



TAKE ACTION!
Wyoming is looking to
adopt the NGSS

The Wyoming State Board of Education is a group of 11 members appointed by the Governor. This Board is given the statutory authority over Wyoming's state education standards.

The science standards are beginning the review process and in **NOVEMBER 2013** the **Wyoming State Board of Education** will be voting on whether or not to adopt the **NEXT Generation Science Standards** for the review process. These are the **ONLY** science standards being considered by Wyoming at this time.

PLEASE let the Wyoming State Board of Education know that you DO NOT SUPPORT THE ADOPTION OF THE NGSS FOR REVIEW IN WYOMING.

Wyoming State Board of Education
members' emails:

joe.reichardt@wyoboards.gov
sue.belish@wyoboards.gov
kathy.coon@wyoboards.gov
pete.gosar@wyo.gov
hugh.hageman@wyoboards.gov
scotty.ratliff@wyoboards.gov
walt.wilcox@wyoboards.gov
kathryn.sessions@wyoboards.gov
belenda.willson@wyoboards.gov
ken.rathbun@wyoboards.gov
ron.micheli@wyoboards.gov

The NEXT Generation Science Standards were not officially a part of the Common Core State Standards Initiative. They were created, however, to fit within the Common Core program and are supported by the same groups that created the "college and career-ready" reform.

Wyoming Citizens Opposing Common Core
www.wyomingcitizensopposingcommoncore.com



**WYOMING
CITIZENS OPPOSING
COMMON CORE**

Information on the NEXT Generation Science Standards (NGSS)



www.wyomingcitizensopposingcommoncore.com

Parents, children and taxpayers have a right to expect objective, religiously neutral education in the public schools

Citizens For Objective Public Education Evaluated the NGSS

- The standards address ultimate religious questions and then use a doctrine or “Rule” that permits only materialistic or functionally atheistic answers
- The standards require a materialistic explanation for any phenomenon addressed by science
- The standards are neither educationally objective nor religiously neutral, because an atheistic or materialistic worldview is consistently affirmed throughout.
- The Standards fail to present legitimate scientific critiques of materialistic theories regarding the origins of the universe, of life and its diversity
- The standards fail to present controversial issues objectively (such as climate change, renewable energy and sustainability)
- The standards are one-sided in that they disproportionately focus on negative effects of human interaction with the environment

Concerns with the Standards

- **Emphasis of skills over knowledge, creating vagueness**
- **Includes “robust standards on evolution and climate change”**
- **Teach that human activity is responsible for detrimental climate change**
- **Religiously non-neutral which would lead to indoctrination, not education**
- **Fail to distinguish historical from experimental science**
- **Fail to distinguish for students the various definitions of evolution, leading them to assume that the word always denotes the same thing**
- **Not based on empirical evidence of efficacy nor are they tested in any environment**
- **Heavy on practice, but light on content**

Fordham Review

Nine scientists and mathematicians reviewed NGSS for the Thomas B. Fordham Institute. **Fordham gave the standards an overall grade of “C,”** (the NAEP and TIMSS standards received the grade of A- from the Fordham Institute).

Four Points from the Fordham Review:

1. The NGSS “never explicitly require some content in early grades that is then assumed in subsequent stan-

dards.”

2. The standards attempt “to put a ceiling on the content and skills that will be measured at each grade,” [which] may limit what is taught by the exclusion of content that more advanced students can learn.
3. The standards fail “to include essential math content that is critical to science learning.” Particularly in physics and chemistry, “the standards seem to assiduously dodge the mathematical demands inherent in the subjects covered.”
4. The “confusing presentation of the standards, combined with vague and poorly worded expectations, earns the NGSS a 1.5 out of 3 for clarity and specificity.”

Another problem Fordham reviewers found is NGSS focuses on students “performing” at the expense of “memorizing.” The Fordham Institute suggests that the creators of the standards “conferred primacy on practices and paid too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices both feasible and worthwhile.” They indicate that in this case “content takes a backseat to practices.” The Fordham report suggests that science education should “build knowledge first so that students will have the storehouse of information and understanding that they need to engage in scientific reasoning and higher level thinking.” (Education Reporter, July 2013)