; since Intelligent Design doesn't follow the scientific process it is confusing, and would affect the organization of the content. Too much information presented in too little detail As a member of the Standards Committee, I am greatly concerned with what was done in a closed process without the original Committee having the opportunity to comment on the MAJOR changes and deletions made. Keep religion out of public schools, not every family believes the same. The science standards are deliberately organized to require science teachers to include religious superstitution in the form of intelligent design ; they also eliminate or greatly restrict the mention of evolution and downgrade it to just a theory among Competing theories. They are organized in such a way that it's hard to understand them. Standards are based upon false hypotheses, as such this connotes agreement upon other subjects. The draft is noningrorus to the point of absurdity. Your religious lobbyists are trying to manufacture doubt where no doubt credibly exists. Instead of encouraging students to doubt evolution, why don't you aky yourselves if you have ever doubted the existence of God or an all-powerful intelligent creator. Who's close-minded now?	No	Standards Standards No Negative Standards Stan		

	1049	It can't be organized if it is missing tonics	No	Negative		
	1045	Stop to ignore dony areas crientific fact, evolution from	110	negutive		
	1050	stop trying to ignore, deny, erase scientific fact - evolution, nom		and the family is a		
	1050	the curriculum.	No	Standards/ Curriculum		
	1051	I am concerned about the content.				
	1052	No opinion on this.				
		Get rid of all references of Intelligent Design. Return the term				
		evolution and evolve to the standards. Research the background				
		influence of 'Intelligent Design' and you will see that this does not				
	1053	belong in public education				
		It was difficult atfollow the connections between grades levels and				
	1054	how the learning progress from K 12				
	1034					
		The 3-dimensions of science structure figure emphasizes the				
		most ambiguous and general concept, knowing science and using				
		science, over the specifics of the standards. Furthermore, the				
		figure makes no attempt to illustrate how each standard is linked,				
		other than it relates in some way to knowing and using science.				
		Representations of models are more important than the text for				
		communicating multi-dimensional concepts. This figure should				
		show (1) what the standards are (2) how standards interact and				
		(3) how each standard will be emphasized at each grade level				
		(5) now each standard will be emphasized at each grade level.				
	1055					
	1055					
1		Evolution is a fact. It is unconstitutional to inject religious beliefs	1			
	1056	in public school curriculum.				
		With the exception of the key concepts column, there is a clear				
		emphasis on using current science education research. The key				
		concepts should be removed from this document; any extra				
		supports should guide educator understanding of the standards in				
		the context of the 3D Framework				
	1057	the context of the 50 framework.				
	1037	The law encode detroit from a factor of the standards. There is a				
		The key concepts detract from a focus on the standards. There is a				
		need to improve the progression from grade level to grade level,				
		ensuring that students are learning new content each year not re-				
		learning concepts from previous years.				
	1058					
		The physical structure of the document is user friendly and				
		consistent in layout, but it is not laid out to support an				
		understanding of the progression of the concents addressed . Key				
		understanding of the progression of the concepts addressed. Key				
	1050	concepts to include section is not neipiul as they detract from the				
	1059	standards.				
		The document flows from topic to topic and is consistent.				
	1060	Unfortunately, the standards lack				
	1061	I found it very easy to follow and understand.				
	1062	Easy enough to read.				
	1063	Less specific				
		They are worded with excessive unnecessary jargon. The essential				
	1064	information is difficult to interpret.				
		The draft standards attempt to produce 3D learning, similar to				
		how the NGES intertwines cross cutting concents, dissiplinary core				
		ideas, and scientific practices. But there are two problems with				
		ideas, and scientific practices. But there are two problems with				
		the way that the draft AZ standards attempt to do this. First, the				
1		crosscutting concepts, disciplinary core ideas and scientific	1			
		practices are not intertwined. Instead, practices and core ideas				
		are merged and then clustered around cross-cutting concepts,				
1		which produces strange clumpings that at times seem forced and	1			
		at other times leave out important connections across grade				
1		levels. For example, patterns are addressed in first grade and fifth	1			
1		grade, but not first, second, third, and fourth grade. As a cross-	1			
		cutting concept, patterns should be made evident at all grade				
1		levels in all content areas. The second problem is the seconingly	1			
1		arbitrany merging of the practices and the core ideas. When are the	1			
		an one any merging of the practices and the core fuelds. Why afen t				
		the core ideas merged with all of the practices? It seems that				
1		students should learn how to ask questions, plan and conduct	1			
1		investigations, develop and use models, use mathematical and	1			
		computational thinking, construct explanations, engage in				
1		arguments from evidence, and obtains, evaluate, and	1			
1		communicate information related to all of the core ideas. This last	1			
1		issue is a problem with the NGSS too.	1			
1			1			
1	1005		1			
	1005	The new stored and encould fellow the format of the North			1	
		The new standards generally follow the format of the Next	1			
1		Generation Science Standards, which are fairly well-organized.	1			
	1066	However, key factors are missing (see below).				
		I appreciate the organization that the committee put together.				
	1067		L		<u> </u>	
		Organization and readability are not what I am concerned about. It				
1		is the content that matters and the content of these standards is	1			
	1000	very concerning				
	1008	tery concerning.		1		1

	I like to cross-cutting relationships and connection to other			
	standards. The science and engineering practices are well done,			
	similar to the 8 common core math practices. The fourteen big			
	ideas are well formulated. It looks like you took information from			
	various other standards and consolidated them well.			
1069				
	The organization of the standards follows the logical template of			
1070	the Framework for K-12 Science Education.			
	I believe it would serve the children of AZ better if we would just			
1071	adopt the Next Generation Science Standards.			
	The sheer willful ignorance of removing Evolution from the			
	curriculum is mind bogling. It would put Az students at a vast			
	disadvantage when moving to higher education. If the			
	superintendent's intention is to replace evolutionary theory with			
	intelligent design she should be removed from office and barred			
1070	from working in education for life. Do jot do this.			
10/2				
	ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Regular Board Meeting,			
	August 24, 20151535 W. Jefferson, Conf Room 122, Phoenix,			
	Arizona 8500/SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIONMEMBERS			
	PRESENT:Dr. CrowMr. SchmidtSuperintendent Douglas Ms.			
	Hamiltonivir. TaylorDr. Kottwellerivir. Carter Mr. Jacks Vice			
	President BallantynePresident Miller MEMBERS ABSENT:Mr.			
	DescheneCALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, MOMENT OF			
	SILENCE, AND ROLL CALLWeeting called to order at 9:00			
	amPledge of Allegiance, Moment of Silence andRoll Call confirmed			
	a quorumitem 1A au President s Report Lavested Appointment			
	of Carol LippertRecorded comments are available (Part			
	1/00:01:58)President Miller announced Carol Lippert's			
	appointment to WestEd.Item 1B a€" Superintendent's			
	Report1.Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and			
	Science Teaching (PAEMST) 〢™arni Landry, Paradise Valley High			
	Schoola@CShannon Mann, Osborn Middle School2.2015 CIO 100			
	Awardat CaMark Masterson Recorded comments are available (Part			
	1/00:02:21) Superintendent Douglas presented awards as listed			
	on the agenda. Item 1C a€" Board Member ReportRecorded			
	comments are available (Part 1/00:10:25)Amy Hamilton gave an			
	update to the Board regarding the Teacher Principle Evaluation			
	Task Force.Jared Taylor gave an update on the Arizona Standard			
	Development Committee.Executive Director Christine Thompson			
	gave an update and spoke to Board members regarding the			
	Standard Development Committee.Item 1D â€" Executive			
	Director's ReportRecorded comments are available. (Part			
1073	1/00:16:08)No report.A.Consideration to approve the following			
	The standards should be organized around big ideas of content,			
	practice, and cross-cutting concepts in alignment with NGSS. The			
	Superintendent's edits to the standards have transformed the			
	document from standards to lists of disconnected facts and			
	factoids that are scientifically incorrect.			
1074				
	Recent changes made by the ADE make the standards confusing			
1075				
	They seem to be absurdly complex. Could probably be			
	streamlined a lot. My impression is that they go into unnecessary			
1076	detail.			
	The inclusion of Key Concepts was probably an attempt to clarify			
	some ideas, but in reality it added an unnecessary layer of			
1077	confusion.			
10/8	UK			
	The Standards are clear and easy to read. Thank you for the effort			
1079	spent!			
	Detailed, generally well-organized. I only hope that teachers will			
	be able to translate the content into meaningful teaching			
1080	activities.			
1081	Well done.			
	i up consider the structure of core ideas, practices, and			
	crosscutting concepts as enective, but they become diluted with			
	the use of the big local document, and are further complicated			
	by what seems like a somewhat random and topical assortment of			
	examples/ key concepts that are given in the right hand column			
1000	or the standards document.			
1082	1. There is lock of clarity between the way of kick asked as the state			
	1. There is tack of clarity between the use of high school and high			
	school plus. 2. The Key concepts column creates contusion by			
	instructure exactly what should be taught. It is more akin to			
1000	curriculum, not a guiding standard.3. I don't know why these are			
1083	connected to AZ nealth standards.			
	nowever, they have been changed so that they intentionally strive			
	to wisceab and do not represent TRUE science.			
1084	1		1	I

	1095 5				
	1065 Seems good.				
	I object to the idea that intelligent design is interchangeable with				
	1086 evolution.				
	1087 Original language should remain				
	1088 They should not be changed.				
	Science Standards should be as the scientific community				
	understands them ReWriting science standards to include				
	theories that are not theories and magnetic currents are just				
	theories that are not theories and magnetic currents are just				
	wrong. Let people who are in the science field decide what is				
	appropriate and what is theory - and lets not teach quackery.				
	1089				
	This depends on who they are written for. I found a great deal of				
	1090 repetition, and unnecessary verbiage.				
	The removal of the term evolution from the DRAFT submitted by				
	the qualified educators makes the DRAFT Science Standards less				
	1091 easy to read.				
	These standards seem thorough with the exceptions of the life-				
	1092 science sections				
	Intelligent Design / creationism are untested / unprovable Ideas				
	Tetellu selicicus in neture Ne scientific rices to heal them un				
	Totally religious in nature No scientific rigor to back them up.				
	Doesn't mean they can't be discussed but science is a provable				
	1093 topic				
	1094 Teach evolution. Evolution is science.				
1	The standards list is incomplete and moot without evolution.				
	1095				
1	1096 Too much educational jargon.				
1	Reasonably easy to follow and read. However. I refer you to the				
	letter sent to you by the Association for Science Education (u.k.):				
	https://psso.com/filos/ASE_lotter_to_Arizona.pdf				
	1007				
	1097				
	If the state allows teaching creationism, they will also have to				
	teach other religion's creation myths, such as Hopi, Navajo,				
	Tohono OOdham, etc. For example, in the Maya creation myth,				
	1098 humans are created out of corn.				
	I read the document and I cannot believe the wording regarding				
	evolution has been deleted. This act is completely absurd and the				
	people behind this change should either go to school and learn				
	hasic biology and the method of science				
	1099				
	New standards are not specific enough and are too open ended				
	new standards are not specific enough and are too open ended,				
	particularly for first year and new teachers. Trainings should be				
	administered from AZ Dept of Ed if they are to be taught correctly				
	1100 in my opinion.				
	The organization is easy to follow, however the reason behind				
	why each standard was chosen for 7th grade science is not				
	1101 effectively represented.				
	A clear progression, and rigor of requirements is not obvious.				
	1102				
	The linear format of the grade levels and what will be addressed is				
	helpful. The standards are not measurable though. They allow the				
	nespital the standards are not measurable chough. They allow the				
	possibility of students to come out knowing nothing of something.				
	Granted, standards act as an outline for the general purpose of				
	the rest of the document. The document is redundant almost like	1			
	someone copy and pasted each grade level and just changed a				
1	couple things. They are repetitive. I think a shorter format would				
	be in order so that teachers felt like it was worth their time to				
	read it.	1			
	1103				
	I find them somewhat hard to read, but am not sure there is a				
1	1104 better approach				
	They repeated themselves a lot. There were spacing errors and				
1	1105 the grammar was not up to spuff				
H	1106 Organization secure along and well laid aut				
	Cuplotice should be taught should be tau				
1	Evolution should be taught, clearly, in our schools. Anything				
	otherwise is a violation of the separation of church and state.				
	1107				
	I have no problem with the organization, but the actual standards				
	1108 concern me.			<u> </u>	
	The standards are neatly organized but slanted inappropriately to				
1	favor religious opinion as equal to scientific process.				
	1109	1			
	1110 The content was presented in a logical manner				
1	1110 me content was presented in a logical manner	1	1		1

			Standards in general are challenging for a novice to follow.			
			Arizona's original standards, and the current draft, are no			
			exception. I have concerns that some of the topics are poorly			
			defined, based on the intensity with which they should be			
			included in the curriculum. Nevertheless, it the standards are not			
			unusually difficult to unpack in terms of improving the format, the			
			single greatest recommendation I would make in this vein is to			
			orient the formatting vertically, so it may be read in the ordinary			
			manner. The frequent use of herizontal tables in many state			
			standarda (including both the prining) and droft standards) is			
			standards (including both the original and drait standards) is			
		1111	puzzing and hinders legionity.			
ł		1111	ul. P			
ł		1112	It's fine.			
			The standards are not written in language accessible to many			
ł		1113	parents; a college education seems required.			
			They should be collected more sensibly based on classes that are			
ļ		1114	taught.			
			There are a lot of sections. Some are the actual standards, some			
			are instructional notes, some are concept notes. Please at least			
			add a table of contents. Also please provide options to access			
			standards by grade level as well as by Physical / Earth & Space /			
ļ		1115	Life.			
			Regarding physical sciences, organization and ease of reading are			
l		1116	fine, but that is not the problem.			
			Alignment of core ideas across grade levels helps readers see how			
			standards are connected and progress. Interesting choice to focus			
			grade-levels on cross-cutting concepts. However, I would argue			
			that since the cross-cutting concepts are exactly that, grade foci			
			should not be limited to some concepts. For example, it is			
			appropriate to see how patterns are relevant to content studied in			
		1117	all grades.			
ł		1118	Please teach science			
ł			The organization seems appropriate in length and organization.			
		1119				
ł			Attempting to speak creationism in through the back door of a			
		1120	science curriculum is an afront to education			
ł		1121	They are well organized			
ł			Please do not allow the instruction of Creationism/intelligent			
			design in our K-12 schools, this is nure conjecture & not science			
			My future offspring deserve to learn the facts about evolution			
			Polizion has no place in school, we will teach our shildren about			
			religion on our time			
		1122	rengion on our time.			
ł		1122	What is at the top of the illustration given? 'Engage is an enter at			
		1122	what is at the top of the mustration given? Engage in argument			
ł		1123	Adoquete			
ł		1124	AUEQUALE NO CREATIONISMENO INTELLIGENT DECIGNENO			
			INCONSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT OF RELICION IN SUBJECT	1		
		1125	UNCONSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT OF RELIGION IN PUBLIC			
ł		1125	SCHOULS. SCIENCE ONLY IN SCIENCE CLASS.			
			reaching creationism in school is an unconstitutional			
			endorsement of religion in tax payer funded public schools. Any			
			ettort to introduce this into school curriculum will be met with			
ļ		1126	strong opposition.			
			I do not understand why, in this day and age, there is removal of	1		
			evolution in science. It's not a theory, it's as close to a fact as we			
ļ		1127	can get.			
			The organization is fine. It's the content I have concerns about.			
ļ		1128				
			I do not know of any reason there should be any drastic changes			
ļ		1129	made.			
			Include evolution and creationism isn't science since it cannot be			
			shown through experimentation. Evolution can be tested so it	1		
		1130	should be taught.			

1			1	
	If the goal of organization was to illustrate how each standard			
	could stand alone and he integrated into source sciences. the		1	
	coulo stano alone ano pe integrateu into several sciences, the			
	organization is more complex than it needs to be. Organizational			
	categories should divide information in order to be able to use it			
	As it stands, standards are not appropriately connected to the			
	science classes in which they traditionally belong. Taking into			
	consideration the transition to 3D curriculum, different categories			
	consideration the transition to 50 curriculum, unrerent categories			
	would better serve: 1) Big ideas - larger cross concepts for all			
	Sciences, 2) General Science - smaller pieces of content to break			
	down those Big Ideas into senarable and studiable parts 3) Next			
	down chose big ideas into separable and studiable parts, 5) Next,			
	specific Science content, 4) Cross curricular concepts, 5) Skills, 6)			
	Meta Ideas, 7) Technology & Engineering componentsEXAMPLE:			
	EADTH & SDACE SCIENCE 1) Big Idea: All matter in the Universe is			
	EARTH & SPACE SCIENCE 1) Big luea. All matter in the Universe is			
	created from atoms which interact to make the things around us,			
	<ol> <li>Atomic Structure, Periodic Table, 3) Earth &amp; Science curriculum</li> </ol>			
	specifically-protops peutrops electrops pucleus charge (1)			
	specifically protons, field ons, electrons, fideleds, charge, 4)			
	Structure and function cross curricular. After the Big Ideas are			
	identified and curriculum science categories are determined.			
	individual sciences can determine how they will specifically			
	individual sciences can determine now they will specifically			
	teach/use the curriculum in their course. This way, simply, many			
	courses can teach Atomic Theory- not just Chemistry. This			
	particular curriculum can be taught in Earth Enviro Biology and			
	characterized and can be caught in Earth, Enviro, biology, and		1	
	cnemistry. The way the curriculum is written now it TOO		1	
	complicated. It does not need to be so. Science Content is one of		1	
	the pillars of 3D learning. You cannot leave out the curriculum		1	
	the price of object may be to control reave out the control of the		1	
	part- which you put in later as the 'Key concepts' part! This is too		1	
113	disorganized! Allow each curriculum science course team to		1	
113	2 81/8			
113	2 IN/A			
	The draft was easy to read and followed a pretty logical path from			
	my experience of education. Though some of the language			
	invexperience of education. Though some of the language			
	seemed too open for interpretation around the evolution topic.			
	We should work to ensure that real scientific research is used to			
	teach our children what has been proven as a sound theory (near			
	teach our children what has been proven as a sound theory (near			
	equivalent meaning as 'fact' in science definitions).			
113	3			
113	4 It clarifies a few things.			
	The exercise is seen to follow. The continue of every survivular			
	The organization is easy to follow. The section on cross-curricular			
113	5 ties is important and will be useful.			
	If Diane Douglas does not believe in evolution then Diane Douglas			
	does not believe in science. She needs to turn in her cellphone			
	does not believe in science. She needs to turn in her celiphone			
	and go back to the pony express, turn in her modern car and go			
	back to a horse, turn off her GPS and use a map, turn off her air			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her pext			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warrings not the mainstream of Arizona			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here,			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, here will not to a by denyine science. Remember this is PIIRI I/			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC denational PULCIPUE and the function of the PULCIPUE and the function of the PULCIPUE and the function of the PULCIPUE and the function of the PULCIPUE and the			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her lik do not like			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her lik do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'fail wareins the had'			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog'			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBUC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zelotry.			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry.			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of muchultion in the filter science. This if extrement			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her lik do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science: Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. It was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of arbitic resolut Met mather ta united a Ris Riolence from 't			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joceph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that I aquired a BS in Biology from U			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that I aquired a BS in Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from UC			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her itk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. 5 They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that 1 aquired a Bs in Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not REUGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that I aquired a BS in Biology from U I view, followed by a MA and PHD from Duke focused on Demography. Laubt Demography. medical Covidenu and Arize			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. 5 They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that laquired a Bs in Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology after U Penver and the Plan Tom Duke focused on Demography. I taught Demography, medical Sociology, and Aging			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sof saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that 1 aquired a BS in Biology from UC Irvine, followed by a MA and PHD from Duke focused on Demography. I taught Demography, medical SociOgy, and Aging (as well as a few other course) for 36 years at ASU. I fear that my			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school Hart enth al aujierd al SBi Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, and MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, and MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, and MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, and MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, and MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass, and MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U mass and MS in Boy and Poly from Duke focused on Demography. I taught Demography, medical Sociology, and Aging (as well as a few other courses) for 36 years at			
113	continuer and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her lik do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science scions. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that I aquired a BS in Biology from UC livrine, followed by a MA and PHD from Duke focused on Demography. I taught Demography, medical Sociology, and Aging (as well as a few other course) for 36 years at XSU. I fear that my 7 grandchildren will be ill preparedfor 21st century STEM jobs and			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school I After that la quired al Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Mass, and Sin explores of saint joseph in the catury STEM jobs and the economic future of this state will be undermined by Douglas'			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her lik do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that Laquired a BS in Biology from UC larvine, followed by a MA and PHD from Duke focused on Demography. Laught Demography, medical Sociology, and Aging (as well as a few other course) for 36 years at XOJ. I fear that my 7 grandchildren will be ill preparedfor 21st century STEM jobs and the economic future of this state will be undermined by Douglas' imposition of her ignorant zealotry.			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education in the State RELIGIOUS education. If those of the ritk of not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science: Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sciencis. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joceph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that I aquired a BS in Biology from UC livrine, followed by a MA and PHD from Duke focused on Demography. I taught Demography, medical Sociology, and Aging (as well as a few other courses) for 36 years at ASU. I fear that my 7 grandchildren will be ill preparedfor 21st century STEM jobs and the economic future of this state will be undermined by Douglas' imposition of her ignorant zealotry.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her lik do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that laquiced als Bin Biology from UC Irvine, followed by a MA and PHD from Duke focused on Demography. Laught Demography. Laught Demography. Itageth the countor will be ill preparedfor 21st century STEM jobs and imposition of her ignorant zealotry. The banding the science sections.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joceph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that I aquired a BS in Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology, and Aging (as well as a few other courses) for 36 years at ASU. I fear that my grandchildren will be ill preparedfor 21st century STEM jobs and the economic future of this state will be undermined by Douglas' imposition of her ignortant zelotry. This conflates important scientific knowledge with unimportant			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that la aquiced a Bis Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Demography. Luaght Demography, medical Sciology, and Aging (as well as a few other course;) for 36 years at ASU. I fear that my 7 grandchildren will be ill preparedfor 21st century STEM jobs and the economic future of this state will be undermined by Douglas' imposition of her ignorant zealotry. This conflates important scientific knowledge with unimportant Biopinons.			
	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of her ilk do not like science fine but they do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. 5 They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that laquired a Bs in Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology from U Mass, an MS in Population and Environmental Biology, and Aging (as well as a few other courses) for 36 years at ASU. I tea that my granchildren will be ill preparedfor 21st century STEM jobs and the economic future of this state will be undermined by Douglas' imposition of her ignorant zealotry. 7 This conflates important scientific knowledge with unimportant 8 pinions.			
113	conditioner and start sweating and instead of flying to her next vacation destination, take a horse and buggy, and on and on. It is only the religious fringe elements who are trying to excise evolution and global warming, not the mainstream of Arizona residents and residents of the United States and the world. If Arizona wants to attract technology companies to invest here, they will not do so by denying science. Remember this is PUBLIC education not RELIGIOUS education. If those of the rilk do not get to impose their minority view on the rest of us who do. The expression 'tail wagging the dog' comes to mind. The purpose of education is to teach our children about the world around them as it actually is, not filtered through religious zealotry. They were easy to read until the Superindent thought it was ok to impose her radical religious views and delete all mention of evolution in the life science sections. This is outrageous. Mainstream religions have no conflict with evolution. I was taught about evolution by the sisters of saint joseph in my first 12 years of catholic school! After that laquiced a BS in Biology from U Irvine, followed by a MA and PHD from Duke focused on Demography. Laught Demography. Laught Demography. Itaght Sociology, and Aging (as well as a few other course;) for 36 years at ASU. Ifear that my 7 grandchildren will be ill preparedfor 21st century STEM jobs and the economic future of this state will be undermined by Douglas' imposition of her ignorant zealotry. This conflates important scientific knowledge with unimportant Socions.			

	The standards should be re-formatted as performance objectives.			
	They should be very well defined and specific in order for teachers			
	to develop appropriate curriculum from them. The key concepts			
	are too nebulous and leave too much up to interpretation. They			
	should be omitted and instead have very clear specific			
	performance objectives.			
1141				
1142	The organization mirrors the NGSS.			
114	Need more emphasis on the lower grades content			
	The Science Standards should ALWAYS be organized around			
114/	SCIENCE and not politics (religion			
114	Science and not pointics/religion.			
1145	Science standards should encourage critical trinking and			
114.	KEEP ALL religious beliefs out of the classroom TEACH REAL			
	KEEP ALL religious beliefs out of the classroom. TEACH REAL			
	Science based upon nundreds of years of research and peer			
	reviewed studies. DO NOT ALLOW any so-called beliefs about a			
	certain religious creation story that was first brought forth by			
	people that didn't know where the sun went after setting. Please			
	allow Arizona children to really learn science and be prepared for			
	working in the 21st century.			
1146	D			
	I disagree with the state eliminating requirements that students			
	be able to evaluate now innerited traits in a population can lead to			
114/	evolution.			
	I disagree with the state eliminating requirements that students			
	be able to evaluate how inherited traits in a population can lead to			
1148	evolution.			
	Categories and subjects are arranged in an easy to use format.			
1149				
1150	Clearly laid out and organized.			
	As a science teacher, the standards were relatively			
	understandable. However the wording is vague as far as the verbs			
1151	for learning objectives.			
1152	Creationism should stay out of Science!!			
	I think we should be using a set of standards that reflect the Next			
1153	Generation Science Standards.			
1154	Teach Evolution, not religion			
	The original structure, before internal review, of the standards			
	presents information in a clear and detailed way with more of a			
	focus on the goal of science rather than a checklist of skills.			
1155	5			
	Diane Douglas made this difficult to read by misrepresenting			
	evolution repeatedly as a theory and altering the language to be			
	more religion-friendly. She is solely responsible for this, and not			
	only does it not read well, it derails any semblance of organization			
	of anything when one of the largest overarching principles of			
	science is tossed aside like a used napkin.			
1156	5			
1157	The draft is well organized and precise.			
	The organization is easy to read. No changes necessary here.			
1158	3			
	It is easy to see the relationship between the core and advanced			
	standards. I like how there are two sets of standards; HOWEVER.			
	by having two sets you are tracking students - which can be good			
	or bad. For me a long time experienced teacher. I can easily lean			
	back and forth between the two. For new and young teachers.			
	they will probably choose one track or another and leave out			
	chances for enrichment.			
1159				
1160	keep your god out of our schools			
	Continue to teach evolution and not remove it to teach	1		1
1161	creationism			
	Evolution is an established scientific theory.	1		1
	Creationism/intelligent design is a fantasy. It has no basis in			
1162	reality.			
110	The standards are vague. The only thing that is scrinted is what	1		
	students should be able to know/do at the end of the each year			
	They are not that specific, nor do they give examples of activities			
1165	etc.			
110.	The Science Standards, as initially drafted by knowledgeable	1		
	Arizona science teachers, have been edited under ADE to respond			
	to political pressure and dilute the teaching of evolution, which is			
	a foundational concent of life science and Earth science			
116/	a rounde concept of the science and earth science.			
110-	Poorly organized, appear to follow Next gen standards but fall			
1120	short			
1165	Confusing micloading and unsciontific language recording the			
	evolution and development of life on Earth. We need to achieve			
	demonstrated science, not on a belief in whether want to be the			
110	demonsulated science, not on a belier in what we want to be true.			
1166		1	1	1

	The standards are written as they have always been written. It is			
	noither poorly written or well written. A new teacher in Arizona			
	neither poorly written of weir written. A new teacher in Anzona			
	should be able to read the standards, know the intended learning			
	outcome, what common vocabulary is used, the overarching main			
	concept and all of the concepts that would fall under that			
	overarching main concept			
116				
110	en e			
	Confusing, misleading, and contradictory language regarding			
116	evolution.			
	The removal of key science topics including Evolution and big Bang			
	is wrong. A Theory is not just an idea Here is the definition of a			
	theorya coherent group of tested general propositions commonly			
	theorya concrete group of tested general propositions, commonly			
	regarded as correct, that can be used as principles of explanation			
	and prediction for a class of phenomena:			
116				
	Diane Douglas stated that evolution is just a theory. That is a			
	failed talking point of creationists. There is absolutely no evidence			
	far any and That is a fast of Develop and provide verifiable fasts			
	for any gods. That is a fact. If Douglas can provide verifiable facts			
	that god exists, then he remains just a theory. Evolution is one of			
	the most important scientific theories of all time. The sequencing			
	of the human genome is proof positive, if there was ever any			
	doubt, that evolution is a fact. At present, many teachers fear			
	teaching evolution simply because they fear reprisals from			
	students' sevente. Furthise should be tought is all schools and			
	students parents. Evolution should be taught in all schools and			
	without interference from religious zealots such as Douglas. These			
	new standards are a joke, and they will set Arizona education back			
	to the 1950s. Shameful!			
117				
	I am concerned that the phrase science and engineering practices			
	has replaced the term is contific method. I do not understand the			
	has replaced the term scientific method. I do not understand the			
	rationale. Also, the separation of standards into essential and plus			
	isn't a bad idea, but students only receiving essential standards			
	seem to be missing out on rather essential content such as natural			
	selection			
117				
	Somo standards are not scientific standards seem more like			
117	some standards are not scientific standards seem more like			
117.	religious ories.			
	I feel that we SHOULD NOT SPRIAL earth concepts over the three			
	years, this content is very boring and is not vital to the learning. I			
	feel that the content currently in 8th grade should stay at the 8th			
	grade level, except ecology concepts that should be moved down			
	to 7th Physics and chemistry content should stay in 8th grade as			
117	to vali nysies and chemistry concert should stay in our grade as			
117	Well as genetics.			
	obluscating the meaning is contrary to all scientific evidence.			
11/4				
	Creationism is not science but a religious belief. If evolution is not			
	taught in schools, students will be lacking in fundamental			
	knowledge of science. Bacteria are evolving and now are			
	resistant to many antibiotics. This is because they are evolving			
	This is because of evolution. If students are not taught evolution			
	This is because of evolution. If students are not taught evolution			
	in school Arizona students will be looked at as coming from an		1	
	already flawed, underfunded education system we have here is		1	
	Arizona.			
117	5			
	Within the standards, they should be organized by core ideas			
	instead of topics. It will help teachers see the connections			
117		1	1	
117	I DEIWEEN IODICS			
	The organizational structure seems to comply with the part			
	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next			
	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they			
	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/			
117	Detween topics. The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction ages (e.e., ages 9 for K-2) describe core eagles for each level that			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that offen don't outile match un with the individual standard.			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new strandards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for k-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new strandards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g., page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for grade 3.For Summary table on page 200My are there no examples			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for grade 3.For Summary table on page 20Why are there no examples for U3, knowledge produced by science is useful for products, in			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g., page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for U3, knowledge produced by science is useful for products, in the life science standards? Plenty of examples to choose from.			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for grade 3. For Summary table on page 20Why are there no examples for U3, knowledge produced by science is useful for products, in the life science standard? Plenty of examples to choose from, including communicable divesces. medical disenses and			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for U.3, knowledge produced by science is useful for products, in the life science standards? Plenty of examples to choose from, including communel diseases, medical diagnoses and treatment and comits and comits and the standards for the standards place standards? Place to choose from, including communel be diseases, medical diagnoses and			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for U3, knowledge produced by science is useful for products, in the life science standards? Plenty of examples to choose from, including communicable diseases, medical diagnoses and treatments, agriculture practices, food production and			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for U.S. knowledge produced by science is useful for products, in the life science standards? Plenty of examples to choose from, including communicable diseases, medical diagnoses and treatments, agriculture practices, food production and consumption.			
117	The organizational structure seems to comply with the next generation science standards, which is the standard by which they should be judged. https://www.nextgenscience.org/ organized. I find the older standards much easier to read, as they better identify how strands of knowledge or individual topics change and complement each other through the grade levels. Contrary to the claim of not prescribing curriculum, the new standards seem excessively detailed and don't make clear connections among topics or to other grade levels on the same topic. The introduction pages (e.g. page 9 for K-2) describe core goals for each level that often don't quite match up with the individual standards described. E.g. 4th grade is supposedly about the role of the sun in providing energy, but that is the topic of individual standards for grade 3.For Summary table on page 20Why are there no examples for U3, knowledge produced by science is useful for products, in the life science standards? Plenty of examples to choose from, including communicable diseases, medical diagnoses and treatments, agriculture practices, food production and consumption.			

	I enjoy how standards are linked to previous grade level standards				
	in the key concepts column. I feel the other information				
	(vocabulary words and concents) are a helpful addition: however				
	teachers must be explicitly told or trained to use this as a guide				
	rather than just verabulary. Boiling down the three dimensional				
	lastice that just vocabulary. Doining down the three dimensional				
1100	learning idea into a vocabulary list would just be a giant waste of				
1180	Time.				
	There is no mention of Charles Darwin theory in the life science				
	curriculum. Specifically there is no mention of evolution as he is				
	currently excepted by 99.99% of the scientific community of this				
118:	L country				
	Science must include the scientific research published in high				
	ranking peer-reviewed journals of climate change, evolution, and				
	mechanisms of natural selection if student are to have a better				
	understanding of the scientific process, theories, and major				
	mechanisms at work in our world. It is also essential preparation				
	for higher education as these are subjects that will be taught				
	heavily in entry level biology class. Sometimes spanning an entire				
	semester, and make up more advanced science course such as				
	organic evolution. It is imperative to a student's education in				
	science that large scientific fields such as evolution and climate				
	change research not be censored like banned books.				
1182	2				
	Draft science standards need to be improved to encourage critical				
	thinking and evaluation of the evidence relating to evolution. Your				
	Core Idea L4 implies that evolution over countless generations is				
	the only explanation for the origin and development of life.				
	However, a large percentage of researchers in the Life Sciences				
	community do not find evidence for this neo-Darwinian model of				
	evolution taught in schools as assumed fact. Their findings need				
	to be given equal weight in the interest of scholastic integrity and				
	intellectual honesty.				
118	3				
118	The organization is not what I find fault with				
	I do not understand eliminating references to evolution as a				
	driving force for biological diversity. Evolution of plants animals				
	and humans over time are scientific facts and should be explored				
119	in detail by students				
110.	Intelligence is missing from the section: prosesses by which a				
	Intelligence is missing nom the section, processes by which a				
119	species may change over time due to environmental conditions.				
110	7 Marcel and the marce dealer?				
110	Organization by grade is adequate				
1100	orderhy				
110.	In both Kindergarten and 3rd grade Rhyrical Science Standards				
	statement changes shift the standards' focus from physical				
	science to life science, reculting in the physical science import				
	science to me science, resulting in the physical science import				
	the learning progressions of the sore content as well as vertical				
	che learning progressions of the core content as well as vertical				
1100	alignment between grade levels.				
119	J Telios ve heeli te the deali eese				
119.	Trakes us back to the dark ages.				
119.	Comply with scientific fact, thorework to				
119:	The content, should evolution be watered down by talks of				
	intelligent design theory, is alarming intelligent design is ant				
	scientifically accurate and it only pucket unconstitutional reliations				
	indoctrination upon A7 students. I'm your diconscitutional religious				
	Douglas thinks sho can go against matters kink as assute him				
	already received. Any attempt to the here here here and the the				
	into public policy chould warrant as investigating into human line personal beliefs				
	the public policy should warrant an investigation into her ability				
	educational background, co wo must particulate a strong				
	educational background, so we must continue to guide her in				
	areas sile is apparently ignorant.				
1194	*			1	
	iney are not as easy to read as the next generation science				
119:	Standards. I lind the key concepts very contussing.				
	very organized, clarifies objectives better by being more specific				
1196					
119.	The Dept of Education makes it easy to follow.				
	The Dept of Education's blases are evident in their revisions.				
	Some are okay, but many are not acceptable. For example,				
	evolution is not a theory any more than gravity, Earth's revolution				
	around the sun, and now bables are made are theories. The use of				
	positive and negative effects throughout the document are also				
	plased and should be removed.				
1198					
****					

		There are several sections that do not belong. Primarily any			
		inclusion of creationism is bogus hogwash and does not have any			
	1200	role in Science.			
	1201	done by a buerecrat			
	1202	They are comprehensive and data oriented.			
		The science standards for Arizona students should contain all			
	1203	relevant scientific theories.			
		I am horrified that religious creationist garbage is being inserted			
		into curriculum by a religious zealot. We do not want to become			
		more uneducated as a nation. Intelligent design has no place in a			
	1204	public school curriculum			
		Clear horizontal alignment charts showing each essential			
		standard's progression from k-12 on one page would be helpful.			
	1205				
		The draft standards are much less detailed than those articulated			
		in the common core curriculum within the Az-Merit program that			
		Superintendent Douglas vowed to remove when she took office.			
		They are easier to read but this is mainly because the content is			
	1206	orten vague and poorly stated.			
	1200	Ma innuna			
	1207	I taught in A7 several years and the science standards are			
		appropriate and well aligned to standards in most other states. It			
	1208	would be best if they were left as is			
		Please take this moron out of the decision making process, please			
		guit being over sensitive and trying to change everything. We are			
		turning today's children into cry babies, children with a sense of			
		entitlement and we are doing them a disservice if this changes			
		due to her beliefs/values.			
	1209				
		Do not remove evolution. We should be teaching our children			
		progress and science, not instilling the board's beliefs - school is			
	1210	NOT the place to do that.			
		Science should be organized and taught to founded and			
	1211	researchable theory this was not.			
		How do teachers feel about the organization of the science			
		standards? They are the ones who will be responsible for			
		teaching to the standards. Teachers should have the final say in			
	1212	the structure of the standards.			
	1212	I oo often refers to acronyms and standards not part of the			
	1213	document.			
	1214	childron. Gwowties in 5th grada is insanal			
	1214	L can read them			
	1213	The organization of this draft seems appropriate. My comments			
		have more to do with content in some areas. Lam currently a			
		professor at Northwestern University (Evanston, IL) and a			
		research scientist at the Chicago Botanic Garden. I received my			
		PhD from the University of Arizona in the department of Ecology			
		and Evolutionary Biology.			
	1216				
		I am commenting on the DRAFT Science Standards from the			
		Committee NOT as amended by the the ADE staff and			
	1217	Superintendent!			
	1218	The organization of the science standards is acceptable.			
	1219	I't missing some key components.			
	1220	I have not read the full draft, so have no comment on this			
L	1221	Organization is fine for each grade level.			
		Evolution is central to all of Biology and must be included in the			
		science standards because biology only makes sense in light of			
	1222	evolution.			
		The wording is difficult to understand for some of the standards.			
	1223	It is a second into an understandable format			
	1224	No. I found them to be confusing leaving a lot of recent for			
	1775	interpretation			
1	1225	interpretation.	1	1	1

	High School Standards: The high school standards are confusing		
	to understand the difference between essential and plus		
	standards Possible solutions: reference page of how the		
	essential standards and/or plus standards align to current courses		
	that schools have indicate that essential standards are the tested		
	ctandards: Make one table (column for both) holding or		
	standards, Make one table (column for both) bolding of		
	nightighting the tested standards (standards for all students).key		
	Term Column: Although this column contains lists of words that		
	might be useful to a teacher, they do not assist the teacher in the		
	practices or cross cutting concepts that should be integrated with		
	that standard. In addition, listing terms can be a check-list for		
	teachers indicating that they taught the standard. Possible		
	Solutions: Include the learning progressions from Framework		
	and/or Working with Big Ideas of Science Education instead of		
	terms; include the crosscutting concepts that align with that		
	standard - this would indicate a 3-dimensional approach rather		
	than the 2 dimensional approach that is currently indicated by the		
	way the standards are written; Have that column as an appendix		
	or a resource to the standards - other information could then be		
	added such as info about the practices and new discoveries		
1226			
	Science classes must include the scientific research published in		
	high ranking peer-reviewed journals of CLIMATE CHANGE,		
	EVOLUTION, and mechanisms of natural selection if students are		
	to have a better understanding of the scientific process, theories,		
	and major mechanisms at work in our world. It is also essential		
	preparation for higher education as these are subjects that will be		
	taught heavily in entry level biology class, sometimes spanning an		
	entire semester, and make up more advanced science courses		
	such as organic evolution. It is imperative to a student's education		
	in science that large scientific fields such as evolution and climate		
	change research not be censored like banned books.		
1227			
1228	Organization is straight forward		
	It is necessary for students to understand the process of science		
	and to understand how new revelations in science, based on peer-		
	reviewed data and interpretation, results in small vet significant		
	changes in our understanding of how living and non-living matter		
	change over time. Science uses language to express concepts that		
	hest fit the hest available data. But science is much more than		
	concent vocabulary. Science is an every changing understanding		
	that refines our percention of and capacity to utilize matter and		
	energy in numerous different functional processes. What is		
	missing is the lack of the over-arching framework of science in		
	which the major ideas come from the critical thinking of analyzing		
	how the small pieces fit together to form the big pieces. The plan		
	needs a comprehensive concentual structure based upon the key		
	ideas in science		
	ideas in science.		
1770			
1225	I do not understand why there are essential standards and then		
	other standards, especially when the other standards peed to be		
1720	taught to achieve the essential standard		
1230	They ramble on in some cases.		
1251	I wish you could just adopt the NGSS as other states have there is		
	no need to reinvent the wheel and this will make it challenging to		
1232	find a strong curriculum.		
1151	Only in an impending theocracy intelligentsia design' taught. It	1	
	being less than a pseudo-science with no proof or empirical fact 1		
	will not let the children of this state be taught, at the discretion of		
	some teacher with no scientific background that adam and eve		
	were the first humans and their mythological deity created a		
	universe in 6 days. Why not just give then a lobotomy if you are		
	going teach what they do in the middle east Lour nation to		
	become the equivalent of the taliban and the saudi's.		
1233			
1234	Fine	l	
	There simply is no organization when facts are removed in the	İ	
1235	standards.		
1135	Understanding the theory of evolution is critical to the fields of		
	medicine, biology, and applied science like agriculture.		
1236			
1130	Understanding evolution is critical to the fields of medicine.		
1237	biology, and applied science like agriculture.		
1238	Just ok	İ	
	Educational structure as long as the teachers/ admin can figure		
1239	it out.		

1240	I appreciate the connections to other content areas. This is helpful			
1240	to encourage interdisciplinary studies.			
	standards.Evolution is the internationally accepted and			
	scientifically provable Theory which belongs in these standards.			
1241	Science was organized in my time in CUSD			
11-11	Creationism is not a valid scientific theory. Keep religion out of			
1243	schools.			
	Based off the general impressions of the organization, content,			
	There is nothing appropriate about what you are trying to do.			
1244				
1245	Send the standards back for review.			
1246	Intelligent Design does not belong in our science standards.			
	Removing all references to Evolution is nothing but conservative			
	correctness run wild.Worse, endorsing Intelligent Design as			
	belief the Earth is flat, or that it's the center of the universe.			
	What's next, teaching the theory that disease is caused by			
1243	witchcraft, or punishment from Apollo?			
1247	The Science standards are biased and not based on scientific			
1248	knowns.			
1249	Science standards should teach science, not religion.			
	are no longer teaching science. You're putting the children of			
1250	Arizona at a distinct, global disadvantage.			
	Intelligent design is a front for 'creationism'.Creationism is not			
	simply observation of data, while this 'creationism' is designed to			
1251	fit a belief system.			
	I like the similarities between NGSS and the AZ science standards.			
1252	across topics.			
	Efforts to Include creationism in a science based curriculum			
	methodology applied within the scientific community.			
	Creationism fails the evidence threshold and should take its			
1353	rightful place within the realm of theology; science and religion			
1253	To say that evolution is just a theory demonstrates a gross			
	misunderstanding of science. Biological evolution is not just a			
	theory, it is the most robustly demonstrated theory in all of science. By omitting this fundamental concept and achievement of			
	the scientific method severely disadvantages the children of			
	Arizona. They will not be able to compete with the jobs of			
	tomorrow. Job in bio-science and medicine make money and cure diseases because they are founded on reality: the reality of			
	evolution.Do not let ideology or ignorance hold our future back.			
	Put evolution back into the curriculum. Facts aren't ideology.			
	Evolution is a fact. You test it every time you get a flu vaccine or eat food from plant and animals humans have changed and			
	domesticated over the last 10,000+ years.Shame on Diane			
	Douglas. Keep your religion out of our schools.			
1254				
	I am only clicking agree here so that I can get to the part of the			
	survey where I can comment on the removal of certain items in			
	together the standards are opposed to what Diane Douglas has			
1255	done here.			
	Science Standards should include the study of evolution, an			
	medicine. To be rigorous, the Standards must include evidence-			
1256	based science.			
1257	The way the content is defined does not make sense to me			
1258	and had no place in science instruction.			
1259	Organization ignores proven theories of evolution.			
1260	Lasy to follow. Painful to read. Contains many grammatical errors making it			
1261	difficult to comprehend.			
1003	They may be organised but are not based on true science and			
1262	The standards are difficult to			
	Evolution happened, is happening, and will continue to happen.			
1764	You are dumb-ing down our children by teaching them fake news.			
1204	1	1	1	1

	4365	Any well-organized Science Standards would not include		
	1265	creationism.		
		had a best best for Contract of the second strain and have published a		
		evolution. It is a travesty to turn the clock back to the age of the		
	1266	Scopes Triall		
	1267	Evolution is fact		
	120,	I prefer the Next Generation Science Standards for organization.		
		detail. and overall scientific content. These draft science		
		standards are a poor substitute for the Next Generation Science		
		Standards. Maybe you should use those. They are based on the		
		same books you claim to base these standards on, but the NGSS		
	1268	are much better.		
	1269	Evolution needs to be included		
		The standards do not use the language of scientists. Important		
		words have been changed and will negatively affect the learning		
	1270	of our kids.		
		The removal of vital information shows that these new science		
	1271	standards are NOT well-organized.		
	1272	Needs to go back to review.		
	1273	You need to review this		
	1274	It needs to go back to review.		
		There are strands mentioned on the connections to other		
		academic disciplines, but I can't find an explanation of the strands		
		or how they fit into the overall framework of the standards. The		
		previous standards listed the strand, then the concept and were		
	1275	much easier to follow.		
		Science classes must include the scientific research published in		
		high ranking, peer-reviewed journals of climate change, evolution,		
		and mechanisms of natural selection if student are to have a		
		better understanding of the scientific process, theories, and major		
		mechanisms at work in our world. It is also essential preparation		
		for higher education as these are subjects that will be taught		
		neavily in entry level biology class, sometimes spanning an entire		
		semester, and make up more advanced science course such as		
	1276	organic evolution.		
	1270	The original draft was great before the unscientific edits		
	1277	Needs review		
	12/0	The constant refer to standard and references back to other		
		grade levels is unclear and convoluted. State the standard and		
		what key concepts need to be taught. Teachers need guidelines		
	1279	not word searches.		
	1280	not perfect but ok.		
	1281	Much better now!		
	1282	It looks nice but has major content issues.		
	1283	Inaccuracies make them difficult to read.		 
		As sent by the 111 science specialists in November 2017 (left		
	1284	unchanged).		
	1285	No problem with the organization.		
	1286	The changes are unacceptable.		
		Due to trying to downplay the role that evolution has in Science,		
		the standards are worded weirdly and are harder to understand.		
	1287			
		I think you should keep some of the original explanations for the		
		Space Science for the HS. E2U2.17 Also, the 8th Grade and High		
		school changes are unacceptable. Specifically, changes to some of		
		the vocabulary words. How this gets rid of words such as evolve,		
	1300	big bang meory, and etc.		
	1288	I would profer the standards acknowledge the ssigntification		
		accepted theory that all things evolve. The use of the word		
		evolution is not a had thing. Religious extremism door not halong		
	1790	in science standards.		
	1285	Fasy to read		
	2230	You are taking out requirements for evolution. This is absolutely		
	1291	necessary to be required learning in science.		
				1

	While I do appreciate the connections drawn between grade		
	levels. I think all of the 5.P2U1.3 type verbiage all over makes		
	them hard to decypher. Teachers would have to keep several		
	grade hands of standards available in order to figure out where		
	exactly they need to begin and end their instruction based on		
	prior knowledge that should have been acquired and not step of		
	phor knowledge that should have been acquired and hot step of		
	the toes of future instruction. Also landscape with 1 margins		
	doesn't provide for a reasonable use of space. The midule grades		
	standards could easily fit on 2 pages (which could be copied front		
	and back) to allow for easier referencing. #earthfriendlyl am also		
	very concerned about what the testing for these standards will		
	look like in a grade band scenario the tested grade teacher will		
	be responsible for filling multiple years of gaps and teach their		
	own content.		
1292			
	I am confused by the knowing and using science as big ideas. It		
	would be far better to use the science and engineering practices,		
	cross cutting concepts, and disciplinary core ideas that the rest of		
	the country is using. These came from A Framework for K-12		
	Science Education , a document upon which the AZ draft science		
	standards are supposedly based upon. Further, the key concepts		
	are NOT concepts. They are a vocabulary list. This defeats the		
	intent of the new vision for science education to have deeper.		
	richer conceptual understanding.		
1293			
	HS+C.P1U4.8 and all Physical Science Plus (+) Standards. We do	1	
	not have materials to teach all this standards so that it will be		
	engaging to students. If the Department of education will provide		
	science kits that will address all this standards then we will be		
	willing to teach it and engage our students well or else Physics		
	class will be boring and bard with Physics with just mathematical		
	calculations - Lwould like to see Physics as more applicable to		
	calculations I would like to see Physics as more applicable to		
	daily lives of students and they can really apply it in their house		
	and etc. As of now, my focus are topics like Motion and Forces,		
	Energy Conservation, and electricity. Also, there too many Physical		
	Science Standards ( Physics ) compare to Chemistry. Chemistry		
	essential = 4 and plus= 9 total of 13 only, then Physics has		
	essential 6 and plus = 13 total of 19 why there are too much of		
	the Physics. Hopefully all students are being considered too and		
	not only A schools, our students needs still basic mathematics and		
	it's hard to teach hard topics like magnetism with them. Although I		
	am trying to engage them with everything that I can		
1294			
	Evolution is more than a theory, so believe the theory of should		
1295	be edited out		
	I am thinking in terms of content and cannot get pass the glaring		
	mistakes. Magnetic field, evolutionterms that are completely		
	acceptable and agreed upon by the scientific community and that		
	are missing from this draft. I for one do not want my children		
	growing and learning in a community that still calls Evolution a		
	theory and opens the door to thinking the world is flat		
1296	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
1230	There should be more content per p.o		
1297	Organization is adequate to convey information		
1255	Keen Diane Douglas out of this process!		
1255	The standards as presented do not have a foundation base and		
1300	leave behind many students		
1300	Like the listing of the key concents. How the Distribution of the		
1201	standards are broken out and connected together		
1301	Well organized		
1302	Very concerned about evolution not being talked about. The 1-t		
	amondmont is being trampled. The Establishment Clause 1 hours		
1203	amenument is being trampied. The Establishment Clause is being		
1303	naunteo.		
1304	nt sinne.		
	Unituing information on change over time, evolution and the big		
	bang theory, completely negates the validity of this document.		
1305			
1306	I can read them and understand them clearly.	 	
1307	"Theory' needs to be defined in scientific context	 	
	Organized by grade level and able to follow, although many of the		
	edits add more ambiguity and detract from the scientific concepts		
	to be taught. Also an issue with disciplines skipping years, or		
	multiple years as seen with concepts in physical science and life		
	science bands in middle school.		
1308			
1309	Generally OK		
1310	Organization is fine		
1311	Well laid out with color coding is easy to follow and read		

Γ		Downplaying the FACTS of EVOLUTION is not science. It is not				
		your job to advance the religious nonsense pushed by the AZ				
		Republican Party, Your job is to make certain FACTS and SCIENCE				
		are taught throughout A7's PUBLIC schools. Parents who are made				
		sad by science & facts may place their children in PRIVATE				
	1312	religious schools				
ŀ		A table of contents or other organizational tool at the beginning				
	1212	would be beinful				
ŀ	1515	These standards are not written in an easily understandable way 1				
		These standards are not written in an easily understandable way. I				
		don't feel that they are organized by a "unit of study". It would be				
		better if they were more specific and less general. I understand				
		the idea of being broad as to lend itself better to more in-depth				
		study, but I don't feel that these provide enough direction.For				
		example, this standard: Obtain and evaluate information				
		regarding how scientists use technology toidentify substances				
		based on unique physical and chemical properties. My question:				
		What is meant by technology ? Would this be what students				
		would be utilizing in the process of doing a lab to identify				
		substances? Such as laboratory tools?				
	1314					
ľ		I would like to see the standards first, followed by the overall		l		
	1315	explanation.				
ł	1010	The Core vs Plus set up is not very easy to read. I think it would be		1		
	1	hetter to have them senarate like they do in the math standards				
	1216	beccer to have them separate like they do in the math standards.				
ŀ	1510	They are your configuring and hard to payigate. When I first viewed				
		They are very confusing and hard to havigate. When this viewed				
		the standards, I was very lost and not able to understand the				
		standards due to the lack of organization. The standards should be				
		straight-forward and organized in a way that a parent, student,				
		and teacher (both new teacher and experienced teacher) could				
		access and understand how they are formatted. Instead, I found				
		myself having to search for content and look for certain pages to				
		access material.				
	1317					
Γ	1318	I can easily read the standards.				
Γ		I believe we need more time when talking about Newtons three				
	1319	laws of motion.				
Γ	1320	a bit repetitive, but acceptable				
Ē	1321	wordy and unnecessarily difficult to search				
ŀ		Organization seems fair although matching better to what is used				
		at University level using terms like applied mathematics and				
		nhysics would be beneficial for continuity				
	1322	physics would be beneficial for continuity.				
ŀ	1322	Weitten is a state service using these service shy. Disectores is				
	1223	whiten in a more passive voice than previously. Directness is				
┢	1323	always better.				
ŀ	1324	organization is important, but content more so.				
	1	The key concepts do not correctly refer to the science standards.				
	1	The key concepts distract from the main points in the standards				
	1	and add too much incorrectly placed terminology for students to				
	l	have to memorize. One of the issues that we have in our current	1			
		standards, is the 2-3 year gaps between touching base on certain				
	1	concepts. I still see this issue in the new draft, I was hopping that				
	l I	issue would be resolved.	1			
L	1325					
	1	The science standards are not organized well. Concepts have				
	l	been moved to lower grades that are not developmentally	1			
	1	appropriate. For example, atoms in 6th grade have been moved				
	l I	from 8th grade along with matter and physical properties. 8th	1			
	1	grade students struggle with these concepts. In addition, the				
	1	periodic table is taught in 5th grade and then not mentioned again				
	1	until high school so teaching atoms in 6th grade and atomic				
	l I	bonding in 8th grade are out of context without the periodic table	1			
	1	of elements				
	1276	or elements.				
ŀ	1320	The proposed science standards with the added key second a				
	l I	not articulate well. Many ideas that are introduced in order	1			
	l	alementer and an and an and alementer and are introduced in early	1			
	100	elementary school are too difficult for these young children to				
ŀ	132/					
		STOP DENTING OUR KIDS A FULL EDUCATION WITH YOUR				
1	1328	KELIGIOUS AGENDA!!! Evolution is real!	1	1	1	1

	I disagree with the minimizing of the role Evolution plays in human			
	history and science education. It is not dehated in the Science			
	community. The science standards of Arizona need to be			
	community. The science standards of Arizona need to be			
	compatible with modern scientific fact, not blases or religion. If			
	Evolution is being wrongfully omitted I grieve to know what other			
	facts the Arizona Department of Education will omit from			
	Education. That is limiting future generations of American			
	thinkers, who face scientific truths of the world and use the			
	scientific method for progression of humanity. Please revise the k-			
	12 science standards to fit current scientific fact, so that future			
	generations will posses the knowledge they have the right to			
	recieve from their Education department. Thank you			
	270			
	It is good that they are constrated and color coded by strand			
	it is good that they are separated and color-coded by strand.			
	However, I do not like the naming system. I think it would be best			
	to just include a letter to represent the strand (i.e. P for physical			
	science, L for life science), than to try to incorporate multiple core			
	330 ideas into the name.			
	The three dimensional nature of the organization allows for some			
	confusion, especially U2. Perhaps it would be better to leave out			
	the core ideas and just list the standards.			
	331			
	332 Its fine.		İ	
	The standards as revised by staff compromise their intent and			
	therefore compromise the ability of Arizona students to deal with	1		
	222 the medere would	1		
<b>├</b> ──── <b>├</b> ────	333 the modern world.			
l	334 I ney are organized fine			
	The proposed edits make the standards much less clear. Please			
	use the standards that were submitted, prior to the edits.			
	335			
	336 No comments			
	There is no mention of the scientifically accepted concepts of			
	evolution or natural selection. These are core concepts in biology			
	that help explain vital parts of life science. It is unacceptable to			
	337 not include them			
	338 Fasy to follow and understand			
	L find Concert Mans confusing and not to the point. Often created			
	I mu concept waps comusing and not to the point. Often created			
	to make people look like they have been working when in fact			
	339 they are just recycling old stuff.			
	I do not understand the purpose of the far right column, especially			
	340 when it says, Refer to Standard.			
	The standards are vague in some cases and are left open to			
	341 interpretation.			
	342 I think it is well organized			
	343 I like the organization			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember also that the			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has hear under unconstitutional			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the science of enviroine in unbit schemeter.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. 001 The science deaders are seen even with science laborations and the science of the science laboration of the science of the science of the science laboration of the science of the science laboration of the science of the sc			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. 001 These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002           002         Scientific fact of evolution			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science           344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001           These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the           002         scientific fact of evolution           These storings are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence. The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools. 001 These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           344 standards lack structure and coherence.           346 standards lack structure and coherence.           376 standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001           These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which threes areas of study are			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science           344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001           002         scientific fact of evolution agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002         scientific fact of evolution The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         Thes standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science           344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001           These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           The science andards. The work(s) in which threes areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         The sections are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           344 standards lack structure and coherence.           340 standards lack structure and coherence.           361 standards lack structure sign has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001           The sectandards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 022 scientific fact of evolution.           The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which threes areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a 004 child's education.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science           344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001           The science standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a 004           11t is difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a 004 child's equivation.           It is difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and areas to read when these us in farts an opach, designed it before			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science           344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001           These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           The science andards. The awy(s) in which threes areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a 004 child's education.           It is difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and easy to read when they are in fact so poorly designed. It does			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         Thes standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a lit's difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and easy to read when they are in facts op porty designed. It does little good to clearly explain something that is so nonsensical in			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which threes areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a 004 child's education.           It is difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and easy to read when they are in fact so poorly designed. It does little good to clearly explain something that is so nonsensical in 005 every other respect.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           004         It's difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and eavy to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a lift's education.           004         ht's difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and eavy to read when they are in fact so poorly designed. It does little good to clearly explain something that is so nonsensical in 005 every other respect.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science           34 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution.           22 scientific fact of evolution         The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a 004 child's education.           It is difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and easy to read when they are in fact so poorly designed. It does little good to clearly explain something that is so nonsensical in 005 every other respect.           006         Organized and negical.           007         While 1 disagree with them, they are clear.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         These standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the US scientific fact of evolution           The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a 004 child's education.           It is difficult to argue that the standards are well-organized and easy to read when they are in fact so poorly designed. It does little good to clearly explain something that is so nonsensical in 005 every other respect.           006         While I disagree with them, they are clear.           007         While I disagree with them, they are clear.			
	Without the input and additions from the state, the science 344 standards lack structure and coherence.           The science standards appear to remove the teaching of evolution, which is not scientific. Remember, also, that the teaching of intelligent design has been ruled unconstitutional because it advances the role of religion in public schools.           001         Thes standards are an unconstitutional ploy to put a creationism agenda into the curriculum and confuse students about the 002 scientific fact of evolution           The sections are conveniently broken up by grade level. These are further organized based on physical, earth and space, and life science standards. The way(s) in which these areas of study are connected to other academic disciplines is straightforward and has been well implemented.           003         It's hard to read a draft that aims to do so much damage to a lit's hard to read a when they are in fact so poorty designed. It does little good to clearly explain something that is so nonsensical in 003 every other respect.           004         Clearly explain something that is so nonsensical in 005         It does little good to clearly explain something that is so nonsensical in 006           007         Minie I disagree with them, they are clear.         008         Simple, and easy to follow.           008         Simple, and toxic proven Science         Weren word not to teach proven Science			

ſ		They WERE well-organized until they were edited by non-			
		scientists/non-educators. We will do a GREAT disservice to			
		students in Arizona if non-scientific views, i.e., religious views,			
		obstruct the established scientific truth in the standards. Already			
		military families avoid our public schools because the Arizona			
		Legislature does not invest in our children. Now they will avoid			
		the public schools because of the antiquarian myths perpetuated			
		in the standards. It is essential that real science be taught in			
		Arizona.			
ļ	2011				
		Evolution is not a theory. It is proven. It is ongoing in our lifetime			
		that living creatures and plants adapt and evolve. Stop injecting			
ļ	2012	uncertainty in to scientific methods.			
ļ	2013	confusing			
ļ	2014	Please teach evolution and not creationism			
ļ	2015	Well organized.			
	2016	key components within each grade level cluster allow appropriate			
	2016	categorization of content topics/strands.			
		while the grammatical changes do improve the standards,			
		evolution should be included as a fact, not a theory. If students			
		want to explore theories, philosophy classes in college and bible			
	3017	studies can assist students with deblogy that has not yet been			
ł	2017	I think the organization reflects the foundational documents, the			
		Framework for K-12 Science Education & the Big Ideas in			
		Science Not sure where to put this comment so I'll put it here			
		The wording of the Big Ideas (knowing and understanding science)			
		came from published sources- the wording for several of these			
		big ideas has been altered throughout the document. The original			
		document should be referenced and the original language of each			
		of the big ideas should be retained. Specifically: P4 the words in			
		a closed system were added. L4 The wording should be			
		returned to the original The diversity of organism, living and			
		extinct, is the result of evolution . U1 The wording should return			
		to: Science is about finding the cause or causes of phenomena in			
		the natural world U4 The wording should return to: Applications			
		of science often have ethical, social, economic and political			
		implications.			
ļ	2018				
ļ	2019	Teach Science			
		The standards are no longer grouped in a logical order. 7th Grade			
		is no longer Earth and Space, which are two sciences that			
		traditionally go together. Instead physics has been added and			
		geologic time has been added to 8th Grade. There is no longer a			
		logical flow and connection within each grade level. It seems very			
ļ	2020	random.			
ł	2021	as I read them on line, they seemed well organized			
	2022	Given that it's an official document, not (for instance) a work of			
ł	2022	The organization of the Science Standards is not the reason for my			
	2023	current comments.			
ł	2025	I would prefer a neither agree nor disagree ontion.			
ł		K-12 Framework for Standards for Science and cross disciplines	İ		
	2025	clear and consise			
Ì	2026	well organized			
Ì	2027	N/A			
Ì		The current (2004) standards are fine. The proposed changes			
		regarding the removal of 'evolution' and 'Big Bang Theory' are an			
		affront to intelligent, educated people and these changes have no			
		place in in the Arizona State Science Standards!!			
ļ	2028				
		I felt that they were well organized into overall concepts and			
		broken into units well. As a 4th grade teacher, I felt that the			
		content was better distributed among the grade levels making not			
		so heavy in 4th grade. I agree with some of the content like plants,			
		classifications of plants and animals, and cells were given to other			
		grade levels so that 4th grade could use it's energy to concentrate			
	2020	mostly on earth science which is an extensive part of the			
ł	2029	The key concepts deply make sones. They are VOCABULARY			
	0000	words, not concepts up it make sense. They are VULABULARY			
ł	2030	By not using the word evolution some parts of it make little or no			
	2021	sense			
ł	2031	I prefer the old format			
ł	2032	well organized and easy to read and follow		1	
	2000		1	1	1

		I DO NOT support the teaching of creationism in Arizona schools.			
		Please keep religion out of our public schools and keep Science			
		classes focused on 'sense-making (as) a conceptual process in			
		world to construct logical and coherent explanations that			
		incorporate their current understanding of science, or a model			
		that represents it, and are consistent with the available evidence.			
		Evidence being the operative word.			
	2034				
		This formatting is not the easiest to read. The tables just seem to			
		top to bottom like the old standards would be easier to read. Also			
		the colors make it more difficult to follow what is happening, even			
		though their intent is probably the opposite.			
	2035				
		Mrs. Dougles needs to get with the 21st century and science.			
	2036	This is lown over due, and a star is the right disection			
	2037	The deliberate intention to obfuscate the critical role evolution.			
		has in biology by definition makes this not easy to read in the			
		sense that it makes it hard to ferret out the insidious influence of			
	2038	groups with special interests.			
		Stop oppressing us with your Christian views. I am not a Christian			
		and this is an obvious attack on science. Evolution is important for			
		up your own private school that teaches religion over evolution.			
		Don't oppress us with your beliefs. It's raking away our liberty.			
	2039				
		I don't have a problem with the organization of the standards. My			
	20.40	disagreement is with the substantive changes of the standards.			
	2040	Biology is a science, not a background text to insert the Education			
		Secretary's personal religious beliefs. There is no place for			
		creationism or intelligent design in public school textbooks. The			
		addition of ANY language purporting to introduce these religious			
		concepts, which are NOT related to actual biological processes of			
		evolution and selective adaptation, is scientifically ridiculous and			
		as specified in the United States Constitution First Amendment. As			
		an attorney, I must say you that introducing these religious			
		concepts into public school textbooks could well be legally			
		actionable. Existing, science-based biology textbooks need no			
		revisions or additions. Please abandon this misguided attempt at			
		placating a few religious conservative voters, and consider the			
		intrusion into public education.			
	2041				
		Please do NOT make changes that remove or downplay references			
		to evolution and the big bang made by Diane Douglas. These			
		on the record as supporting intelligent design (which is about as			
		scientific as believing that Mickey Mouse controls the weather)			
		would doing our students a great disservice by removing or			
		mumbling through references to genuine scientific principles and			
		theories. Because they are supported by rigorous scientific			
		research, data and real-world observation, evolution and the big			
		Douglas supports is based on religious beliefs and have no place in			
		public education.			
	2042				
		Confused wording throughout downgrades the understandability			
	2043	of the document			
	2044	and will ill-prepare them for the future.			
	2044	don't confuse science with religion. teach science in school. teach			
	2045	religion in church or temple.			
	2046	Should be written by scientists ONLY			
		Science is evidence based. Pseudoscience and faith based			
		speculation are not science! Diane Douglas do your job! Stop			
	2047	box for your religious beliefs! Shame on you!			
L			1	l	1

	Teach science, not religion. Diane Douglas is a religious fanatic,		
	which is her right. However, she has no right to impose her		
	religious views on the children of Arizona. Public schools are not		
	allowed to teach religion. Evolution is not a 'theory'. It is based		
	on sound science. That science should be taught to our children in		
	science classes. If Ms. Douglas wants to teach 'creationism' and		
	'intelligent design', then she should get a job as a Sunday School		
	teachers and subject the children in that environment to her		
	unscientific beliefs.		
2	048		
2	049 It seems like a good, logical structure.		
	De emphasizing evolution and the Big Bang true a science		
	instruction in those areas on its head. Eliminate the nonscientific,		
	last minute draft revisions done by the Superintendent and		
	reinstate the work product of the science teaching workgroups.		
2	050		
	Evolution is an integral part of it without religion of any form		
2	D51 included.		
2	052 reasonably clear		
2	D53 Competent		
	Organization is fine, the problem is their intention to alter already		
2	054 correct science standards.		
	My wife and I find the proposal fundamentally wrong and		
	therefore, are sickened when reading the proposed revisions to		
2	055 the Science Standards.		
	The organization of the standards are sufficient. Breaking them		
	down across the three major sciences for 6th grade is a good		
	decision. Though, pretending to integrate the scientific method		
	into the standards will not benefit students. There is no		
2	056 foundation laid for 6th graders here.		
	The standards are extremely confusing. Originally, they seem		
	straight forward, but then after looking into them more in depth,		
	the cross curricular content makes it even more confusing. I do		
	enjoy the new key concepts which will help the teachers to		
	understand a little more, but in some circumstances they are still		
	so vague. In 8th grade we are supposed to teach about how		
	energy can transfer and how energy affects wave characteristics,		
	but that can mean so many different things. We need a more		
	specific guide on what you want us to teach.		
2	057		
	You have to flip through the standards too much to see exactly		
	what was taught previously and what you need to teach at your		
	grade level. There is not enough specificity as to what is expected		
2	058 at each grade level.		
	I like how in the draft the broad core ideas for knowing science		
	are tied together in one chart. I do not like how the 6th grade		
	standards have taken on the former 8th grade standards. I don't		
	think the students are going to be ready for those concepts		
	developmentally at this level. I don't think the flow of standards		
	are as good as they use to be.		
2	The labeling of the storade de la construction of the storade labeling of the storade de labeling of the storade labeling of t	 	
	The labeling of the standards is very confusing, and the titling of		
	While looking at the standards, they appear post and accused and	-	
	but when you null apart all the core ideas, there is more		
	information in the coding. This then makes the standards quite		
	overwhelming and difficult to follow. Having to go from one cheet		
	to another in order to understand what I need to teach and how I		
	need to document that is difficult. It is lacking precision		
2	need to document that is difficult. It is latking precision.		
	Overall Llike the new standards. Lam very concerned that the		
	teaching of evolution is being diluted, and what that implies.		
	Some tonics are being moved to lower grades, for example the		
	periodic table is being moved from 8th to 5th. I'm concerned it		
	will be difficult to teach all the concepts to kids who are so young		
	More importantly, science is largely ignored in K-5 because such		
	an emphasis is placed on ELA/Math. Even fourth grade teachers		
	currently complain about lack of time to teach science		
2	062		
	I like how they are chunked and how the language is easy to		
	understand. However, I feel that the standards are quite broad -		
	there is a lot of room for interpretation, which could be good and		
	bad depending on the instructor's confidence level and access to		
2	D63 resources.		

	The standards for 7th grade don't flow together at all. It looks like			
	someone just picked some random standards and put them at the			
	7th grade level. If someone wants the students to come away			
	each grade with more content knowledge then we need to start at			
	a basic level and allow the teachers to continuously build on the			
	a basic level and allow the teachers to continuously build on the			
	students prior knowledge; instead of waiting a few years to circle			
	back to standards. Right now there are concepts at the lower			
	levels that those students can't grasp because they just don't have			
	the background.			
2064	1			
	I have no problems with the understanding the expectation of			
	what is to be taught to reach each of these standards.			
2065				
	There are a lot of components to each standard such as core			
	ideas, crosscutting concepts, engineering practices, and lower			
	grade level connects which all require you to look in different			
2066	places within the standards.			
	I am very concerned about the proposed changes related to			
	evolution Any deletion of the term reflects an anti-science bias			
2005	weet likely with reliaious metions			
2007	these are structured al.			
2068	they are structured ok.			
	Have not looked I am here to comment on the proposed			
	wording for evolution and the Big Bang. I do not understand the			
	need to spend time and resources developing standards			
	specifically for AZ when there are national standards that have			
	been developed by experts: NGSS. I strongly support the NGSS			
	because K-12 Science Education Should Reflect the			
	Interconnected Nature of Science as it is Practiced and			
	Experienced in the Real World.'The framework is designed to help			
	realize a vision for education in the sciences and engineering in			
	which students, over multiple years of school, actively engage in			
	scientific and engineering practices and apply crosscutting			
	concents to deepen their understanding of the core ideas in these			
	fields 'The vision represented in the Eramework is new in that			
	students must be opgaged at the power of the three dimensions:1			
	Students must be engaged at the nexus of the timee dimensions.1.			
	Science and Engineering Fractices, z. crosscutting concepts, and s.			
	Disciplinary Core ideas.Currently, most state and district standards			
	express these dimensions as separate entities, leading to their			
	separation in both instruction and assessment. Given the			
	importance of science and engineering in the 21st century,			
	students require a sense of contextual understanding with regard			
	to scientific knowledge, how it is acquired and applied, and how			
	science is connected through a series of concepts that help further			
	our understanding of the world around us. Student performance			
	expectations have to include a student's ability to apply a practice			
	to content knowledge. Performance expectations thereby focus			
	on understanding and application as opposed to memorization of			
2000	facts devoid of context. The Framework goes on to emphasize			
2069	get to the second			
2070	Lasy to read			
2071	standards are well organized			
2072	2 NC			
	As a lay person, I find it a bit hard to follow. I would defer to the			
	opinions of science teachers and professionals on this, however.			
2073	3			
	Religious viewpoints should be taught in church and by parents,			
	not by science teachers and the Dept. of Ed. should have no role			
	to play in introducing religion into school sccience curriculum.			
	Encourage teachers to help students explore science and use their			
	native curiosity and not stifle by making teachers offer biased			
2074	information.			
	I have not read the official document. My opinions are based on			
	nublic information as provided by TV and newspaper			
2075	public mornation as provided by 14 and newspaper.			
2073	The organization and readability of the new draft standards are		1	
	not in question. The scientific content and accuracy are a method			
	of an accuracy are a matter			
2076	While I have not used all of the Colored Chardes to the Solarity			
	write i nave not read all of the Science Standards, I found what I	1		
	nave read to be in many cases wordy: run-on or exceedingly long	1		
	sentences, and repetitive phrases between sentences. Also, some			
	language choices seem cryptic, and could be written more clearly.			
2077	7	1		

ſ		As a parent of 2 daughters who attended K-12 as well as			
		undergrad and graduate schools in Arizona, I oppose the changes			
		to the science curriculum that Diane Douglas is proposing. Science			
		belongs in schools and the bible belongs in the religious			
		community. Science and technology are moving at lightning speed			
		today and to muddy the waters of content is depriving Arizona			
		students of the tools they need to compete in the world. The			
		Arizona education system is ranked well behind the rest of the			
		country and the United States has fallen behind many industrial			
	2078	countries.			
ł	2078	pretty easy to read a little repetitive			
ł	2075	I RECOMMEND YOU EXPLORE THE CURRENT CURRICULUM OF			
		THE AWARD WINNING BASIS SCHOOLS AND THE AWARD			
		WINNING UNIVERSITY HIGH PROGRAM IN TUCSON. THEY ARE			
		THE ONLY COMPETITIVE, NATIONALLY RANKED SCHOOLS I AM			
		AWARE OF IN ARIZONA. DO YOUR HOMEWORK! How can you			
		consider these well organized when you obfuscate and de-			
		emphasize the critical role science plays in a child's education			
		through their scholastic experiences from kindergarten through			
		college? You are attempting to muddy the waters and mix specific			
		religious views with accepted, peer-reviewed science. That is			
	2020	deceitful and misrepresents the best available science.			
ł	2080	Standards should be totally evidence based and not on any			
	2021	specific religious beliefs or dogmas			
ł	2001	I will not comment on the organization of the standards because I			
	2082	am not a teacher.			
ł		The design of the standards are easy to follow and should help			
	2083	teachers identify the focus of required instruction.			
Ī		Any attempt at questioning the role of evolution in our existence			
		or any question as to the theory of how we became what we			
		became as put forth by 98% of all scientist is an injustice to every			
		Arizona student and please, please must not be done.			
ļ	2084				
ł	2085	They are better but still not great.			
ł	2086	Leave the organization remain as it is.			
ł	2087	no comment			
		A bit dense for the average parent/public. I realize the necessity of			
		version more user friendly would be beleful			
	2088	version more user menary would be neiprui.			
ł	2000	Under Core Ideas of Using Science and Core Ideas of Using			
		Science, the author appears to add word salad to remove the			
		word, Evolotion, from the document. Many similar examples			
	2089	throughout.			
Ī		Of course you should teach evolution, why ever question that?			
	2090				
		KEEP the word EVOLUTION in the standards. Evolution is			
		accepted science . There are NO alternative theories that are no			
ł	2091	religiously based.			
	2002	Evolution is no longer a theory it is proven fact and must be taught			
ł	2092	In our science classes.			
		better connected to each other. The standards reflect record			
		changes to the science education in A7 and should be put into			
	2093	action right away.			
t	2055	This feedback form attempts to hide the actual crux of this debate			
		(Evolution vs. Creationism). These questions about the entire			
	l	content of this draft are insignificant. Douglas should have been			
		less Draconian and put out a survey that only states the actual			
		changes proposed to the Physical Science part of the Curriculum.			
		Everything else is just a diversion to confuse.			
ļ	2094				
		NULE: ALL COMMENTS ARE PERSONAL OPINIONS AND DO NOT			
ł	2095	REPRESENT THE OPINIONS OF MY EMPLOYER			
ł	2096	They are NOT easy to read since Sister Mary Diane Douglas is			
	l I	trying to fool the public into believing she truly wants to adveste			
	2097	the children of AZ.			
ł	2057	Organization of the science standards is not the issue. At issue is			
	l I	whether religious beliefs will be allowed to guide science			
	2098	instruction.			
ľ	2099	No issues.			
l	2100	The content infringes on separation of church and state.	 		
ſ		Well done by educators who understand the needs of students			
	1	with out editing by politicians who have no understanding of			
ŀ	2101	scientific principles.			
		Add a table of contents to help readers find things they are			
L	2102	IOOKING IOI'	1	L	

2103	Ambiguous and misleading comments about evolution			
 2104	You need a table of contents			
 2105	Keep it simple.			
 2106	Well-written and well-organized.			
 2107	These appear to parallel the organization in NGSS.			
	Learning progressions are critical to providing appropriate grade			
	level rigor, and can lead to differentiation for students. What			
	causes some confusion is the designated focus on only certain			
	crosscutting concepts is too limiting - schools & districts should			
	determine which and how crosscutting concepts will be			
	developed throughout all grade levels in their curriculum			
2108	development.			
	I have no qualms with the organization of the standards at this			
2109	time.			
	I have concerns about the Key Concept section. I am not sure			
2110	what is meant by 'Refer to standard' in some areas.			
	The theory of evolution should not be omitted from the Science			
	Standards, removing the comment unity and diversity of			
	organisms, living and extinct, is theresult of evolution is egregious			
	and only benefits in further weakening of our education system.			
2111				
	It is organized but incredibly simplified. I'm looking at the 4th			
	grade standards and there is really no depth of content.			
2112				
	Keep your religious beliefs out of the public schools. There is a			
	separation of churc and state in the US. If you wish to teach			
 2113	unitellable, do it at church!			
	I am not concerned about the organization of the document			
2114				
	Really appreciate making the draft with internal review comments			
	readily available, this facilitates a more thorough review.			
2115				
	The color coding is the same as the science and engineering			
	practices, core ideas, and crosscutting concepts, not clear. Plus,			
	you must know the core ideas for knowing science and using			
	science to read the grade band standards.			
2116				
	They weren't horrible to read but definitely need to be cleaned up			
2117	a bit.			
	ABC But, by analogy, the fine organization of garbage does			
2118	not make it more than garbage.			
2119	This document is an affront to critical thinking!			
2120	No Comment			
	Standards are relatively easy to follow. Some charts appear to be			
	designed with space saving in mind and not readability.			
2121				
	color coordination works well, the headings and definitions of			
	standards, curriculum, and instructions are clearly stated and			
2122	delineated			
	For a non-educator and non-scientist this is not an easy read but I			
2123	am not sure it needs to be.			
	Religion has no place in the classroom that is why we have a			
2124	separation of church and state.			
	The quantity of coding - particularly referring back to previous			
	topics - make it very difficult to read. Hard to have a coherent full			
	image with so much of the text abstract.		1	
2125				
	I especially like the connections to other areas of the curriculum.			
2126				
2127	None			
	The science standards are concise but not thorough enough. For			
	instance, the chemistry standards should be broken down into			
	subdivisions of chemistry. Students should be able to explore the			
	branches of chemistry such as biochemistry, organic chemistry,			
	and inorganic chemistry. This is essential for students at all levels.			
	The content in the HS chemistry standards are very specific to			
	inorganic chemistry (also known as General Chemistry in high			
1	school). For students entering college for the allied health fields or	1		
1	pre-professional allied health fields, a solid foundation in	1		
1	chemistry will be necessary to prepare students for college level			
	chemistry, a prerequisite for organic chemistry.		1	
1		1		
2128				
	I feel that the Key concepts include but should not be limited to			
1	part of the standards outline is unnecessary. I am confused as to			
1	why science and engineering are separate. I do not feel it is			
2129	necessary.			
	Does not need any non scientific hypothesis such as creationism	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
2130				
 2131	They read very similarly to the College Board standards.			

1	2122	I am fine with the anneximation		
	2132	ram the with the organization .		
		Science is not based on religious fantasy. Creationism is fantasy!		
	2133			
		The standards are poorly worded. The behavior expectations of		
		the objectives are too cumbersome. There are too many cognitive		
		actions (e.g. Observe record and ask questions: Observe		
		describe ask questions and predict). The conditions are also		
		describe, ask questions, and predict). The conditions are also		
		vague and mostly at a DOK-1 or DOK-2 level.		
	2134			
		The committee did a good job. Just remove the edits by Douglas		
	2135	and you have a reasonable product.		
	2136	Very cluttered		
	2137	I don't think they need to be altered		
		They are often hard to read and difficult to suss out what exactly		
	2120	They are often hard to read and difficult to suss out what exactly		
	2130	each standard is asking for.		
		I nere are standards that are randomly placed in grade levels that		
		do not make any logical sense for growing and developing		
	2139	curriculum.		
		The attempt to delete the word evolution from the document is		
	2140	not acceptable.		
		Science standards should reflect the latest information based on		
		peer-reviewed scientific knowledge. For example, evolution		
		been reviewed sciencific knowledge. For example, evolution		
		should be taught as a known fact. There is no scientific evidence		
		whatsoever for creationism and should NOT be included in the		
		science curriculum whatsoever! As a retired biomedical scientist, I		
		am aghast that this issue is being considered in 2018! Ms. Douglas		
		is not qualified to make such a decision for Arizonans and should		
		not change the Science Standards without extensive review by		
		noted scientists at our higher education institutions of ASII and		
		Inded scientists at our higher education institutions of Aso and		
		UA. Religion should be taught outside of public education and has		
		no place in our school system in Arizona!		
	2141			
		Separating the cross cutting concepts and core ideas for using		
		science from the core ideas and practices makes for cumbersome		
		reading. It would be useful to at minimum have cross cutting		
		reading. It would be useful to at minimum have closs cutting		
		concepts embedded within each standard. It would be less		
		confusing if Using Science was separated out completely as an		
		appendix. Connections to other disciplines should be listed as an		
		appendix as well. Key concepts column is redundant to Core Ideas		
		for Knowing Science.		
	2142			
		You are the dept of ed, not religion, Religion is faith based and		
		there are multiple religions in the world. Science, on the other		
		there are indiciple religions in the world. Science, on the other		
		nand, is fact based. Science belongs in school, religion does not!		
	2143			
		We must not remove the word evolution from our curriculum		
	2144			
		We care more about the content than we do about the		
	2145	organization. You can't really organize ignorance anyway		
	2145	They have to be continually modified. The science taught in grade	1	
		asked as de to be continuous mounted. The science taught in grade		
		school, needs to expanded as the curriculum moves through the		
		classes. we can't just dump our deepest sciences on grade school		
	2146	students.		
		Some of the changes in green have created incomplete concepts;		
		the key concepts are confusing would suggest putting the learning		
		progressions from the document Working with Big Ideas in		
		Science - this allows teachers to see the concepts in context with		
		vocabulary that makes more sense to teachers		
	21.47	vocassiony that makes more sense to teachers.		
	2147	na ha fa sana data a fa sana da sa fada na hala da sa mainina da		
		Beliets resulting from the study of the Bible have NO PLACE		
	2148	dictating a science curriculum.		
		They appear to be orderly and generally well organized. Should be		
	2149	easy to follow for most teachers.		
		I understand the process, but this reductionism to this level of	l	
	2150	detail would be stifling to a competent teacher		
	2130	The standards are not well organized; they are bard to follow and		
		the standards are not well organized; they are hard to follow and		
	2151	hard to understand.		
	2152	It is ok.		
		well organized, but I object to any change in language that		
	2153	attempts to undermine evolution as scientific fact.		
	2154	very vague		
			T	

	Creationism does not belong in public school science curriculum.		
	The purpose of public schools is to educate our children, and the		
	purpose of science curriculum in public schools is to educate		
	children about science. It is not to educate about religious beliefs.		
	Creationism is a religious belief, not a scientific principle.		
	Education about the Big Bang theory and evolution belong in		
	public school science curriculum. DRAFT is a sneaky and		
	underhanded way to impose the religious beliefs of a few on the		
	majority, and it is morally wrong.		
ł	2155		
ł	2156 Organization is sufficient.		
	riese standards - BF DEFINITION - apply to the teaching of		
	through the use of The Scientific Method, which is a reasoned		
	iudgement based on evidence that can be renlicated in a		
	laboratory setting. Statements that arise from the acceptance of		
	ANY religious, spiritual or emotional theory as explanation for how		
	history and human activity have changed over time are worthy of		
	study, but DO NOT BELONG IN ANY SCIENTIFIC CURRICULUM. We		
	(still) live in a secular democracy, not a theocracy.		
L	2157		
	I read the Science Standards and redlined version as of Sunday		
	night, attempting to comment while the public survey was down.		
	This version is NOT the version I saw Sunday night. You have		
	removed several areas of redlining as they existed at that time,		
	showing only your replaced verbage; and you have revised the		
	organization of our facing page on the public comment forum to		
	encourage people to look first at the non-redined version of the		
	Drait. This is misleading and unethical, given the Education Department's clear awareness of the racing debate over chapters		
	to terminology related to evolution and the Big Bang theory. You		
	are not serving the public responsibly nor ethically with these		
	manipulations		
	2158		
ľ	NGSS is what we are using. We don't even follow AZ standards.		
	2159		
	The revisions made by the Department, to the draft that was		
	submitted by the teacher committee, did not add any clarity to the		
	standards, and only muddied the presentation of evolution by the		
	addition of the tentative and ambiguous theory of when		
	presenting evolution. Evolution is no more of a theory than		
	respiration and photosynthesis, and to clarify it as the theory of		
	evolution is disingenuous and misleading.		
ł	Z100 The science standards are clear, eacy to understand, and up to		
	2161 date as they exist current v.		
ł	2162 Evolution needs to be taught.		
ľ	The attempt to weave the 3 dimensions as outlined in the		
	Framework for K-12 Education falls short of what is needed. The		
	way the crosscutting concepts are grouped seems forced and		
	often leaves out important connections across grade levels.		
	Please see the NGSS as a model that we could work from, making		
	adjustments as our teachers and content experts see fit.		
ļ	2163		
	From what I can find online and read the organization of the		
	Science Standards seems OK but I object to the attempt to change		
	evolution to the theory of evolution. These are Science		
	Standards. Evolution is science. Creationism and Intelligent		
	Design are stories for Sunday School. These stories don't belong		
	2164		
ł	2105 Educator speak no thought given to parents /oublic		
	Euclator speak, no thought given to parents/public	1	

					1
	The organization is OK but the language of the standards is often				
	scientifically inaccurate. For example, the Core Idea L4 is				
	inaccurate in that the theory of evolution does not merely seek to				
	indecardie in and the mesh of evolution does not merely seek to				
	make clear the unity and diversity or organisms, rather it actually				
	explains the unity and diversity of organisms by way of specific				
	mechanisms that account for the unity and diversity of				
	organisms. The Science and Engineering Practices are referred to				
	as formerly the scientific method. That comparison/reference is				
	as formerly the sciencine method . That comparison/reference is				
	inaccurate. The Practices are not the same thing as the scientific				
	method. They represent a variety of activities that scientists and				
	engineers engage in, whereas the scientific method implied a				
	specific set of steps involved in all scientific activity. In the				
	ananiantian of the standards there is an indication about hour				
	organization of the standards, there is no indication about now				
	the Cross Cutting Concepts are to be used. If cross cutting				
	concepts are important, then they should be used in organizing				
	the standards in such a way that their place and role in the				
	standards becomes clear Most of the Key Concents in the				
	standards analytic base list of same silar to say and says be same				
	standards appear to be a list of vocabulary terms and may be seen				
	as terms to be learned rather than concepts to be understood.				
	The standards should be organized in such a way that the				
	concepts appear as integral parts of the standards rather than as				
	separate list of terms. It is not clear to me why we are relying more				
	on a foreign publication (Harlen 2015) to develop our standards				
	on a longin publication (manen, 2015) to develop our standards				
	ratner than relying more fully on the NRC 2012 Framework, which				
	provides a well organized and well thought out vision for K-12				
	Science Education.				
216					
216	/ Need to keep evolution.				
	I cannot endorse any curriculum with religious content. Intelligent				
	design and evolution can co exist, but intelligent should be taught				
	at home and left to parents to explain their family's belief system				
216	8 to their children.				
216	9 There's a lot to read. Does there have to be so much?				
	I will not consider any changes if the teaching of evolution is in				
	is a set of the set of				
	jeopardy including the word evolution. Thave taken the time to				
217	u read the proposal for every grade level.				
	It should be organized based on when the standard should be				
	taught throughout the year building up to more difficult				
217	1 standards.				
	These comments are exclusively about the proposed adoption of				
	Intelligent Design, theory in the classroom, I'm sure you know				
	shout the federal court area rulias it us constitutional but I usuald				
	about the lederal court case ruling it unconstitutional, but I would				
	like to add that these kinds of ideas are what make Arizona's				
	educational system the butt of so many jokes. What utter				
217	2 nonsense.				
	The standards need to be revised with the only agenda being that				
	of advancing science education, rather than the advancement of a				
217	2 the second sec				
217	s theoratic agenua.				
	My team and I had to really carefully read to see if we are still				
	teaching anything we are familiar with in second grade. It appears				
	as though we are teaching most of what we did before we some			1	
217	4 additions.				
217	5 The standards are fairly easy to read and understand		1		
	Some of the wording is unclear and needs to be a voice of a				
517	E teacher				
217					
217	/ No comment				
217	8 No comment				
	The use of color and strikethrough font made changes very easy				
217	9 to review				
	This DRAFT should have been designed and vetted by scientists				
	not by Diane Douglas who has no science training.				
218	0				
	Well organized and easy to read??? This is what is important in a		1		
	science standard? How about the full knowledge and scope of that				
	and a field De anti-ates de anti-transmissione de la competitione de l				
	particular field! Do not water down the language that defines our				
218	1 science standards!				
218	2 seem fine				
	Diana Douglas does not have the education background just				
	because she was voted in soley on the Republican ticket. Teach				
218	3 science not religion.				
210	4 Appear similar to the NGSS				
210	I feel that the 2004 standard format is easy to following and			1	
	in reer that the 2004 standard format is easy to following and				
	understand. It is easy to see the standards that go along with each				
	section across all grade levels. The revision is more cumbersome				
218	5 and distractive.				
218	6 Fine				
218	7 Put it back the way it was.				

	The current draft of the science standards does not reflect the			
	necessary and sought-after shifts in science education as charged			
	to the Science Standards Committee with respect to organizing			
	the standards around 14 core ideas and developing learning			
	progressions to coherently and logically build scientific literacy			
	from kindergarten through high school.			
2188	3			
	This new language is vague and sounds made up. As a mother of			
	son in the Math Science Academy at SHS, I find this disheartening			
	our educators find this is to be at a high standard.			
2189				
2190	Organization seems OK			
	I like the overall organization, however, I feel like the final draft			
	should contain headers and bookmarks for easy digital havigation.			
	functionality once the document is converted to RDF			
2101	functionality once the document is converted to 1 br.			
	As a resident living in AZ and a grandparent and a great			
	grandparent of children attending school in AZ. I strongly object to			
	forcing religious beliefs into the educational system funded by			
	taxpayers. This idea cannot be considered good leadership for			
	public education, but simply a way for the Christian church to 'get			
2192	them young'			
	It is surprising how much information is within the standards. This			
	is something that is usually within each district curriculum map			
2193	instead of standards lists.			
	Life Science standards should be ordered in a way that the			
	standards would be taught. Starting small going to large as			
	following the textbook used by the districts. The standards should			
	be dumbed down especially because new teachers could be			
	intimidated.Standards need to broken down and labeled better.			
	Organisms is what we are learning about because biology is			
	itterally the study of life , organisms are alive. The Cells and			
	Organisms label should be broken down between organization of			
	iffe, blochem, cells then maybe broader into specific organization			
	Constice Corganization of Life>Biochemistry>Celis			
2194				
	special education students in high schoool can have trouble with			
2195	meeting some of the standards.			
	The organization is well-planned and communicated. However,			
	the order of the content may need changing. Organization of			
	Living Things> Biochemistry> Cells>> Genetics>			
	Organisms> Evolution> Ecosystems I understand that this is a			
	curriculum discussion but it may make life simpler to have that			
	standards in the same order. At the end of the day, they are			
	definitely well organized and easy to read.			
2196	5			
	It jumps around too much from small to big to small. I would like			
	to see the order of the standards going from small to large			
	concepts. Kinda in the way our textbooks sort of do it, following		1	
	he textbooks that our districts adapted would be beneficial. I			
	much. So the action would be nice to change the order of the		1	
	standards. As far as reading them, the standards seem a little			
	wordyit would be nice to see a little more to the point of what			
	is being asked. Many teachers take each standard differently		1	
	because it is too broad at times.			
2197	7	<u> </u>		
	I do not think it makes sense to label a variety of items in the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	document as positive and negative when referring to			
	implications. Both of those are more charged and leading. I don't			
2198	see the positive impact of including those words.			
	They're easy to read and identifty the different topics but they		1	
	don't give enough information and examples to go with each			
2199	topic.			
	It would be more clear if the Science Standards are more clear		1	
3300	about which Crosscutting concepts, and Science and Engineering			
2200	The standards are not clear and are very broad. It leaves so much			
1000	room for interpretation which leads to confusion			
2201	We are back to vocabulary again instead of the scientific principles			
2202	that make up our standards.			
	I believe that the Three Dimensions of Science Instruction are			
	explained in the opposite order of what they should be: I would		1	
	start with the Core Ideas and move outward, instead of the other		1	
2203	way.			

keep science in science classes not religious opinionskeep		
evolution and reject intelligent design. Church and state are		
constitutionally separate for this very reason. This woman needs		
2204 to be fired.		
The suggestions for modifications of Science Standards are not		
2205 logically organized		
While organized, there is some discontinuity in terms of voice and		
conceptual frameworks - particularly in regards to energy - is		
there one kind with various transfer and storage mechanisms, or		
are there different forms? Can it be used or merely transferred		
around? There are others, I will attempt to place them in useful		
parts below (those that have not already been communicated).		
2206		
The standards are organized in strands that make sense and are		
2207 cross referenced with other content area skills.		
2208 The use of a new way but it can be followed		
The Use of Science is a new way of organizing but it is		
2209 understandable.		
The use of science is a new way of organizing but it is		
2210 understandable. I can follow it.		
The organization is a new format, but fairly easy to understand.		
2211		
They are bad, You shouldn't eliminate or water down the ideas of		
evolution and the big bang. They are scientific theories, which		
have been proven time over time. Evolution is a FACT.		
 2212		
I think that the layout of the standards is good and, to a lay		
person, I imagine that they are easy to read. However, I am a		
recently certified science teacher (middle/high school) who used		
to work as a professional scientist (teaching is my second career). I		
found the edited version difficult to read because the edits		
changed the meaning of the original intent so much and there are		
fundamental flaws in understanding that are now part of this		
 2213 document.		
 2214 Too complicated.		
I'll admit it - I mostly skimmed it, and read through the parts that		
people were in a tizzy about. But despite skimming, it seemed		
 2215 easy to read!		
All faith based or religion related education needs to be		
eliminated from all science education. Opposing points of views		
must NOT be taught in relation to Creation Science or Scientific		
Creationism. We are no longer in the dark ages!		
 2216		
221/ OK	1	