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The motivation for this research study was tertiary in nature. Initially, educational experiences placed the researcher in the eyewitness position of what the psychologist and researcher Robert K. Yin explains in his book, *Case Study Research: Design Methods* (2003), as a “participant-observer” by coming into direct contact with the developmental process of history standards as a contributing writer and reviewer at the state and local levels. The *National Standards for History* (1994-1996) were utilized as both an impetus and integral framework for the *Learning Standards in the Social Sciences* of the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) (refer to Appendix B) and the *Social Science Learning Outcomes* of the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) (refer to Appendix C) and subsequent successor, the *Chicago Academic Standards (CAS) in the Social Sciences* (refer to Appendix C).

It was under the aegis of the Council for Basic Education (CBE) that the discredited *National Standards for History* were revised and this organization subsequently also led the training for the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU) and CPS collaborative project, the *Framework for Transforming Teaching and Learning* (1994). This endeavor resulted in Chicago becoming the first urban school district in the nation to produce learning outcomes and a standards-based framework for learning in the content areas including history, as well as the other social sciences.
In addition, involvement and leadership in professional organizations such as the Illinois Council for the Social Studies (ICSS) and the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) provided opportunities for conferencing and networking with discourse about the development of standards. Personal intellectual pursuits also led to a series of interactions with the stakeholders of the National History Standards Project (NHSP). For example, being a Woodrow Wilson Fellow at Princeton University forged a relationship with Dr. Ross Dunn, a subsequent interviewee and Coordinating Editor of the NHSP World History Standards, who led two of the drafting sessions of the *National Standards for World History*.

On January 18, 1995, *The National Standards for History* were censured on the floor of the United States Senate politicizing the state of history education by having the government intervene in the official national standards project that involved academia, professional organizations and classroom practitioners. What was once a negative spotlight on history education has come full circle in the legislature with the contemporary advocacy movement aligning supporters of history (both American and world) and the social studies to counteract the NCLB ramifications. Dr. Robert Bain, Associate Professor of History Education, University of Michigan, interviewee, NHSP Council for Basic Education committee member and contemporary advocate for history education posited that:

Numerous studies have shown that elementary schools have taken on an ‘expanding horizons’ structure that places history on the margins of students’ instructional experiences (Halvorsen, 2006; Ravitch, 1987). In addition, there is increasing evidence that No Child Left Behind (NCLB)
has been forcing all social studies, whether history is dominant or not, out of the elementary curriculum in favor of reading and math.¹

This partnership of educators and legislators has intensified with the lobbying efforts of both the leaders and the rank and file of professional organizations for a combined partnership to bring public awareness to the current state of history education and that of the social studies in American schools. Dr. Jesus Garcia, Past-President of NCSS and Professor of Social Studies Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, acknowledged the importance of this collaboration:

In the last five years, after identifying evidence suggesting that the amount of time devoted to social studies in K-6 classrooms had diminished, NCSS leaders have taken the initiative and formed alliances with officers of other education organizations and business and community leaders to lobby for the inclusion of social studies/history as a core subject in the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind (NCLB).²

In 2004, as President-Elect of ICSS, the researcher was a part of a legislative leadership lobby cohort of NCSS that petitioned legislators in Washington, D.C., for the inclusion of history and social studies education in the proposed revision of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (2001) legislation. Some of these were the same legislators of the current bi-partisan Senate Committee (i.e., the late Senator Ted Kennedy, D-Massachusetts, Senator Richard Durbin, D-Illinois, former Senator Barack Obama, D-Illinois, Senator Richard Byrd, D-West Virginia) that requested Dr. Theodore K. Rabb, another interviewee, Professor Emeritus of Medieval History at Princeton University, Co-Founder of the National Council for History Education (NCHE), and NHSP World


History Committee Member, to assess the state of history education which promulgated the *Crisis in History: A Statement* (refer to Appendix D).

These senators also drafted and supported the current *Senate Bill 2721, the American History Achievement Act*, to improve secondary history education. Other Congressman such as Representative George Miller, D-CA., House Committee Chair in Education and Labor, supported the *Crisis in History: A Statement*, as well as other initiatives with the senators such as the *Teaching With American History Grant Program* with contingent funding until the year 2010.

Most important, the purpose of this study is that it will be a resource that provides background information in the application of standards for teachers of history and the social sciences. A novice history teacher’s query at a professional development session that was both pragmatic, yet probing, became the crux of the research for this study.

*Where do these history standards come from, and why do I have to use them in the classroom?* It is for this reason that the transcriptions of the oral history interviews and other archival artifacts from this project will be housed for public access at the Cudahy Library of Loyola University Chicago. The intent of this research study is (1) to analyze the various perspectives that were involved in the development and aftermath of the *National Standards for History*, and (2) how educational policies were subsequently developed that impacted local curricula in history education.
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GLOSSARY

Adequate Yearly Progress. Minimum amount of percentage gains by students stipulated by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) benchmarks for academic achievement in content areas on state assessments. Any states that are recipients of NCLB monies, such as Illinois, are required to have school districts make AYP otherwise remediation measures will be taken such as placing schools on the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) Academic Warning List.

Benchmarks. Specified targets of achievement that are age-appropriate designated by grade levels in core disciplines.

Chicago Academic Standards. Systemic standards adopted as policy replacing the Learning Outcomes Project developed by writing teams of teachers based on the national standards and Illinois Goals for Learning.

Chicago Academic Standards Examinations. Mandated examinations written to assess skills and content in the Chicago Academic Standards.

Content Standards. Standards delineating the competencies, skills and knowledge for all American students to attain achievement in academic disciplines.

Core Subjects. Defined by the National Education Goals as English, mathematics, science, geography and history; school districts reference as language arts/English, mathematics, science and social sciences.

Curriculum Task Forces. NHSP committees of 15 experienced teachers that converted content standards to elementary and secondary performance standards with coordinated teaching activities.

Focus Groups. Eight advisory groups of 15 members chosen by their organizations to serve as consultants to review materials for the National Council for the History Standards.

Habits of Mind. Acquired skills of analysis and inquiry in the social sciences.

Illinois Assessment Frameworks. ISBE content and skills analysis in specific grades.

Illinois Goals. General statements of what students in Illinois should “know and be able to do” within the six fundamental learning areas.

Inclusiveness. The ethos that United States history should be balanced to reflect a genuine representation of all contributors embracing multiculturalism, minorities and women.

Learning Outcomes Project. Systemic learning outcomes adopted by the Chicago Public Schools for Grades 2, 4, 8 and 11 based on the ISBE State Goals for Learning in six fundamental subject areas mandated as policy in 1994.

NAEPs. National Assessments of Educational Progress examinations for Grades 4, 8, and 12 in core subject areas.

National Educational Goals. The nation’s governors set six performance goals to improve American education as a result of their Education Summit of 1989 held in Charlottesville, Virginia.

National Council for Education Standards and Testing. Created by Congress (Public Law 102-62) on June 27, 1991 to address the issues of the National Education Goals.

National Council for History Standards. The oversight body of the NHSP responsible for setting and directing policies of the drafting and revision of the standards in history.

National Forum for History Standards. NHSP advisory body comprised of 29 organizations concerned with history in the schools selected from educational, public interest, business, parent, and other groups.

National History Standards. The three types of standards of content, process, and performance of what students should “know and be able to do” in history.

National History Standards Project. Cooperative UCLA/NEH Research Program that developed and disseminated national achievement standards for United States and world history.

No Child Left Behind Legislation. Federal legislation of 2001 that tied funds to measures of accountability in reading, mathematics and science. In Illinois AYP is also mandated for achievement in state writing assessments to meet guidelines.

Performance Descriptors. Indicators that denote the quality of student performance in subject matter in specific grade levels.
Standards-Aligned Classroom. ISBE project for schools based on Richards Stiggins tenets of instructional targets for classroom and individualized learning in standards-based instruction utilized in some Illinois school districts.

Tools of Social Inquiry. Skills in the history/social sciences including historical research, analysis of primary documents, utilization of technology and critical thinking.
ABSTRACT

This qualitative research study, in the format of an historical narrative, chronicles the issues, process of consensus, and the impact of the National History Standards Project (NHSP) on local policies and curricula in history education. The “culture wars” for the National Standards for History of 1994-1996 and quest for a further clarification of a national identity were also a part of two concomitant movements; the global standards movement in international education and also the domestic voluntary national standards movement in the core subjects (i.e., reading, mathematics, science and history) that was sponsored by governmental commissions and professional organizations.

The acrimonious ideological and satirical rhetoric that was exchanged in the formation of the National Standards for History entangled historians, educators, curators, legislators, special interest groups, professional organizations, government agencies, think tanks and the media. In 1995, the contentious pathway eventually led to the censure of the National Standards for History in the United States Senate and with a process of consensus, a set of revised standards were issued and disseminated.

In order to understand the prominence of the NHSP, a brief narrative overview is provided chronicling the seminal reform initiatives in history education beginning with the 1892 prestigious Committee of Ten. The need for the NHSP was precipitated by both the movement for national standards in learning and federal legislation that later impacted state and district curricula. Because the impact did not occur immediately, changes in
local policies both with the Illinois Board of Education (ISBE) and the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) are chronicled to 2004, a decade after the *National Standards for History* were written. Topical issues in history education and accountability are also examined.

Multiple sources of evidence were utilized in the research including oral history interviews (refer to Questionnaire, Appendix A) and documents and artifacts from the NHSP housed in the archives of the Charles E. Young Humanities Research Library at the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA). Archival materials are also referenced from the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU) and the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) which demonstrate the curricular applications of the *National Standards for History*. According to Yin, the convergence of multiple sources of evidence including documents, archival records, open-ended interviews, primary and secondary sources provide an invaluable advantage in the case study strategy.3

Although a critical first step was the creation of the voluntary *National Standards for History* to establish clear goals for learning and achievement to raise the overall quality of history education, currently, the implementation process of the history standards is not uniform in all of the states’ schools districts. Although generalizations are made to national trends and implications, this research study primarily focuses on the policies of ISBE and those of CPS.

The conclusions reached in this qualitative study are: 1) that the *National Standards for History* impacted the ISBE history standards and those of CPS; 2) the state of history education is adversely affected by the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB)

---

(2001) legislation to fully implement the history standards effectively and (3) educational policies and funding must be changed to ameliorate the accountability measures in assessing the performance of students to achieve the intended content and skills of the history standards.

The implications for teacher preparation and certification in history and the social sciences are also examined for the promotion and sustainability of highly qualified teachers to ensure the mastery of the history standards in instruction. The contemporary advocacy movement in history and social science education by professional organizations is also discussed as well as the role of government in educational policy making including the issues of accountability and assessment.
INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Goals of the Study

To remain ignorant of things that happened before you were born is to remain a child.

-- Cicero, Oration on Aging

Background

Contemporary elementary and secondary history educators have to instruct within the confines of national, state and district curricula mandates and with the latest reform initiatives of standards-based education (refer to Illustration 6), which will be further delineated in Chapter Four. The prominence of the origins and ramifications of standards-based education as a contemporary educational policy reform movement was the focus of the keynote address by Dr. Eva L. Baker, Past-President of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), to the 25,000 interdisciplinary membership:

The wave of U.S. reform was stimulated, in part, by lackluster performance on international comparisons more than two decades ago. Not surprisingly, the reform plan was to follow the international lead and design a quasi-national system of standards and assessments. Despite awareness of huge differences in context and traditions (our 50-state autonomy in education, distributed curricula, independent teacher education institutions and waning respect for those working in education) state and federal legislation enabled state standards and related tests (National Council on Education Standards and Testing NCEST) (1992). ¹

The most significant federal legislation to impact current educational policies in standards and assessment is the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) (2001) (*Public Law 107-110; 115 Stat. 1425*) which is scheduled for reauthorization in the 2009-2010 Congressional sessions. Although the altruistic intent of NCLB (2001) was to “close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility and choice, so that no child is left behind,” history, as well as other social science disciplines (e.g., political science, geography, economics, et al.) have been negatively impacted by this federal legislation as will be shown. Some would say that the NCLB (2001) legislation intentionally omitted history and the social science humanities-based disciplines sending educators and policy-makers a message that if history was previously a stepchild within the curricular hierarchy, it is now merely an orphan, not even considered a core discipline for students with reading, mathematics and science.

In a contemporary research report issued by the Council for Basic Education (CBE), the organization that oversaw the revisions of the post-controversy *National Standards for History*, found that this national trend since the federal enactment of NCLB (2001) has been recognized as “narrowing the curriculum” in having both state test programs and standards-based reforms to be inclusive of language arts, mathematics and science, pushing aside non-tested areas of study like history and the social studies.\(^2\) Claus von Zastrow and Helen Janc, “Academic Atrophy: The Condition of the Liberal Arts in America’s Public Schools,” *Council for A Basic Education, A Report from the Council for Basic Education* (Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2004), 7.

President of the Thomas B. Fordham Institute and Dr. Diane Ravitch, currently Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, NHSP committee member, former Assistant Secretary of Education, and Professor of Educational Research at New York University, both advocates of the teaching of American history, refer to this educational policy as: the “big curriculum squeeze”, a compression of the school programs to reading, math and science to comply with the epochal but flawed NCLB statute.\(^4\)

Subsequently, this diminution of instructional time in history, primarily at the elementary level, could have a detrimental effect on the preparation of students for required secondary courses and electives. According to Dr. Margaret Spellings, former Secretary of Education, the 2007 National Assessments of Educational Progress (NAEP’s) data reports less than one-half of the fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders are proficient in American history.\(^5\) This performance deficiency in American history is attributed by some educators to a pervasive decreased “time on task” instruction.

Walk into any low-performing middle school classroom in your district and you may be shocked to find children unable to identify the state or country in which they live. Many may not know the continents or the U.S. president. ‘By fifth grade kids should at least know what the U.S. Constitution is and the Bill of Rights and know that we have a president, a Congress and a court system’ says Peggy Altoff, social studies facilitator for Colorado Springs, Colorado School District 11 and past president of the National Council for the Social Studies. However, because such basics are not being taught at the elementary level, kids in middle and high school are not performing well, according to Altoff. At any low-

\(^4\)Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, eds., *Beyond the Basics: Achieving A Liberal Education for All Students* (Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2007), 2.

performing school, they spend most of their days on reading, writing and math.  

This marginalization contradicts the stated aims of NCLB, to reduce the “achievement gap” and provide more opportunities to all students and in particular, to low-performing students. A paradox exists between the ethos (what all students should know and be able to do) and the practice of standards to improve instructional equity as noted by another contemporary reform advocate:

Gayle Y. Thieman, Past President of the National Council for the Social Studies, says that schools with high minority populations and low socio-economic status are suffering the most. ‘What’s really criminal about that is the enriched curriculum that all kids deserve is still taking place in districts with high-achieving kids’ says Thieman.

The “opportunity gap” is further correlated to the “achievement gap” by additional NAEP data:

Students from low-income families, or those eligible for free or reduced-price school lunch on an average scored lower on the National Assessment of Educational Progress’s (NAEP) U.S. History test in 2006 than those from higher-income families. The gaps between those in the lowest income levels and the highest were 31 points in fourth grade and 28 points in eighth grade. Similarly, on the NAEP civics test, fourth and eighth graders from low income families had lower scores in 2006 than students from higher income families by 28 points and 30 points respectively.

These contemporary concerns have been noted and have been voiced not only by history and social science educators, but also by professional organizations. On October 6


9Ibid., 2.
21, 2004, over one hundred and twenty diverse organizations, spearheaded by the National Center for Fair and Open Testing in conjunction with NCSS, sent to the Congressional Committees on Health, Education and Labor, *A Joint Organizational Statement* to reform the NCLB Act (2001) with recommendations for testing and the inclusion of history as well as the other social science disciplines as core disciplines (refer to Appendix D).

Including in the activism and support were the American Historical Association (AHA), the Organization of American Historians (OAH), the National Council for History Education (NCHE), National History Day, the National Coalition for History and the World History Association (WHA).

It should be duly noted that “social studies” and “social science/s” as a point of reference will be henceforth utilized interchangeably inasmuch they are cited in these various formats in the literature, scholarly research and policies. It should also be noted that the *National Standards for History* (1994-1996) often encompass social history which includes some of the other social science disciplines such as political science, economics and geography. Both the ISBE *Illinois Learning Standards* (ILS) in the social sciences and the former *Chicago Academic Standards* (CAS) in the social sciences of the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) have distinct separate history standards and eras in both United States and World History which are further explained in the curricula applications in Chapter Four.

The formidable measures of accountability triggered by NCLB in the disciplines of reading, mathematics and science have promoted both a mentality and reality of “high-
stakes” testing. Accountability in assessments is measured at the national, state and local district levels.

A test is ‘high stakes’ when its results are used to make important decisions that affect students, teachers, administrators, communities, schools, and districts (Madaus, 1988). In very specific terms, ‘high-stakes’ tests are part of a policy design (Schneider and Ingram, 1997) that ‘links the score on one set of standardized tests to grade promotion, high school graduation and, in some cases, teacher and principal salaries and tenure decisions (Orfield and Wald, 2000). As part of the accountability movement, stakes are also deemed high because of the results of tests, as well as the ranking and categorization of schools, teachers, and children that extend from those results, are reported to the public (McNeil, 2001). 

These findings are further supported by the multiple research of Amrein and Berliner (2002a, 2002b); Lipman (2004); McNeil (2000); McNeil and Valenzuela (2001) and Watanabe (2007) who concluded that high-stakes testing limits the ability of teachers to meet the sociocultural needs of their students and corrupts systems of educational measurement. The mandated accountability measures of high-stakes testing have placed teachers into the dilemma of “teaching to the test” which focuses more instructional time on the tested subjects because of the intensified scrutiny of administrators to achieve district performance expectations and to have positive teacher evaluations insuring job security.

Although NCLB mandates that all children be proficient in basic subjects by 2013, earlier research has detailed how similar test items are used year after year, encouraging teachers to teach to a narrowing range of domains.

---
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At times entire state tests are quietly circulated among teachers (Stetcher, 2002).12

The accountability measures for NCLB have become intensified:

The passage of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 solidified the growing trend toward test-based accountability. Accountability regimes are designed to increase achievement growth and promote equality of educational opportunity. With these goals in mind, schools are now identified as ‘in need of improvement’ or failing to make ‘adequately yearly progress’ (AYP) by a formula that individual states create, emphasizing progress toward all students being proficient on standardized tests. Actions taken against schools for failure to meet AYP in consecutive years, required by NCLB for Title I schools, escalate, culminating in reconstitution of the schools.13

In order for schools and districts to meet the hurdles of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (refer to Glossary) both instructional time and budgetary resources have been re-allocated away from the social sciences, primarily history education. This alarming concern has been expressed by Dr. Theodore K. Rabb, interviewee, NHSP member and Co-Founder of the National Council for History Education (NCHE) and supported by other prominent historians such as Eric Foner, the late John Hope Franklin, Kenneth Jackson, David McCullough, Sam Wineburg, William Leuchtenburg, the late Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and the membership of the NCHE in the Crisis in History: A Statement (2004). The statement was issued to Congress noting not only the decrease of instructional time in history, but also in curricula-related activities at the elementary level


with additional recommendations for the professional preparation of history teachers (refer to Appendix D).

Subsequently, this educational policy has created a domino effect throughout the states, including Illinois, to eradicate state testing in history and the social sciences (formerly administered by ISBE in grades 4, 7 and 11) resulting in the mindset that “if it is not tested, it is not taught.” In 2007, only eleven states in the United States tested social studies in the elementary grades, whereas, in 1998, thirty states tested social studies.¹⁴ State assessments in history and the social sciences (history was the major social science component in the ISBE state assessments) were rescinded by the Illinois General Assembly by Public Act 094-0875-105ILCS5/2-3.64 (refer to Appendix B) in July of 2003 as a cost-effective budgetary measure to provide funding for the NCLB mandated assessments at the elementary and secondary levels in reading, writing, mathematics and science.

In addition, history education in many schools nation-wide has been relegated to “reading in the content area” to support language arts instruction and literacy skills because of accountability measures to meet the guidelines of student achievement performance expectations. According to Cathy Roller, Director of Research and Policy with the International Reading Association:

Reading assessments at the upper elementary and middle school levels which include social studies materials are assessing not just word identification but comprehension. A great deal of comprehension is about having the background, vocabulary and conceptual knowledge to interpret

the words. For example, if students encounter a passage about the War of 1812 on a reading assessment, they have a greater likelihood of comprehending the passage and scoring higher if they’ve previously studied the topic. Particularly in grades K-4, children who are not exposed to social studies education are not gaining essential vocabulary, conceptual and word knowledge. It’s extremely shortsighted not to teach social studies in K-4.15

The recent findings of Lintner, Heafner, Lipscomb and Rock (2006) purport that even in states that test history as well as the other social studies, competition for instructional time among tested curricula leave social studies with a disproportionately small amount of time when compared to reading and math.16 This premise is further substantiated by the Center on Education Policy Research (2006) that the aforementioned “narrowing of the curriculum” fostered by NCLB has in 33 percent of school districts surveyed resulted in fewer resources, fewer contact hours with students and fewer opportunities for professional development in history, civics/government, economics and geography.17

Why Not History?

The curricular forerunner in the nation to develop a coherent framework of history standards was the California State Board of Education’s History-Social Science Framework for California’s Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1988). This project was developed by California K-12 history practitioners in

---


17“From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act,” Summary and Recommendations, Center on Education Policy (Washington, DC, 2006), 12.
conjunction with the scholars at the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS) at the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) under the leadership of the NCHS Co-Founders, Dr. Charlotte Crabtree and Dr. Gary Nash.

In 1992, Crabtree and Nash authored with the historians Paul Gagnon and Steve Waugh, *Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire*. *Lessons* was a widely-accepted culturally diverse practical compendium of standards-based prototype interactive history lessons that had been previously piloted in California classrooms. *Lessons* also had a national reputation and served as a resource to other states and school districts including the writing teams of both the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) for the development of history standards. The National History Standards Project (NHSP), the official project that drafted and disseminated the national history standards, had its genesis with Crabtree’s application to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) chaired by Lynne V. Cheney in partnership with the Department of Education (DOE) for a federal grant.

In 1992, shortly before I left the Chairmanship of the NEH, I signed a grant for $525,000 (and the Secretary of Education signed a grant for $865,000) to fund this project. The award was made on the basis of an application from the History Center at the University of California at Los Angeles in which the directors of that center offered as a model of the work they would produce a highly regarded publication that they had previously done, *Lessons from History*. *Lessons* rightfully included Americans like Sojourner Truth, who were frequently overlooked in the past, while still emphasizing figures like George Washington. *Lessons* was frank about this country’s failings without neglecting our many achievements.18

---

Cheney’s original enthusiastic support of the NHSP turned into a public and acrimonious admonishment that fostered a “culture war” steeped in conservative ideology:

but the standards that were published in 1994 bore almost no relationship to Lessons. Instead they reflected the gloomy, politically driven revisionism that has become all too familiar on college campuses. They took the important principle of inclusion to such an extreme that a new kind of exclusion resulted. Harriet Tubman, who helped slaves escape from the South, is mentioned six times in the standards, while two of her white male contemporaries, Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, are cited one and zero times respectively. The History Standards also drove home the point that no matter how committed an Endowment head might be to traditional scholarly standards, he or she could not succeed in upholding them when those most influential in the community of humanities scholars no longer thought them worthy. Asked in 1995 to testify before the Congress about the future of the NEH, I felt compelled to say that it was time to do away with the Endowment, time to turn funding of the humanities--and the arts as well--back to the private sector.  

It is the contention of the researcher, as well as others, that this current national policy stance, particularly towards history education, that has filtered down to the individual states, has a direct link to the political fallout of the censured National Standards for History that were developed by the National History Standards Project (NHSP), as will be shown. For example, the post-controversy influence of the national standards in history in policies of states concerning history education was characterized as being “radioactive” by Ravitch, the former Assistant Secretary of Education and

---
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NHSP member. Moreover, what ramifications, if any, can be evidenced in Illinois with the policies of the ISBE or with the CPS, the second largest school district in the nation?

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study is (1) to provide an analysis of the development and aftermath of the *National Standards for History* through post-controversy research of some of the pertinent stakeholders, and (2) to correlate how these standards impacted history education and local educational policies and curricula. The influence of the National History Standards Project (NHSP) will be scrutinized to demonstrate how it was an impetus not only for the development of standards in history for the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), but also for those of the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). The relationships of federal initiatives on history education and state policies and directives will also be analyzed.

In addition, this study demonstrates a link between the curricula reform cycle at the national and local levels, and the role of the history standards in the hierarchy of standards-based-education (refer to Illustration 6). The definitional syntax of the word “curriculum”, deriving its roots from the Latin word *currere* (Eisner, 1994), denotes a circular race track, an *apropos* analogy to the reform cycle in history education consisting of national exams, the National Achievement of Educational Progress (NAEP’S) in grades 4, 8 and 12, national goals and eventually the voluntary national

---

standards.21 This study will also analyze the multiple structures and functions of the history standards in curriculum and educational policy inasmuch it was both the emphasis and transmission of the content of the NHSP standards that was at the center of the political controversy.

The state of Illinois began a reform cycle in 1985 with the *Illinois Goals in the Social Sciences* (Goals 14-18) (refer to Appendix B) including history (Goal 16), followed by state assessments, state standards, teaching content standards, certification examinations linked to the teaching content standards, performance descriptors, framework assessments (refer to Glossary, pp. xvii) and the eventual revocation of the state assessments in history and the social sciences.


**Methodology**

Throughout this research a unique perspective has been presented because of the researcher’s involvement as an eyewitness, “participant-observer” and contributing writer to the ISBE *Learning Standards* in history and social sciences, contributing writer to the

---

CTU/CPS *Learning Outcomes in the Social Sciences* and contributing writer and chair of the teacher writing teams for the development of elementary and secondary CPS *Chicago Academic Standards* in history and the social sciences. In a professional capacity, the researcher, as Manager of Social Sciences of CPS, was responsible for the development of district standards-based support materials and the systemic professional development for elementary and secondary teachers in history and social sciences which encompassed the skills, strategies, content and academic rigor of the *National Standards for History* and those of the ISBE *Social Science Illinois Learning Standards* (ILS). According to Yin, the researcher, as a “participant observer” instead of a “passive observer” adds strength to the research by the ability to gain access to events or groups that are otherwise inaccessible to scientific investigation.22

It is the intent of the researcher to present a balanced treatise on the development and aftermath of the *National Standards for History*, but there were limitations in the research because certain stakeholders were not amenable to interviews. Subsequently, their views are voiced in research obtained by primary or other sources. The verbal research collected through the format of oral history interviews, which were in the duration of a minimum of forty-five minutes, utilized a uniform questionnaire (refer to Appendix A) that provided unique post-controversy perspectives by some of the NHSP stakeholders, educators and academia on the contemporary state of history education and standards-based instruction. The interview questions were focused on three consistent lines of inquiry: (1) participation in or awareness of the NHSP (Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4);

22Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 94.
(2) reaction to the national history standards and also of their impact and (Questions 5, 6, and 7) and (3) the issues confronting history education including the role of the government and preparation of history teachers (Questions 8, 9, and 10). Another form of verbal research that was utilized were the audio-tapes of the recorded sessions of the NHSP official meetings obtained from the NHSP archives at UCLA.

The research model of the interviews is characterized by the Harvard sociologists, R. L. Merton, M. Fiske, and P.L. Kendall (1990), as the implementation of an open-ended focused interview format. The benefit of this format is that the uniform questions asked of all interviewees, added structure to the interviews while the respondents were empowered to address, to clarify or to expound on their viewpoints in a guided conversational manner. This case study interview format allows for flexibility in the consistent line of inquiry to elicit fluid rather than rigid responses (Rubin and Rubin, 1995).

The interviews followed the professional guidelines of the Oral History Association and the field work encountered sites in Los Angeles and San Diego, California; Princeton, New Jersey; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Chicago, Illinois. The researcher was the first non-NHSP participant to access the archives relating to the National Standards for History at the Charles E. Young Humanities Research Library at UCLA. The oral history project was approved by the Loyola University Chicago Institutional Review Board, Protocol Number 73127 (refer to Appendix A).

---


The researcher’s evidence collected was both verbal and written in nature. The verbal evidence is in the format of the tape recordings of oral histories using a uniform questionnaire and phone interviews when the questionnaire was not utilized due to circumstance. All but one of the interviewees (Dr. Robert V. Remini, the Official Historian of the United States House of Representatives), were “participant-observers” and stakeholders either directly involved with the NHSP, or with the development of curricular materials related to the history standards at the local level. The interviewees were:

Dr. Robert Bain, Ph.D., Associate Professor, School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; former teacher on the NHSP World History Panel and reviewer for the Council for Basic Education

Mr. Richard Carlson, Division of Curriculum and Assessment, Illinois State Board of Education; Social Science Consultant for Standards

Dr. Charlotte Crabtree, Ph.D., Professor Emerita, Founding Director of the National Center for History in the Schools, UCLA; 1994 NAEP Governing Board; Founding Co-Director of the NHSP; phone interview without questionnaire

Dr. Ross E. Dunn, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus of History, San Diego State University; Director of World History Projects at the National Center for History in the Schools, UCLA; Co-Editor of the NHSP World History Standards

Dr. Deborah M. Lynch, Ph.D., former President of the Chicago Teachers Union AFT#1 and Co-Founder of the CTU Quest Center; phone interview without questionnaire

Dr. Gary B. Nash, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus of American History, UCLA; former President of the OAH, 1994-1995; Founding and current Director of the National Center for History in the Schools, UCLA and Founding Co-Director of the NHSP

Dr. Theodore K. Rabb, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus of Medieval History, Princeton University; Co-Founder of the National Council for History Education; Member of the NHSP World History Committee
Yin further asserts that interviews are an essential source of case study evidence, but as verbal reports, interview data must be corroborated with other sources of information. The verbal evidence has been coupled with two other formats of written evidence (Barzun and Graff, 1985) to accommodate this stipulation for the chain of evidence.

The additional historical research in this qualitative study can be classified as what the historian Jacques Barzun categorizes as namable kinds of written evidence: (1) “unconscious evidence” perused in the UCLA archives such as receipts, communiqués, minutes of meetings, and other correspondence, and (2) “unpremeditated evidence” in the gathering of documents laws, public acts, resolutions, and educational policies. Informational technology was also utilized in the accessing of research such as records, speeches and articles. Yin further contends that the use of multiple sources of evidence in

---


case studies allows a researcher to: (1) address a broader range of historical issues, and (2) corroborate converging lines of inquiry through the process of data triangulation.27

The model of explanation utilized throughout this study is that of an historical narrative that embodies both the methodology and the review of literature throughout the chapters. The historian Peter Munz delineates the benefits of an historical narrative as allowing for the explanation of causal connections over time to make generalizations to connect the cause-effect relationships. Munz further asserts that in order to do justice to events over time, it must be described in narrative form.28

In this respect, the analysis of the development of the National Standards for History and the aftermath is connected to a continuum of not only the previous attempts to establish committees to formulate uniform history standards, but also parallels to previous history educators and their political stances, writings and concerns about the voices of equity and inclusiveness in curricula that was replicated in the political controversy after the National Standards for History were released. The development of national standards in history cannot be ascertained as an isolated incident, but rather as a crucial component in a curricula reform cycle that is currently in transformation. In this respect, it can be acknowledged that although this contemporary “culture war” was the most vitriolic; it certainly will not be the last in the role of government, schools and the development of educational policies.

27Yin, Case Study Research: Design and Methods, 98.

There are additional benefits to the qualitative research model of “participant observer” utilized in this study that Robert K. Yin delineates in his *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2003). This applied social science research model that analyzes case studies by gathering information from eyewitnesses is amenable to oral histories by both recording statements of the participants and also for the introspection of a specific event with the participants directly involved in the process. Although it does have the limitations of the aforementioned and acknowledged biases, the benefits outweigh these limitations because of the unique introspection that allows for reflection by the respondents. Most of the literature concerning the *National Standards for History* was written in the heat of the controversy (1995-1996) and the stakeholders did not have the prophetic capabilities to see how these standards were later to be incorporated into contemporary educational policies involving history education.

The sociologist, Howard S. Becker, also defends the “the participant observer” model because of the inclusion of information that might not otherwise be taken into consideration and notes that this technique consists of something more than immersing oneself in data and “having insights.”  


\[30\] Ibid., 654.
delineated by Geertz (1983), and Gottschalk, Kluckhorn and Angell (1945) to avoid the pitfalls of the misinterpretation of data and biases.  

Although the research obtained by oral histories lacks the formalization and systemization of tabulated data collection indicative of structured surveys, information gleaned from the interviews might not otherwise be gathered about the development and aftermath of the national history standards or their influence at the local levels. As previously stated, not all perspectives of the stakeholders were obtained through interviews and their voices and representation for balance were attained through their works or citations in other primary or secondary sources to include multiple and divergent viewpoints. 

As a member of some of the professional organizations which are included in this study, the researcher is fully aware of the potential of bias. The researcher acknowledges this personal bias, and has presented multiple perspectives of the stakeholders and organizations to portray a myriad of stances. Furthermore, the purpose and motivation of this study initiated a genuine interest to improve the state of history education and to explain the origin and relevancy of educational policies for the teaching of history in the classroom to educators and administrators.

---

Significance of the Study

The significance of this qualitative study is that it will add to the body of knowledge of contemporary history education by analyzing the implications of standards for teachers of history and the social sciences. For this reason, the study’s broader significance could be potentially beneficial as a resource for educators and school districts facilitating the process of implementing standards, aligning curriculum, designing assessments, or preparing and mentoring teachers.

This study also analyzes the impact of educational policy at the federal level and how it impacts state and district policies and subsequently teachers in the classroom. The reforms of standards-based education are currently in transformation and could be affected again by the guidelines of the re-authorization of NCLB (2001), as well as other legislation tied to state-funding concerning accountability measures and assessments that impact public school districts and subsequently, the curricular policies of history education.

This study also reflects on the significant amount of emerging research on curricular change induced by high-stakes testing (Au et al., 2007)\textsuperscript{32} and the impact on pedagogy in the classroom that has applications to history education. Other contemporary issues examined in this study are: the ramifications of government control in history education; academic freedom; activism; advocacy; the role professional organizations and the challenges in the preparation of history teachers.

\textsuperscript{32}Au, “High-Stakes Testing and Curricular Control: A Qualitative Metasynthesis,” 262.
Both K-12 history practitioners and university academic historians were involved in the development of the *National Standards for History* for a shared educational vision to better history education. This study analyzes that relationship and includes some of the reflections of these stakeholders on the current state of history education. These insights could be beneficial for the profession in the current dialogue for the learning and teaching of history.

**Organizational Format**

The foci of the chapters are thus:

Chapter One chronicles the previous seminal reform efforts and predecessors in history education from the Committee of Ten (1893) to the 1980’s that attempted to structure the formalization of history education and the establishment of standards.

Chapter Two traces the governmental legislation and educational policies of the Reagan and Bush administrations and the founding of the National History Standards Project (NHSP) that developed the *National Standards for History* (1994-1996).

Chapter Three examines the NHSP committee work of the drafting, revision, consensus process and the politicization of the *National Standards for History*.

Chapter Four analyzes the influence and local curricular applications of the *National Standards for History* with the development of history standards and supporting teaching materials for the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and the Chicago Public Schools (CPS).
Chapter Five analyzes the impact of the national history standards in standards-based education and provides recommendations for the contemporary challenges facing history education.
CHAPTER ONE

THE DIVERGENT PATHS OF THE REFORM PREDECESSORS

Those who tell the stories also hold the power.

-- Plato, The Republic

The purpose of Chapter One is to chronicle the seminal antecedents to the NHSP to structure the formalization of history education and also to establish standards. In order to analyze and place into perspective the phenomena of the aftermath of the National Standards for History, other noteworthy reform precedents in history education must be acknowledged. The late educational historian, Dr. Lawrence A. Cremin of Columbia’s Teachers College, and former president of the Spencer Foundation, an educational policy research organization, asserted that:

the argument over standards is surely as old as the world itself. Just about the time Adam first whispered to Eve that they were living through the age of transition, the Serpent doubtless issued the first complaint that academic standards were beginning to decline. The charge of decline, of course, can embrace many different meanings and serve as a surrogate for a wide variety of discontents; only one of which may be that young people are actually learning less. As often as not, it suggests that young people are learning less of what a particular commentator or group of commentators believe they ought to be learning, and the ‘ought’ derives ultimately from a conception of education and of the educated person.¹

The formation of blue ribbon committees, tenets of professional organizations, battles for textbook adoptions, hidden agendas, rebuking of historians and debates in public arenas of the vision and core values for the sustainability of a democracy were not

limited to the development and aftermath of the National Standards for History. The challenges of power embedded in divergent ideologies about race, class, gender, and spirited by reform, spanned decades before the NHSP project. The literature on history education is replete with both traditional and revisionist stances in the formation of curricula and policies and their interactions more commonly referred to as the “history wars” or “culture wars.”

The development of The National Standards for History (1994-1996) was part of a larger reform movement of voluntary national standards that was a very unique wide-scale initiative that has not been equaled since in magnitude, discourse or ramifications in contemporary policy issues in American public education. This confluence of federal government and education resulted in the development of national policy directives which impacted local history education curricula, public school history educators and the preparation of history teachers. Dr. Todd Gitlin, Professor of Journalism and Sociology at the Journalism School of Columbia University, commented on both the political nature of standards and the importance of the history standards being voluntary:

with American students doing poorly in cross-national competition, Cheney and other Republicans, as well as Democrats, had come to think that common historical knowledge was too important to leave to the states and localities. At the least, there should be available a set of common standards on the basis of which new textbooks could be commissioned and curricula worked up at the local level. The standards would be optional, not mandatory, but at the same time, with their national imprimatur they would be widely regarded as exemplary.2

---

The national standards that were developed previously or during the same time period for reading, mathematics and science were adopted without political controversy and enveloped into the accountability measures of the NCLB legislation of 2001. It is the researcher’s thesis and that of some historians and interviewees that the omission of history as a core discipline in NCLB legislation is a direct result of the political fallout and aftermath concerning the National Standards for History, as will be shown. The contentious political controversy that ensued with the National Standards for History was bar none, like no other “history war” or “culture war” in the intensity to establish standards in history education. Gitlin further posits that:

Gary Nash’s widely quoted claim that the standards amounted to ‘nothing short of a new American revolution in history education’ was really making two points neglected by almost all the critics. First, traditionally American history was mainly the history of power and power was white, male and elite. But the new standards carried a sense that history was also the struggle against power.3

Unlike the other core disciplines, the teaching of history is a complex intellectual act embedded with values, political ideals and a cultural memory. The “culture war” surrounding the National Standards for History is representative of what Dr. Ira Shor, educational sociologist at the City University of New York (CUNY), whose work entails the issues of class, race and gender dynamics in education, terms a “curricular restoration of authority” in the politicization of reforms in a ”search for order.”4 Paradoxically, the historian Dr. Sam Wineburg, Professor of Education and History at Stanford University, in his Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts (2001) asserts that the debate which

---
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history to teach so dominated the debate, the important question of *why* teach history in the first place was lost.\(^5\)

In essence, these standards were by no means an “end of history,” but were part of a transforming reform cycle in history education that can be traced back almost a century before (refer to Illustration 1, p. 28). There were a series of previous reform efforts over the decades; first to define what history entails; and secondly to integrate history into the core curricula as a form of cultural transmission and socialization of students to both American values and to a national identity.

Who are we? The acrimony is as intense as the quarrels are predictable. Follow the script of each battle in the culture wars and before long you arrive at the same tangle of long questions: What is America anyway, and who wants to know? Who gets to say, and with what consequences? Are we finding ourselves through or despite our differences, or are we falling apart despite what we hold in common?\(^6\)

The late nineteenth century brought urbanization, industrialization, and an influx of immigrants to American society and schools, and these challenges were addressed by the social reforms of the Progressive Movement. Leading reformer Charles W. Eliot found history in a “humiliated condition with no proper place in American education” when he first launched his campaign in the 1870s to open the curriculum to all subjects.\(^7\) Beginning in the 1890s, leading educators worried about the uniformity of high school curriculum wrote a series of reports to help guide the nation’s schools. The first and most prestigious report was produced in 1893 by the Committee of Ten, chaired by Harvard

---


\(^6\)Gitlin, *The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why America is Wracked by Culture Wars*, 42.

President Eliot. His illustrious committee, sponsored by the National Education
Association (NEA), included William Torrey Harris, who was U.S. Commissioner of
Education and a former superintendent of the St. Louis schools. The Committee
appointed conferences of distinguished scholars and teachers to review nine academic
subjects.8

The Committee of Ten recommended the study of biography and
mythology in fifth and sixth grades, American history and civil
government in grade seven, Greek and Roman history in grade eight,
French history in grade nine, English history in grade ten, American
history in grade eleven, and an intensive study of a selected period of
history in grade twelve.9

The conference on History, Civil Government and Political Economy, referred to
as the “History Ten” also included the New Historians, such as Woodrow Wilson of
Princeton, James Harvey Robinson of Columbia, Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard, and
Charles Kendall Adams, President of the University of Wisconsin.10 Paramount to these
non-traditional historians were the recommendations that the chief purposes of history
teaching should not be to:

- impart facts, but to train students to gather evidence, to generalize upon
data, to apply the lessons of history to current events, and to lucidly state
conclusions.11

---
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Figure 1. Continuum Towards Reform, Dilemmas and Standardization in History Education
Gary Nash, Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross Dunn (henceforth Nash and colleagues) asserted in their book, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past* (1997) that the NEA was visionary in their emphasis on the better methods of teaching history, and that contemporary history teachers still favor the sound instructional practices of questioning, critical discussion and the use of primary documents. These methodologies that embodied critical thinking were apparent in both the format and frequency in the materials and learning standards the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS) at UCLA developed for the state of California, the *History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve* (1988) with performance expectations that later became a model for the NHSP.

The second attempt to reform secondary history education was the Committee of Seven sponsored by the American Historical Association (AHA). The American Historical Association, the largest historical society in the United States, was founded in 1884 and incorporated by Congress in 1889 to serve a broad field of history for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical documents and artifacts and documentation of historical research. In 1895, the AHA began publishing the *American Historical Review* which is the major journal of record for the history profession in the United States. The influence of the AHA as a scholarly professional organization of historians and their research publications strengthened the curriculum initiatives and methodology formats suggested by the Committee of Ten.

---
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In 1899, the AHA proposed that the first year of high school be devoted to ancient history and the early Middle Ages; the second year, medieval and Modern European history, the third year, English history; and the fourth year American history and government.\textsuperscript{14}

Subsequent committees by the AHA made further suggestions for elementary curriculum in history, and Ravitch notes that in addition to the admonishment against rote learning, the major importance of these committees and reports was that the teaching of history was well-established in the first quarter of the twentieth century and that a surprising number of the reformers’ recommendations were implemented by school districts.\textsuperscript{15}

Historians first acted to establish the academic legitimacy of their subject during a period of extreme instability in American education. This occurred during the last decade of the nineteenth century, when the longstanding dominance of the uniform classical curriculum had begun to give way decisively in both schools and colleges.\textsuperscript{16}

The formation and suggestions of these committees by the professional organizations of the NEA and AHA set a precedent for blue ribbon committees in history education. The selection of contemporary history luminaries and their expertise in their respective fields on the NHSP is evidenced in the composition of the committees, focus groups, task forces, panels and advisory boards (refer to Appendix A). Later attempts that were made for the uniformity in history education asserted to posit the importance of history and sought to counter the social need for vocational education. In 1912, the NEA

\textsuperscript{14}Ravitch, “History’s Struggle to Survive in the Schools,” 28.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., 29.

\textsuperscript{16}Robert Orrill and Linn Shapiro, “From Bold Beginnings to an Uncertain Future: The Discipline of History and Education,” \textit{American Historical Review} 110 (June 2005): 728.
comprised of the nation’s superintendents, appointed a Committee on Social Studies, that deemed that a goal of history education was” good citizenship.”

In 1916, the NEA created the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE) which, in 1918, published its final report, known as the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*.

The focus of the report reflected the utilitarian ideology of the era delineating the advocacy of non-academic subjects of: 1) Health, 2) Command of fundamental processes, 3) Worthy home membership, 4) Vocation, 5) Citizenship, 6) Worthy use of leisure, and 7) Ethical character.

Only one of the principles focused on education while the other nonacademic aims sought to foster the needs of society to make better citizens and workers. The report embraced the tenets of social efficiency and although “provisions should be made for those having distinctly academic interests and needs,” most students were expected to prepare for a vocation in high school. Ravitch further asserts that the prominence of history in the curriculum was often downplayed because the academic curriculum was only for a few who were college-bound. The *Seven Cardinal Principles* is regarded by some educators to be as important in its time in setting the tone for discussions of what should be done in the schools as *A Nation at Risk* was sixty-five years later.
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In analyzing the initial efforts of both the Committee of Ten and Committee of
Seven, it should be noted that these initiatives were reflective of the spirit of the times,
conservative, pragmatic and fostered by individuals and institutions steeped in the white
Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) tradition. Symcox maintains that although society will
always be fundamentally divided over what knowledge and whose knowledge should be
handed down, American school children have always had some exposure to our national
history.21

The Role of Academia, Historians and Professional Organizations

The attacks on revisionist historians and claims of subversion were not relegated
to the “culture wars” of the 1990’s and the development of the National Standards for
History. One of the first historians to be criticized for his interpretation of the American
experience was Charles Beard in 1913, in his An Economic Interpretation of the
Constitution of the United States. Seattle banned Beard’s book from the public schools
and ordered city library officials to move it to a sequestered reserve shelf.22  Nash and
colleagues contend that attacks on any historians must be tempered with the climate of
the times, whether in the past or in the present.23

One of the most important contributions of Beard and other “New Historians” was
the interpretation of the past based on rigorous weighing and judging of evidence from a
variety of sources. Nash, Crabtree and Dunn credit these historians with

21Linda Symcox, Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms

22Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 28.

23Ibid.
creating ‘critical thinking’ in historical studies that held the promise of an astute citizenry capable of independent reflection and reasoned judgment and precisely the skills of a dynamic nation to confront problems. \(^{24}\)

The *National Standards for History* espoused the traditions begun by previous revisionists by including “historical thinking” and the “tools of social inquiry” as the necessary and intended “Habits of Mind” for acquired skills in history. These cognitive skills for the *National Standards for History* functioned as a prototype in the writing of the *Chicago Social Science Learning Outcomes, Chicago Social Science Academic Standards* (CAS), and the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) *Learning Standards* (ILS) in the Social Sciences. For example, there is a separate section in the ILS Social Science Standards explaining the Habits of Mind and there is also a section on the former CAS delineating critical thinking skills in history for students. For clarification purposes, it should be noted that the subject of history was utilized as an anchor for the CPS Chicago Outcomes and Standards, while the ILS of ISBE, separate committees (history including American and world, political science, economics, geography and behavioral sciences including psychology, sociology and anthropology) were formed. These initiatives are further detailed in length in Chapter Four.

Professional organizations continued to have a profound influence on history education but history teachers found themselves without a national organization or voice. \(^{25}\) In 1921, educators at Teachers College at Columbia University established the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) to carry out the recommendations of the

\(^{24}\)Ibid., 34.

\(^{25}\)Ravitch, “History’s Struggle to Survive in the Schools,” 30.
CRSE. Ravitch concurs with Robert Orrill and Linn Shapiro, who purport that although their intent was visionary to organize historians:

   NCSS was not only led by professors of education but initially disallowed teachers from leadership positions in the organization.26

   Orrill and Shapiro further assert that NCSS was never linked to a discipline and “history was absorbed into an amorphous meld of many subjects.”27

   The formation of NCSS had enormous consequences for history education. In contrast to NCSS, associations such as NCTE and NCTM were organized along subject matter lines, and this made it possible in theory for teacher members to think of their work as following broad disciplinary contours.28

   The stance of NCSS has shifted dramatically over the years developing into one of advocacy and support of teachers of all the social studies from elementary to the collegiate level. Currently, NCSS is the largest association in the country of approximately 26,000 members devoted solely to social studies education with one hundred and ten affiliated state, local and regional councils in fifty states and sixty-nine countries.

   Ravitch asserts that in the early decades of the twentieth century the social and political climate of the times was that history was far beyond the competence of the average student.29 The 1920s and 1930s witnessed the rapid industrialization, the work of the Muckrakers, and the social reconstructionists of Harold Rugg, George Counts, and
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Carl Becker in Progressive education. All three of these reform historians were attacked because of their supposed “Marxist teachings.” Rugg was targeted because of his social criticism in his textbooks and a political cartoon depicted his sentiments as “Treason in the Textbooks.” Because of the anti-Bolshevik fervor, Rugg was accused of spreading Communist lies, and Ravitch labels this assault as the ‘first successful ambush by the Red-baiting vigilantes.’

History textbooks were the most scrutinized of all curricular materials because they were the intellectual venue of socialization and representation of our national identity. It must be noted as an historical perspective that stakeholders on both sides attempted to perpetuate their belief systems. Each decade brought both the extrinsic and intrinsic conflictual aspects to history education as to what was taught in the classroom and what materials were to be utilized which were influenced by the social history of the day and reflective of the times. Traditional and revisionist views were raised by legislators, academia and other groups either to maintain the status quo or to challenge it.

The works of George Counts questioned the social justice of Hoover’s America in his Social Frontier, and in his design of social studies curriculum to develop social worth. Carl Becker’s modern history embraced the Eurocentric viewpoint, but encouraged teachers to explore the new realms of social, political and economic changes.

---
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All three of these historians had to defend their textbooks, research and writings because they raised the issues of class conflict.

Forecasting in a remarkable way the consequences of Lynne Cheney’s 1994 attack on the National History Standards, Rugg noted that a ‘single article distributed by a national patriotic organization can alter the mood of people in hundreds of communities scattered widely over the country, and has resulted in the censorship of schools.’

In the 1930s and 1940s, the curricula reflected the dominant Anglo-Saxon values and attitudes in the general history courses. The only “world” in world history consisted of ancient origins and emphasis on ancient civilization. In the interwar period, world history focused on the progress of the West and of the United States as one of the democratic nations that won the war. The historian and NHSP committee member Philip Curtin encapsulates these times as “history taught backward” starting with the United States and tracing the roots of American civilization back to Europe. Nash and his colleagues further delineate this interpretation by assessing that world history had two main components: ancient civilization, and the non-existent African, Southeast Asia, or pre-Columbian Americas because they were semi-civilized.

As will be shown, the definition and composition of world history would later become one of the major consensus initiatives of the work of the NHSP world history committee because of the very nature of the content of this discipline. Gitlin comments on Rabb, an interviewee:

---
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Princeton’s Theodore K. Rabb, the only history specialist on the standards council, wrote in the *Washington Post* that while he had objected to ‘reducing the West to about 40 percent’ of the world history standards---he pointed out, ‘such a diminution of the central influences in a nation’s heritage would be unthinkable’. The standards were defensible as ‘sets of recommendations from which teachers could select the topics that arouse their own and their students’ interests and that they amounted to a serious effort to remedy the shortcomings of history education.’

With the 1950s, the Cold War and McCarthyism brought a fear driven self-censorship to academia throughout American campuses.

At five University of California campuses, all but three historians took loyalty oaths that eventually became a requirement for teaching, and American intellectualism reflected the social history of ‘retreat into quietude’.

The space race and launch of Sputnik focused for the first time on how American students competed academically on an international basis. Curriculum in all core subjects, especially mathematics and science, were included to assess the preparation of American students. Consequently, the comparison of American students to international students would become the impetus for the national standards movement and the federal justification for “world-class standards” and standards-based education.

In 1962, another noteworthy historian, the late American colonial scholar of Brown University, Dr. Carl Bridenbaugh, was criticized for his “Great Mutations” speech he delivered as AHA President.

His reference to ‘urban, foreign-born mutants’ was clearly interpreted as being anti-Semitic and showed his discomfort with those that were not of the ‘highest intellect and deepest American roots.’

---
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As will be shown, a similar nativist tone would re-emerge with the publication of the *National Standards for History* forming a neo-conservative backlash against inclusiveness and multiculturalism with the objections of including women, minorities and the disenfranchised in the history lesson prototypes and standards descriptors (the exemplars cited to assist teachers).

In the 1960s, another controversy emerged concerning a history project. Funded with $6.5 million from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and developed under the leadership of Harvard psychologist Jerome Bruner and Harvard educator Peter Dow, an innovative sixth-grade curriculum, *Man: A Course of Study* (MACOS), would eventually go down in history as one of the “most dramatic instances of public indignation against the efforts of discipline-based scholars to create progressive curriculum reform.”

Symcox asserts in her book, *Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms* (2002) that the MACOS curriculum, Harold Rugg’s textbooks, and the *National Standards for History* all shared the commonality of coming under attack by fierce conservative criticism. Both MACOS and the NHSP were initiated by presidential initiatives to create more academically prepared American students to compete in a changing world.

Symcox also notes the further involvement in education by the federal government when in 1958, President Eisenhower asked for a fivefold increase in funding for educational initiatives sponsored by the NSF. An analogy can also be made that the Committee of Ten that favored student-centered activities, paralleled the inquiry-based

---

inductive pedagogy of the K-12 curriculum of MACOS Project. The skills of discovery using primary sources were advocated by Bruner to interpret human behavior. As with the NHSP, Bruner’s project was criticized by legislators as challenging American values.  

Symcox also details how textbooks came under scrutiny at this time because they were seen like the NHSP, as a vehicle for social transformation and the redistribution of power. When the National Standards for History were finally disseminated after required revisions, the impetus of the reform had been temporarily halted as was the MACOS scandal bringing the NSF reform movement to an abrupt end. The continuum of divisiveness between the traditional and progressive views on education would advance to the next decades and would become both more entrenched and expansive.

The 1960s were a time of great social, political and cultural upheavals that witnessed a transformation in curricula materials. The Civil Rights Movement, initially begun a decade earlier, came to full fruition as did the rise of feminism. Ravitch posits that this era witnessed the emergence of specialization in history education with “ethnic studies” for those previously disenfranchised with Afrocentric, Latino, Native-American courses and Women’s history programs.

Although these times promoted social activism and a new emphasis on current events, there was not one state that established a coherent, sequential history curriculum. In many states, one could become a social studies teacher without having taken any college courses in history.

---
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The tenuous situation for history to maintain a secure position in the secondary curriculum was also recognized in a 1975 study by the Organization of American Historians (OAH). The report gave specific examples of the sapping and segmentation that occurred in the discipline:

In New Mexico, the trend was toward ethnocultural courses; in Hawaii, toward integrating history into a social science framework focused on problem solving, decision making and social action; in Minnesota, teachers were encouraged to shift from historical study toward an emphasis on concepts that transcended any historical situation.45

To further elaborate on this diversification:

One OAH representative from California predicted that history would continue to yield to such ‘relevant topics’ as multicultural studies, ethnic studies, consumer affairs and ecology.46

In 1976, to further substantiate the efficacy of the inclusiveness initiatives, NCSS issued a proactive position statement on multi-ethnic education through resolution by its membership. This public advocacy by a professional organization for inclusiveness was not only a pioneer effort, but also a political statement on the value of multiculturalism in the classroom in both textbooks and instruction. The NCSS guidelines published under the leadership of the scholar James A. Banks advocated the curricular approach of teaching both cultural pluralism and cultural assimilation.47


In 1979, the role and authority of the federal government in education became pronounced with the founding of the United States Department of Education (DOE). Although the prime responsibility for education is relegated to the local control of the states under Amendment X of the United States Constitution, this precedence of a Cabinet position was a predictor of the evolving influence government was to have in the formation of educational policies. The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), funded by the federal government, was the Co-Sponsor for the NHSP to develop the National Standards for History with the DOE.

Future stakeholders involved in the NHSP scenario would utilize the power of governmental authority to exert their influence. William Bennett served first as Chairman of the NEH, then as Secretary of Education; Lynne V. Cheney succeeded Bennett as NEH Chair from 1986 to 1992. As Chair of the NEH, Cheney voiced her criticism of the history standards not only in the media by calling press conferences but also from what Theodore Roosevelt called the bully pulpit of Capitol Hill:

The National History Standards developed at UCLA and released in the fall of 1994 are the most egregious example to date of encouraging students to take a benign view of, or totally overlook, the failings of other cultures while being hypercritical of the one in which they live.\footnote{Lynne V. Cheney, \textit{Telling the Truth: Why Our Culture and Our Country Have Stopped Making Sense—And What We Can Do About It} (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995), 26.}

Later, Cheney’s husband became Vice-President in the George W. Bush Republican administration that authorized the NCLB legislation (2001) that funded initiatives and assessments in the core subjects of reading, mathematics and science. The dynamics of Washington politics, platforms and agendas provided not only a prominent visibility for
the NHSP, but also thrust academia and teachers of history into a position where they had to defend their practice in their classrooms to legislators and the media.

Dr. Michael Kirst, Professor Emeritus of Education and Business Administration at Stanford University, notes that the Reagan era manifested not only an enhanced role of the federal government, but also of the quasi-governmental style of voluntary organizations such as the National Educational Goal Panel (NEGP) and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).49

The confluence of both the global standards movement and the domestic national voluntary standards movement enhanced the role of the federal government in educational policy-making, funding and accountability.

The Influence of Global Standards

The quest for national standards was not limited to the United States. Other industrialized nations such as the Soviet Union, Mexico, Japan, France, Germany, Canada, Great Britain and others made strides to issue new history curricula by their ministries of education to further promote a national consciousness.

The experiment of a national body of knowledge with the American voluntary national history standards that were developed were in stark contrast with a country like France, which holds students accountable for a standard curriculum—it used to be said that at any moment you could tell exactly what subject students were studying anywhere in the country.50

Depending on the degree of centralization in their educational systems, the publication and revision of history textbooks and a national curriculum also experienced
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controversies, with a national discourse steeped in political control. Dr. Maurice R. Berube, Eminent Scholar Emeritus of Educational Leadership and Counseling at Old Dominion, ascertained:

Every major industrialized nation has a national system of education---communist countries as well as democratic countries. These countries have national ministries of education that often determine the relationship between education and the economy. Only the United States among major industrialized nations persists in a vague, decentralized and informal system. Nevertheless, there are signs that the American public and official policymakers are emerging from a severe cultural lag in education. Proceeding with this thinking, one wonders whether a constitutional amendment may be necessary to establish a national framework of education.51

In 1988, the British Parliament instituted a new mandated National Curriculum as part of an education reform measure. Nash and colleagues paralleled the impact of the British and American governmental policies and how they affected academia and the school system because their reforms also included a framework, performance standards and assessments.52

The British national story and the Traditionalist Party’s reaction to the national curriculum and progressive pedagogy of critical thinking skills and “Habits of Mind” in historical inquiry became a future reference to American historians and created a dialogue among international scholars of history. Of particular interest to American historians were the debates on multiculturalism, the processes of implementation, the revision of standards and future implications for history curriculum because of the interpretation of the colonial history of the British.

---
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The global standards would also play a prominent role in the formation of National Goals of 2000 of the Department of Education (DOE) and subsequent agency reports that spirited formation of the national standards in the United States. Although the initial reaction was in response to the statistics generated by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) in the Trends in Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (1995) for American students, our students performance in United States History on the National Assessments for Educational Progress (NAEP’s) was yet another substantiation for the NHSP.

National standards and achievement on national examinations establishes criteria, benchmark and levels of expectation in student performance. The public debates, criticism and revision of our national history standards were analogous to the process other countries encountered. Most important, the controversy that the NHSP experienced elicited an international response from the history scholars as to their involvement, reaction and suggestions to balance the relationship among conflicting governmental agendas, public opinion and academia.

Although the first century of reforms in history education in America can have parallels drawn to the evolution of standards and to the development of both national curricula and examinations in other countries, the philosophic and intellectual tensions that were contested remain pertinent and viable today. The late Pulitzer Prize winning historian, Richard Hofstadter, in his Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (1962) asserts that the American attitude toward education historically represented a republican and
egalitarian protest “against the old order of Europe, forward-looking and optimistic, dynamic, vital and originative.”

To further substantiate this brand of originality is the reflective analysis by Gilbert T. Sewall in his *Standards for a Democratic Republic: The Committee of Ten Revisited* (1994) in which he posits that the dynamics between the style that marks classical education and the utilitarian style is uniquely and aggressively American.

The quest that had begun in the 19th century for the apostolic aims to educate the citizenry and to promote patriotism was to become more fervent and vocal in the next decade with the institutional policies and agenda of the partnership of academia and the government to produce and promote “world class standards.” This partnership was to become a dual-edged sword in educational-policy making intensifying the role and sanctions of government-sponsored educational reforms.

Dr. Arthur Link, American historian, NHSP committee member, 1984 President of the AHA, in urging the association to revive their educational activism forewarned:

‘others’—most probably government agencies, would enter the policy void to take control of issues that properly should be decided within the community of history educators. No task was of greater moment and urgency than the recovery of a crucial role for the AHA in the determination of the curricula of our secondary schools.

---
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CHAPTER TWO

EVOLUTION OF THE HISTORY STANDARDS

*The best education for the best should be the best education for all.*

The purpose of Chapter Two is to: (1) trace both the governmental legislation and educational policies of the Reagan and George H. W. Bush administrations and (2) to chronicle the founding of the National History Standards Project (NHSP) that developed the *National Standards for History* (1994-1996). There were several seminal organizational and policy initiatives in the 1980s that provided the ideological cornerstone of the national history standards resulting in a confluence of politics with academia. The relationship of these two pivotal forces began with the altruistic common bond for the benefit of an educated democracy and evolved into a public power struggle that challenged not only academic freedom, but also the ethos of Thomas Jefferson for a democratic society and public education grounded in civil leadership and individual virtue.

In 1980 the three major professional organizations in history and social science education formed the History Teaching Alliance. This collaborative effort was the largest concerted initiative of K-16 history educators who joined together to support advocacy for quality history education as a continuum from primary to collegiate education.
Nash emphasizes the importance of this collaboration because all of these professional organizations would have a future role for their input to the NHSP (refer to Illustration 2).

This connection and collaboration was responsible for a number of innovative projects by the American Historical Association (AHA), the Organization of American Historians (OAH), and the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) that promoted professional development of history instructors, professors, and public historians through collaborative seminars funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and private foundations.¹

Furthermore, the success of these endeavors would provide credibility for the possibility of future interdisciplinary projects in the social sciences. Nash and colleagues assert that this alliance for providing for a “substantial program in history” forged relationships and stakeholders that were to become prominent in the development of the national history standards and reminiscent of the 1920s when the AHA and NCSS worked hand in glove.² Professional organizations such as the AHA and OAH philosophically consider history as the anchor and cornerstone of their academic research and instruction, whereas NCSS maintains that an integrated approach in instruction of all the social sciences or social studies is optimal.

Nash further re-iterated this premise by stating that the planning, conversations and expectations for the teachers of history that were voiced in this collaboration were the beginning of a contemporary national dialogue in history education and the groundwork for the networking and substantiation for the future funding of the National History

¹Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 111.
²Ibid.
Figure 2. NHSP Contributors and Participating Organizations
Standards Project (NHSP).\footnote{Gary B. Nash, interview by author, tape recording, Bunche Hall, University of California at Los Angeles, 19 April, 2004.} Professor Kenneth T. Jackson of Columbia University and NHSP member, and Barbara Jackson both members of the Bradley Commission, credit the work of Kermit Hall of the History Teaching Alliance and the establishment by both the OAH and AHA of special divisions designed specifically for the teaching of history in the classroom as part of the influential foundation for the creation of the Bradley Commission on History in the Schools.\footnote{Paul Gagnon, Editor and The Bradley Commission on History in Schools, \textit{Historical Literacy}, Kenneth T. Jackson and Barbara B. Jackson, \textit{Why the Time Is Right to Reform the History Curriculum} (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989), 10.}

One of the catalysts for the national standards movement in the core disciplines was the April 26, 1983 publication of \textit{A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform} by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE). The proposed study that was developed by a distinguished panel under the leadership of Secretary of Education Terrel Bell was initially met with opposition from the White House. Symcox astutely analyzes the transformation of the study as a potential albatross when the Reagan administration did not want to highlight the role of the federal government in education because of their intent to abolish the U.S. Department of Education (DOE).

In essence, the “at risk” report later provided Reagan with an educational agenda that turned out to be a handsome political windfall that was valuable as his second presidential campaign was about to begin.\footnote{Symcox, \textit{Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms}, 43.} Bell forewarned that the deficiencies in
American education would impact future generations unless appropriate measures were taken.

Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world…. The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur---Others are matching and surpassing our attainments. We have squandered the gains in student achievement in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. We have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible, we have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral, educational disarmament.6

The Nation at Risk met with many critics such as Dean and Regent’s Professor of Education at Arizona State University, David Berliner and Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Bruce Biddle, who challenged not only the inflammatory rhetoric, but also the misinterpretations of data, including the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores.

Although critics have trumpeted the “alarming” news that the aggregate national SAT scores fell during the late 1960s and early 1970s, this decline indicates nothing about the performance of American schools. Rather, it signals that students from a broader range of backgrounds were then getting interested in college, which should have been cause for celebration, not alarm.7

Berliner and Biddle further contended that Nation at Risk solidified the public’s perception that the schools were in a state of demise and that action was necessary to remedy the situation. Their premise in The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud and the

---


Attack on America's Public Schools (1995) was that this was the intended result of a well-orchestrated political agenda that was initiated at the national level that filtered down to the local levels.

The appearance of this report by the NCEE prompted governors, state legislators, presidential candidates and citizens groups to debate a wide variety of proposals for improving schools. This public dialogue fomented into two themes in school reform; the improvement of schools through the quality of teaching and staff and the quality of the curriculum.8

Nation at Risk was but one in a series of prestigious reports that set the tone for a “crisis in the humanities.” Shor commented on the rhetoric that prompted action:

A wave of other commission reports with similar bleak messages, came out at about the same time and more than 300 task forces nationwide launched new programs for school reform. The fifty governors put out their own report under the aegis of the Education Commission of the States (ECS): Action for Excellence. This report was second only to A Nation at Risk in its hyperbole and its political impact. Action for Excellence brought the national educational agenda to the states.9

A few months later the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching issued their results by Ernest Boyer called High School which recommended specific changes in curriculum and assessment across the curriculum including those in social studies.10 To counterbalance the reports of the Reagan commissions, Boyer was

---


supported by other dissenters in his thesis to decrease the amount of de-personalization and alienation for secondary students with Theodore Sizer’s *Horace’s Compromise* (1983) and John Goodlad’s *A Place Called School* (1983). Although these sentiments were well received in the educational community, Symcox notes that the educational policy-makers supported a platform of “teacher-proof standards,” teacher-centered instruction and authoritarian attitudes towards students.¹¹

During the years 1984 through 1989 there were numerous organizations that championed the need to reform education in light of our perceived deficiencies to compete in the global arena for economic superiority. Conservative think tanks such as the Olin Foundation, the Heritage Foundation, the Hudson Institute, the American Enterprise Institute, the Hoover Institute and the Free Congress Institute would become influential in Washington politics through their lobbying efforts and position statements. Symcox chronicles these foundations and their development of agendas to privatize education in the George H.W. Bush administration and the advantages of the voucher system delineated by Paul Weyrich to wage a “culture war” described in the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation’s report, *Cultural Conservatism: Toward a New National Agenda* (1987).¹²

The platform and alliances that emerged provided the force behind the humanities reform movement which later resulted in the call for national history standards. Ravitch, who was Assistant Secretary of Education during the second half of the George H. W.
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Bush administration, had chronicled the heroic efforts of educational reform in her *The Troubled Crusade* (1983). As a public intellectual and policymaker her book was viewed as a liberal historical narrative that championed the triumphs in education, but her position soon embraced the neo-conservative camp.13

The neo-conservative agenda is reflected in the literature as one that supported parents’ choice for vouchers and charter schools by leaders of the Christian right. In addition, because of the “abysmal” NAEP test results reported by Ravitch and Finn, accountability measures such as “high-stakes” testing and public accountability gave credence to the need for reform.

In 1983, the same year that she published *The Troubled Crusade*, Diane Ravitch and Chester Finn, Professor of Education at Vanderbilt University, and later Assistant Secretary of Education during the senior Bush administration, were funded by William Bennett, NEH Chair, and by the Vanderbilt-based Education Excellence Network to convene a series of conferences for high school teachers in the humanities.14

It was the interpretation of these authors that the “humanities crisis” far exceeded the dangers inherent in the “math and science crisis.” The crisis in the humanities was not simply a crisis in technical knowledge and expertise: it was no less a crisis of the

*American soul*.15

---

13Ibid., 53.


*Nation at Risk* galvanized the emerging stakeholders with a noble universal challenge to improve the state of education. Finn echoed the focus of the reform movement that he portrayed as a grass-roots movement:

> We are in the midst of an educational reform movement of epochal proportions. Its impetus comes not from the federal government or the profession, but from the people.16

To further substantiate this claim, anecdotal evidence and statistics were used to further inform the public of this deplorable state of humanities education.

In fact, a national test in history and literature might reveal whether students were in danger of losing their identities as Americans and of losing the privileged legacy of Western civilization inherited from their European ancestors. In 1986, Lynne V. Cheney, now chair of the NEH, funded an assessment of 8,000 eleventh grade students in the subjects of history and literature.17

The National Assessments of Educational Progress (NAEP) administered these examinations with a formal review of the data by Ravitch and Finn. Since the NAEP’s reflected core knowledge in history that American students should know, the issue of accountability in the schools as to what curricula actually was being taught came to the forefront. Symcox notes that Hirsch subsequently wrote his *Cultural Literacy* (1987) with the encouragement of Ravitch, which later became a series of encyclopedic core knowledge materials and training modules for teachers for professional development.

Ravitch and Finn not only analyzed the NAEP scores, but published their findings in their 1987 *What Do Our 17-Year Olds Know?* Their work provided the justification

---


for further funding and also legitimated interventions by the national government to federally fund their stance of the “culture wars”. The data provided further efficacy for the need for national standards:

According to the NAEP assessment, 80% of the students could answer only a handful of history questions correctly: 15 out of the 141 questions. The average student taking the history test answered 54.5% of the questions they attempted correctly, a failing grade according to Ravitch and Finn’s analysis.\(^\text{18}\)

Symcox points out that for many years journalists seized upon one single question from the NAEP U.S. history exam to symbolize everything that was wrong in history education: only 32.2% of the 8,000 students taking the test could place the Civil War in the proper half-century 1850-1900.\(^\text{19}\)

In 1987 to answer the call for a new emphasis and rigor in history education was a response from academia, some of these historians eventually became participants of the NHSP. Under the leadership and partnership of Ravitch and Finn, the Educational Excellence Network, which was to become a consortia of history educators, academia and policymakers was formed which later included a website (1995) to promote excellence in history education. Ravitch and Finn under the auspices of the Educational Excellence Network founded the Bradley Commission on History in the Schools (1987), with a task force consisting of seventeen K-12 educators, academia, curriculum specialists. The commission was chaired by Professor Kenneth T. Jackson of Columbia University.


\(^{19}\)Symcox, *Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms*, 55.
The Bradley Commission on History in the Schools was launched, composed entirely of history teachers and such illustrious historians as William H. McNeill, Leon Litwack, C. Vann Woodward, Michael Kammen, Nathan Huggins and William E. Leuchtenburg. Its eventual report in 1989 created a national momentum for strengthening history education. The National Council for History Education (NCHE) which grew out of the Bradley Commission, mobilized historians and teachers on behalf of good history standards in the states.20

The Bradley report, *Building a History Curriculum*, recommended not only for a substantial program in history, but also for the certification of social studies teachers in middle and high schools:

> the knowledge and “habits of mind” to be gained from the study of history to the education of citizens in a democracy.....history should be required of all students and that an historical grasp of our common political vision is essential to liberty, equality and justice in our multicultural society.21

Further justification for the teaching of history as an equal necessity such as mathematics and science was to become the ethos and guidelines of both the *California Frameworks* and the NHSP:

> History belongs in the school programs of all students, regardless of their academic standing and preparation, of their curricular track, or of their future. It is vital for all citizens in a democracy because it provides the only avenue we have to reach an understanding of ourselves and our society, in relation to the human condition over time, and of how some things change and others continue.22

Another prominent task force, the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (NCSSS) was a coalition of professional organizations, legislators and social

---

20Ravitch, “History’s Struggle to Survive in the Schools,” 31.


22Ibid., 5.
science educators. The commission, co-sponsored by NCSS, the AHA, the OAH and the Carnegie Foundation recommended in their report, *Charting a Course*, the bold thesis to merge the teaching of U.S. and world history thus “teaching our nation’s history as part of the general story of humanity.”23 In 1989 the publication of *Charting a Course* had disagreements in the professional community regarding the emphasis on chronology sometimes at the expense of current events especially by NCSS. NCSS continued to disseminate *Charting a Course* and it was influential in Florida and other states for the development of the state social studies frameworks.24

The ideological materials that the national task forces and commissions produced were not only a body of work but also the rationale for the development of state frameworks and standards in the social sciences. The Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) adopted by the Illinois General Assembly July of 1997 relied on both the utilization of these documents and the expertise of local social science educators. As a participating member of the social science writing team, I noted our resources included copies of the *Bradley Report, Charting a Course*, the NCSS *Expectations for Excellence* (1994) and copies of the *History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* (1988) as well as the editions of the voluntary *National History Standards* of the NHSP.

In 1988, the state of California was the forerunner in the nation to create a history/social science framework for educators. Ravitch and Crabtree were key educators in the

23Nash et al., *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 112.

24Ibid.
development of the innovative state curriculum. The California Superintendent of Public
Instruction and supporter of history, Bill Honig, assembled teachers, administrators and
historians and funded the undertaking. The institutional educational reforms of the
California State Board of Education established a sequence of history courses, added
three years of world history and placed historical studies in the elementary grades at a
level of academic prominence.\textsuperscript{25} Honig also invited historian Paul Gagnon to the blue-
ribbon committee that eventually advocated a history—geography centered curriculum.

California is the only state in the nation, Ravitch rejoiced, that actually has
a history curriculum that meets the demanding specifications set by the
Bradley Commission.\textsuperscript{26}

Nash notes that the success of the \textit{California Framework} was instrumental in the
formation of the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS) at UCLA and it
served as a model for other educators struggling with the same process to develop social
science frameworks for achievement.\textsuperscript{27}

In March 1987 draft frameworks were circulated as a process of public hearings,
1,700 field reviews and meetings of the curriculum commission were held. The required
revisions were completed by Crabtree and on July 10, 1987, the California State
Department of Education adopted the \textit{History-Social Science Framework}. A decade later,
the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) followed the same protocol established by

\textsuperscript{25}Ravitch, “History’s Struggle to Survive in the Schools,” 31.

\textsuperscript{26}Nash et al., \textit{History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past}, 112

\textsuperscript{27}Gary B. Nash, interview by author, tape recording, Bunche Hall, University of California Los
Angeles, 19 April 2004.
California to review, edit and revise the Illinois social science standards and frameworks that are still being used by Illinois educators.

In 1988 the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS) was founded at UCLA under Cheney’s NEH chairmanship. The purpose behind the center was to develop materials, workshops and networks to improve the teaching of history nationally. Although it met with some criticism, the notoriety of the *California History-Social Science Framework* shed a favorable light on the scholarship and leadership in history education at UCLA. The sponsorship by Cheney set a precedence of a vote of confidence for the capabilities to produce a set of national history standards and the forthcoming huge undertaking that would become the responsibility of the NHSP at UCLA.

The last of the governmental commissions to be highly influential in the development of the national standards movement was the Education Summit that was convened in Charlottesville, Virginia by former President George H.W. Bush. The meeting, held in September of 1989, assembled the nation’s governors and was chaired by Governor William Clinton (D) of Arkansas. The intense publicity and bi-partisan collaboration that emanated from the Summit, termed the “Jeffersonian Compact” for education had an agenda to set performance goals for the nation’s schools.28

There were six goals that emerged from the consensus of governors in February of 1990:

1. By the year 2000, all the children in America will start school ready to learn.
2. By the year 2000, the graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

3. By the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, six, eight and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so that they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

4. By the year 2000, the U.S. students will be the first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.

5. By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

6. By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.29

Despite the “crisis in humanities’ and the “rising tide of mediocrity” in education, a national directive was given mandating the teaching of history not only to promote a national identity, but also for the preparation and sustainability of citizenship. Although the Goals 2000 seemed lofty and utopian, Goal 3 became the justification for the development of national standards in history.

The President and governors have declared that by the year 2000, all students should be competent in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history and geography. Implicit in such goals is the need to define what students should know and how to assess how well they have learned it.30

As a result of the National Governors Association (NGA) in July 1990, President George H.W. Bush and the NGA formed a National Goals Panel to monitor educational progress toward meeting the National Educational Goals. On April 18, 1991, President


Bush released their report, *America 2000: An Education Strategy* which was a call to action for both world class standards and a new voluntary nationwide examination system to monitor student progress.\(^3\)

On June 27, 1991 the official federal call to set national history standards began with the Congressional legislation *Public Law 102-62* to create the National Council on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST). The organizational plan that NCEST established were the five task forces whose disciplines of history, geography, English, mathematics and science. There were also the additional task forces whose charge was standards, assessments and implementation. The responsibility of NCEST was to articulate on the issues and recommendations of National Goal 3 and to complete the tasks mandated by Congress. NCEST was co-chaired by Governors Ray Romer (D) of Colorado and Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. (R) of South Carolina.

On October 23, 1991, the NCEST History Task Force convened for the first time at the Hyatt Regency in Washington, DC chaired by Lynne Cheney. There were five questions addressed by the History Task Force that examined the process of how national history standards would be written. The History Task Force advised NCEST on the feasibility of standards based on the following questions:

1. What is the status of efforts to develop standards in your discipline?
2. Are national standards desirable given the wide range of student performance?
3. Are standards that challenge all children without penalizing those of lesser opportunity feasible?
4. Who should develop the standards and how should they be developed? What national, state and local curriculum materials are best available?
5. How long will it take to develop the material? What can be done to expedite the process?\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) *America 2000: An Education Strategy*, 1.
The answer to these prompts was deliberated by the History Task Force comprised of history educators and practitioners. One of the notable members of the committee (refer to Participants List in Appendix A) was Mary V. Bicouvaris, 1989 Teacher of the Year, Associate Professor of Education at Christopher Newport College and a proponent of a strong Western civilization curriculum. It is noteworthy that, the author found two major investigative revelations: 1) the only other dissertation to be written on the NHSP was that of Bicouvaris, and 2) even though I had an opportunity to review the drafts of the history standards while employed by the Chicago Public Schools, I was the first non-member of the NHSP standing committees to access the UCLA archives containing the documentation of the development of the standards.

Bicouvaris’ dissertation, *Building a Consensus for the National History Standards in History* (1994) details the consensus process and was completed before Council for Basic Education (CBE) mandated further revised drafts of both the U.S. History and world history standards that were later published in 1996.

Bicouvaris reflected on the position of the teachers and the standards:

the standards ought to be seen as but one stone in the foundation of the reform movement and with trust that the professional teachers they serve have minds of their own.33

The findings of the NCEST History Task Force were thus:

1. The effort to develop national standards in history does not have to start from scratch but can build on previous work.34

---


2. National history standards should be voluntary not too specific, and should be derived by agreement on what is essential.
3. National history standards must be fair standards and "help the cause of equity" by bringing attention to the "the need for equal resources to meet equal standards."
4. National standards should be developed through a consensual process that allows various groups to be involved.35
5. National standards can be developed in two years of vigorous work.36

The conclusions of the NCEST History Task Force coordinated the final national decree for the development of national history standards. The next step was to organize and fund the initiative under the aegis of an institution of scholarship in history education.

**The Tasks and Formation of the History Standards**

Ravitch notes one of the most formidable influences and discussants on the improvement of quality in public schools was Albert Shanker, past president of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). His power base and credibility was that he led a union of almost a million members and he frequently wrote for the *New York Times*. His influence was exerted at the NGA Education Summit when he urged the creation of a national system of standards and assessments. Shanker wanted explicit content standards that would spell out what "all students are taught at least through elementary school." and

---


36Ibid., K-3.
was an advocate of rigorous tests that had real consequences or "stakes" for students, such as getting into college or a good job training program.37

Shanker was not only to have an influence at the national level, but also in the development of the efforts of the Chicago Teachers Union’s (CTU), AFT #1, collaboration with the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) for the Transformation for Learning Outcomes (1993), the predecessor for the Chicago Academic Standards (CAS) (1996). According to Ravitch, the public pressure exerted by Shanker and other educators for higher academic achievement resulted in the DOE in collaboration with other federal agencies such as the NEH and National Science Foundation (NSF) to award grants to organizations of teacher practitioners and scholars to develop voluntary standards in seven school subjects, science, history, geography, the arts, civics, foreign language and English.38 The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) had been the first professional organization to begin to draft their own standards (1989).

The organizations that received federal grants were to create coherent frameworks and standards that would serve as prototypes for the states. It was the anticipation that Congress would create a national board to evaluate the voluntary national standards in the core disciplines and establishes a process to review and revise the standards.

On November 5, 1991, Charlotte Crabtree, professor and Co-Director of the NCHS at UCLA submitted an application for the NHSP by the NCHS to continue to
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develop dissemination activities. Crabtree noted that she was personally encouraged by Lynne Cheney to submit an application since their previous amicable and professional relationship in founding the NCHS.

The appropriations that Crabtree requested would assist the NCHS by:

1. Maintaining the Center's (NCHS) now well-established and highly successful program of service to the schools in the improvement of history teaching.
2. Providing national leadership in the most challenging of the goals set forth by President Bush's national agenda, America Goals 2000 and in the National Goals Program of the nation's governors, namely, developing through a national consensus process "world class" achievement standards in history will...also serve as a powerful force for improving the history curriculum...as school, districts, nationally mobilize to prepare students to meet these new standards of excellence

On December 26, 1991, Cheney announced at the Old Post Office Building on Pennsylvania Avenue that the NEH in partnership with the DOE would support the NCHS for two years with $1.6 million as it developed a national consensus on world class standards for American students in history.

Cheney predicted that the mission to write history standards would not be easy:

History is a contentious discipline today...but just because history is a contentious discipline doesn't mean it is an intractable one. It is possible to set high standards in history and the California History-Social Science Framework is the clearest evidence of that. It is possible for us to reach consensus on these matters. California has shown the way. We can do it as

---

40Charlotte Crabtree, phone interview without questionnaire, Pacific Palisades, CA, 14 April 2004.
41Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Education Programs, 1991, title page-1, UCLA Archives.
a nation. High standards can be set, and our students deserve to have us work on them.\textsuperscript{43}

Crabtree was well-respected for her professionalism in her participation in the development of the \textit{California Frameworks} and her committee work on the Bradley Commission for the teaching of history.

Ross Dunn, Professor at San Diego University, interviewee, Director and Co-Editor of the world history standards had been the Director of a NEH program at Princeton, \textit{the Quincentenary of Columbus}, reinforced those sentiments and noted Crabtree’s openness to progressive thinking and varied perspectives on multiculturalism and the scholarship of both Nash and Crabtree.\textsuperscript{44}

Building a broad consensus was paramount to Crabtree and was the driving force of the NCHS proposal to the NEH:

We propose to develop a consensus process that includes a wide variety of interested parties. Included will be distinguished scholars in United States and world history; experienced teachers from all levels of pre-collegiate education elementary education and social studies; professional organizations in history education and the social studies; school supervisors, administrators, and state school officers; representatives of the National School Boards Association, the Education Commission of the States and the national Parent Teacher Association; state legislators, and other interested groups.\textsuperscript{45}

The choosing of the participants for the task force committees (refer to Participants Rosters, Appendix A) was critical. Crabtree emphasized it was with great


\textsuperscript{44}Ross E. Dunn, interview by author, tape recording, San Diego, CA, 16 April 2004.

\textsuperscript{45}Crabtree application to the \textit{National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Education Programs}, 1991, 13-14, UCLA Archives.
diligence that each member of the committees were chosen, the "best and the brightest in history education" with a representation of members, who, some had contributed to the *California History-Social Science Frameworks*, as well as others to include different regions and institutions across the United States.\(^46\)

The formation of the committees (refer to Illustration 2) was to represent a balance of classroom teachers in both United States and world history as well as professional organizations that embraced both traditionalist and revisionist historians. The composition of the participant committees was to not only allow for discourse, but also to be respectful of a myriad of expertise:

The National Council for History Standards (NCFHS) has many talented historians on it and they have given much time to the infinitely complex--politically contentious questions of how history is best studied, how much of it ought to be studied, how teachers can best approach the vast amounts of historical scholarship generated in the last half-century, and what is most essential for students to understand. It is encouraging that the two largest historical bodies--the OAH and the AHA are participating fully in the history standards project, as is the National Council for History Education (NCHE) and a number of other historical groups and groups representing allied disciplines. As drafts of U.S. and world history standards are written.....the National Council for History Standards will be consulting fully with all of these groups in order to build a broad-based consensus regarding the kinds of history our young people should be studying.\(^47\)

The representation of the major professional organizations in the teaching of history and the social studies sought to be as inclusive as possible in the various committees that were formed.

---

\(^{46}\) Charlotte Crabtree, phone interview without questionnaire, Pacific Palisades, CA, 14 April 2004.

Nash recalled that there was great optimism expressed at the beginning of the project for the inclusion of multiculturalism and diverse groups that often had been excluded.\textsuperscript{48} Bicouvaris recounts that being chosen for committee work was both an intellectual and emotional endeavor and that the task to develop national standards for history was "monumental and historic."\textsuperscript{49}

The process to develop the national history standards took approximately thirty-two months. In 1994, the last phase of writing standards by the NHSP coincided with the last federal reform initiative for the national standards movement before the forthcoming controversy over the history standards. Congress passed Clinton's \textit{Goals 2000: Educate America Act} (1994) which provided further financial support for the emerging national standards movement begun under the reform initiatives of the former Bush administration.

It was foremost that the elements of multiculturalism and political correctness were evident in the diversity of the committees. These two provisions that were embraced by the \textit{California History-Social Science Framework} would eventually become the center of both the ideological and political polemics. Before the national history standards were ever written there was criticism and references to who would be deciding the core knowledge in history and that the standards would indeed become synonymous as being the curriculum.

\textsuperscript{48}Gary B. Nash, interview by author, tape recording, Bunche Hall, UCLA, 19 April 2004.

\textsuperscript{49}Bicouvaris, "Setting National Standards for History: A Teacher's View," 56.
Critics recalled the 1987 New York Public schools controversy where the system issued a curriculum that was pro-multiculturalism and was met with much opposition resulting in task forces and commissions that revised the history curriculum. The late historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., was a member of the New York task force and was later to become a dissenter on the first set of the national history standards. He rebutted the assertions of the report by New York state commissioner Thomas Sobol that "Afro-Americans, Asian Americans, Puerto Ricans, Latinos and Native Americans have all been the victims of educational and intellectual oppression."^50

Schlesinger commented that the task to write history standards is to combine due appreciation of the splendid diversity of the nation with due emphasis on the great unifying Western ideas of individual freedom, political democracy and human rights. These are the ideas that define the American nationality--and that today empower people of all continents, races and creeds.^51

In 1992 as a safeguard for educational equity with the participating members (refer to Appendix A) and to insure a consensus process of the NHSP, the National Council for History Standards (NCFHS) was formed of K-12 history teachers, school and district administrators and academic historians. Charlotte Crabtree and Gary Nash from the NCHS served as Council Co-Chairs. Appointed to direct the NHSP the thirty-two

^50 Mary V. Bicouvaris, "Building a Consensus for the Development of National Standards in History," Ph.D. diss., Old Dominion University, 1994, 46.

The Origin, Revision, and Consensus Process of the National History Standards

January 24, 1992 National Council on Education Standards and Testing Congessional issues Raising Standards for American Education

1992 Call for the establishment for “World Class Standards” and national examination system

Spring 1992 NEH and U.S. Department of Education fund project in the teaching and learning of history in the nation and schools

1992 National Standards History Project funded by co-directors Gary Nash and Charlotte Crabtree

1992 National Council for History Standards forms 30-member oversight committee

1992-96 4 years of work

Three curriculum task force committees formed
- World and United States History
- Nine organizational focus groups
- National forum for history standards advisory groups

1994 Spring and summer standards consensus on drafts and subsequent revisions

January 1995 History standards censured in U.S. Senate

1996 National Standards for History published by National Center for History in the Schools, UCLA
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Figure 3. The Origin, Revision, and Consensus Process of the National History Standards
member NCFHS would ultimately be responsible for guiding the consensus process. As part of the original 1988 cooperative agreement between the NEH and the NCHS, Cheney, Crabtree and Nash each had veto power over who would sit on the Council.\textsuperscript{52}

Linda Symcox, Assistant Director of the NCHS during the NHSP, noted that political positions were considered very closely in the selection of committee members to remain as mainstream as possible.\textsuperscript{53} Symcox had originally come to NCHS as a consultant to research exemplary history teaching materials in primary sources from across the nation and from model programs. She later replaced Patricia Taylor who had been the original Assistant Director who had contributed in the development of the original 1988 NCHS proposal with Crabtree. Symcox acknowledged her changing role and experience at NCHS, including working with both historians and world history teachers conducting summer and weekend institutes and the standards committee work.

Any potential candidate representing the extreme political left or right would not be included. The political composition of the Council was perhaps just to the right of center, and it was therefore extremely unlikely that the Council would endorse radical departures from current curricular paradigms of how history should be taught in the schools.\textsuperscript{54}

In the two and one half years the NHSP spanned, the meetings and timelines of the 200 participants were staggered to allow for adequate feedback, discussions and commentaries. The standards writing schedule was designed in the proposal by Crabtree as:

\begin{itemize}
\item Symcox, \textit{Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classroom}, 97-98.
\item Linda Symcox, interview by author, tape recording, San Diego, CA, 16 April 2004.
\item Symcox, \textit{Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classroom}, 98.
\end{itemize}
1. Start-up activities from December 1991-May 1992
2. The development of the standards from June 1992 to September 1993
3. The acceptance and dissemination of the standards from October 1993 to June 1994.\textsuperscript{55}

Because of the problematic world history standards additional monies and time had to be allocated and eventually both sets of standards had to be revised after the national controversy (refer to Illustration 3).

The Council met for a total of eleven days, hammering out every detail necessary to build consensus with the various groups involved in the project, which in turn interacted with one another. Nine Focus Groups (refer to Illustration 2, p. 62) representing the various professional organizations with a stake in history education—the AHA, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the Council of State Social Studies Specialists (CS4) the National Council for History Education (NCHE), the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), the OAH, the Organization of History Teachers (OHT) and the World History Association (WHA) met on three separate occasions, independent of the Council which took place over the duration of the project.\textsuperscript{56}

There were several levels of review of feedback that would be taken into consideration including discussion, written reviews by teachers and commentaries.

The Focus Groups, who were to be advisory in nature, would later voice individual demands in the evolution of the criteria and drafts that had to be met with consensus, the most vocal being the AHA, whose objections caused discourse about the revisions.

The Curriculum Task Force committees (refer to Illustration 2 and Appendix A) were divided into three groups; elementary, middle and high school whose charge was to

\textsuperscript{55}Charlotte Crabtree, Application to the National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Education Programs, 1991, 3, UCLA Archives.

\textsuperscript{56}Symcox, Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classroom, 98.
write K-12 standards. Their membership was chosen from candidates submitted by the nine Focus Groups. The Task Force consisted of fifty academic historians, curriculum specialists and school teachers that met for extensive one or two week sessions at UCLA.\textsuperscript{57}

The National Forum for History Standards (NFHS) (referenced in the literature and the research as the Forum (refer to Illustration 2 and Appendix A) made up of representatives from twenty-four different organizations met with the Council on two occasions to help set the criteria for developing the standards and to provide feedback on successive drafts.\textsuperscript{58}

The inclusion and roles of various professional organizations in history education were crucial to the success of the NHSP. Crabtree recalled how her decision was made to begin the selection process for committee work:

\begin{quote}
The first group I called on was the National Council for the Social Studies, and they have come on board. They're going to be involved in at least three different ways, and President-Elect, Charlotte Anderson, will be sitting on the coordinating Council.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{quote}


The 1991 NCSS President Margit McGuire put the standards movement in a national perspective by writing:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., 99.
\textsuperscript{58}Ibid., 98.
testing and curriculum standards debates may serve as a smoke screen by re-directing our energies away from the issues that are systems to our society and schools.60

The Illinois connection should also be referenced inasmuch two NCSS Past-Presidents from Illinois were involved with the NHSP. Charlotte C. Anderson was succeeded by Denny L. Schillings, another NHSP committee member. Schillings’ involvement in the development of the national voluntary history standards gave him the expertise to chair the ISBE Social Science Committee that drafted the Illinois Learning Standards that were adopted by the Illinois General Assembly in July of 1997 in the social sciences in which the author was a contributing writer. Subsequently the NHSP was to have a direct impact on the Illinois framework and standards, both in organizational format and ideology including the “habits of mind” and critical thinking skills in history.

Inclusiveness was not relegated to only various perspectives, but also to the inclusion of disciplines related to history. Although initiatives were being undertaken to write national standards for geography (National Geography Alliance), civics (National Center for Civic Education) and economic standards (National Council for Economic Education) by their respective organizations, NCSS took a stance that to be involved in the NHSP was an endorsement of history as the center of the social studies. Subsequently, NCSS developed standards in the social studies concurrently with the standards by NHSP that were not federally funded. The NCSS Focus Group voiced their concern of the organization:

Learning takes place as a child and content comes together in a particular context. It is therefore not enough for standards to be established only for a history content: the learner and the context must also be taken into account.61

It was the inclusion of history in the 1992 Congressional Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the omission of social studies that prompted social studies educators under the leadership of NCSS with activist lobbying that successfully annexed social studies to the national agenda and named a task force to develop curriculum standards.62

The task force chaired by Professor Don Schneider of the University of Georgia, a Past-President of NCSS consisted of teachers from elementary, middle and high school levels; university and college teacher educators; and state and school district social studies supervisors. The task force worked during 1993 and 1994 to develop standards, review drafts, consider the feedback from review panels and revise and prepare the final document. The NCSS Board of Directors officially approved the standards document in April 1994. NCSS launched a series of discussions and workshops at conventions and in other venues at national, state and district levels.63

These standards were precipitated by the NHSP and were written for educators for both the integrated and single discipline applications of social studies and currently serve as a useful resource for educators and districts.

The task of writing the national history standards was a formidable one and the NHSP had a review, feedback and revision process that was cyclical in nature coordinated by the NCHS. Symcox recalled the immense focus on details and on commentaries that were taken into consideration by the committees. The reviewers of the
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standards wrote commentaries that were met with conscientiousness and entailed an enormity of paperwork that sometimes was overwhelming.\(^6^4\) Symcox was responsible for various phases of the NHSP under the leadership of Crabtree and Nash with the majority of her assistance with the world history standards that were eventually directed by Dunn.

For historians, the prospect of national history standards represented both an opportunity to bring recent scholarship into the schools and a danger that this scholarship would be rejected by standards writers hostile to it. Among historians, debates over new scholarship are a normal part of academic discourse. Thrust into the public arena, however, such debates had a history of becoming politically divisive, particularly when critics hurled injectives of "political correctness" at defenders of a more inclusive reading of the nation's past. Had historians been working with the schools all along, this new research might have filtered down to the schools, texts and classroom teaching much earlier. Historians, however, were only now returning from the "long walk" they had taken from the schools. If at this juncture they refused to participate in writing the standards, they risked cutting themselves off from the schools once again and surrendering their influence on the project.\(^6^5\)

Veteran teachers from all fifty states and Washington, D.C. were chosen to work with historians for the U.S. history and world history K-12 committees.

Theodore K. Rabb, Professor Emeritus from Princeton, member of the National Council for History Standards, world history committee member and Co-Founder of the NCHE, recalled that Gary Nash, a colleague from graduate school, had invited him to become part of the NHSP because of his expertise in European history. Rabb recollected:

As a member of the Council that prepared the standards I was aware of all the people from many, many backgrounds; remarkably all of them devoted and committed to the teaching of history in the schools. They were very

\(^{64}\)Linda Symcox, interview by author, tape recording, San Diego, CA, 16 April 2004.

\(^{65}\)Nash et al., *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 158.
talented and many, many opinions were reflected in our discussions and in the end we came up with a serious and significant set of recommendations. Not everyone agreed with everyone, but that's the nature of the beast. I think all history is equal in the sight of God and don't think it should carry a particular agenda. We thought this was a professional undertaking, not a political one.66

One of the most divisive issues that both the American and world history committees encountered was that of multiculturalism. The dilemma was how the history standards would encompass the historical experiences of racial, ethnic, and religious minorities, as well as women and working classes.67 To allay some of these concerns about inclusiveness because of the previous controversies about the Quincentenary of Columbus, textbook diatribes and state curriculum debates, every effort was made to have a broader range of organizations reflected in the National Forum of the NHSP. There had been national protests against the celebrations of the Quincentenary of Columbus not only because of the claim he had “discovered” America, but also because of the subsequent brutality and genocide that the indigenous peoples had been subjected to without their deserved recognition in history. Of particular note was the activism of the American Indian Movement (AIM) that lobbied Congress and had demonstrations in Washington, DC and other major cities.

The Forum was comprised of (refer to Participants Roster, Appendix A) members of major education, parent-teacher and public interest associations were convened.

The first meeting of the Forum revealed a microcosm of America itself. Sister Catherine McNamee, President of the National Catholic Educational Association; Clifford Trafazer of the Native American Heritage


67Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 160.
Commission; George Nielsen representing Lutheran schools, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod; Nguyen Minh Chou of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education; Mabel Lake Murray of the National Alliance of Black School Educators; Sara Shoob of the National Association of Elementary School Principals; Chester Finn of the Educational Excellence Network as others.\textsuperscript{68}

The notion of political correctness, national identity and inclusive history took a bifurcated path in the U.S. history and world history committees. In the United States history committee, those groups who were historically omitted or were disenfranchised were sought to be included, while on the world history committee the contributions of those outside of the West were mentioned. In anticipation of other potential problems in writing, guiding criteria were needed.

At a meeting May 1, 1992, the NHSP Council drafted criteria to guide the development of the standards. There were later revisions and additions to these criteria after lengthy debates and passionate position statements that were filtered through the Forum and Focus Groups.

Criterion 7 stated:

The history of any society can only be understood by studying all of its constituent parts. As a nation-polity and society the United States has always been both \textit{one} and \textit{many}. Therefore standards should reflect the nation’s diversity, exemplified by race, ethnicity, social status, gender and religious affiliation. The contributions and struggles for social justice and equality by specific groups and individuals should be included.\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{68}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{69}Ibid., 163.
Bicouvaris noted that the tone and members of the Forum varied, but what was evident was the consistent call for the United States history to be inclusive. Ruth Wattenberg, representing the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), spoke about multiculturalism in the classroom and the justification for including it in instruction at the Forum also later in an AFT position statement:

> it helps to bring together our *pluribus* and our *unum*. After all, America was a multicultural nation at its founding. Our culture and especially our politics--from the religious freedom clauses in the First Amendment to anti-slavery laws, the Voting Rights Act, and immigration policy have been shaped by both the presences and the activism of America’s many minorities.

Other professional organizations were also staunch in their sentiments in support of inclusiveness. James Gardner, Deputy Executive of the AHA was equally forceful in stating:

> We would not be part of any standards project that does not address the multicultural aspects of our history….. We don’t see this as an option or an alternative, but the reality of our past…..

The endorsement of the ideology of multiculturalism did not have a universal bandwagon effect. There were opposing concerns expressed that feared a flashback to the 1980s reaction to the exclusionary history of those that had been marginalized or selectively omitted. Mark Curtis, representing the Atlantic Council of the United States warned:

---


72 Referenced by Nash, Joint Meeting of the National Council for History Standards and National Forum for History Standards, audiocassette of meeting, 10 April 1992, UCLA Archives.
The so-called multicultural agendas in history threaten to balkanize American society. They will serve to drive people apart and will diminish the critical importance of teaching about our common heritage.73

As a foreshadowing of the neo-conservative political arena that the national history standards would soon be tossed into, Chester Finn representing the Educational Excellence Network, in his recommendations to the Council cautioned against multicultural excess:

We must teach about diversity, to be sure, but never lose sight of what binds us together as a nation….the great unifying Western ideas of individual freedom, political democracy, and human rights….We agree wholeheartedly that in the past schools did not present history in a very balanced way…but the solution to this problem is not…to turn things around 180 degrees and blame, or even worse, ignore Western tradition…74

This sentiment was counter-posited by another Council member, Sam Banks, a Baltimore schools administrator, who equated Finn’s position as what de Tocqueville called the “tyranny of the majority,” i.e., the larger white society—to decide, the view of many would be that all is well; there are no problems.75

If the issue with the United States history committees was Criterion 7, and the inclusion of groups, the issue with the world history committees was Criterion 13, of not only what world history meant, i.e. Western or non-Western or variations in-between, but also the specific periodizations. The History Forum’s original language of Criterion 13 in February 1992 read as follows:

73 Ibid., 161.
74 Ibid., 160.
75 Ibid., 162.
Standards in world history should include both the history and values of Western civilization and the history and cultures of other societies, with the greater emphasis on Western civilization, and on the inter-relationships between Western and non-western societies.\textsuperscript{76}

Symcox noted that although there were countless renditions and “word-smithing” of each Criterion, the syntax of these two sentences launched a controversial two-year debate that placed the entire project at risk.\textsuperscript{77} Symcox further recalled the Criterion 13 controversy really brought out the ideological differences between the Eurocentric and revisionist world history historians and that the lines had been drawn in the sand and it took much effort to resolve the consensus.\textsuperscript{78}

One of the most resounding critics of Criterion 13 was William H. McNeill, the world history historian and Council member. In correspondence to Crabtree he argued:

I do not agree that Western civilization deserves greater emphasis than other, at least not for the period before 1500 A.D. Why not: world history should explore the history and values of all ten major civilizations of the world, and study some simpler societies as well. Major attention should be directed toward the traditions that continue to affect the lives of large numbers of people today…..i.e., the civilizations of Europe, the Middle East, India and China….The West is not privileged: indeed we are a minority in the world and ought to know it. For the past five centuries there is reason of course to make our expansion central to the study of world history because it was. Before time, however, other civilizations enjoyed primacy and Europeans were completely backward.\textsuperscript{79}

McNeill recognized the ideological stances of historians in world history and how their beliefs would cause discourse and objections.

\textsuperscript{76}Symcox, \textit{Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms}, 107.

\textsuperscript{77}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{78}Linda Symcox, interview by author, tape recording, San Diego, CA, 16 April 2004.

Many of the NHSP professional organizations Focus Groups also objected to the wording, but the most critical was given by Jim Gardner of the AHA who objected to Crabtree in an ultimatum:

This criterion is unacceptable as written. Students with a “world class” education in history should be prepared to act as world citizens, to function in a multi-cultural society, and to understand the historical forces that have shaped and continue to shape the world. It is necessary, then, to make sure that all students have the opportunity to study both U.S. and world history. It is not enough to put the emphasis on western civilization in a world history course, especially when “other civilizations” is so non-specific as to be meaningless. In addition, the use of the word “other” separates western from non-western countries in ways that are particularly problematic. These “other countries” are clearly not “us” and this separation further exacerbates the problems of a Eurocentric curriculum.80

Although the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), NCSS and historian McNeill objected to the wording in Criterion 13, the AHA was the most vociferous in stance and determination. Nash recalled the role of the AHA and the critical stalemate that was resolved:

We had no idea that the criterion would create such an impasse, it was unanticipated…. the AHA wanted the wording changed on Criterion 13 or they would either pull out or go public. The credibility of the NHSP was at stake. The Winston report was also instrumental in moving the world history standards forward.81

The correspondence from the AHA sent to Crabtree and Nash were circulated to the NHSP Council for review and the AHA elected officers were invited to attend the February 1993 Council meeting in which criterion 13 was amended after fierce debates to read:

80Ibid., 109.

81Gary B. Nash, interview by author, tape recording, Bunche Hall, UCLA, 19 April 2004.
Standards in world history should include both the history and values of diverse civilizations including Western civilization, and should especially address the interaction among them.\textsuperscript{82}

The consensus on the criteria was imperative because they were adopted by the National Council for History Standards to guide the development of the K-12 history standards. The criteria were developed and refined over the course of a broad-based national review and consensus process. The adopted original criteria for the development of the national United States and world history standards are thus:

1. Standards should be intellectually demanding; reflect the best historical scholarship, and promote active questioning and learning rather than passive absorption of facts, dates and names.
2. Such standards should be equally expected of all students and all students should be provided equal access to the curricular opportunities necessary to achieving those standards.
3. Standards should reflect the ability of children from earliest elementary school years to learn the meanings of history and the methods of historians.
4. Standards should be founded in chronology, an organizing approach that fosters appreciation of pattern and causation in history.
5. Standards should strike a balance between emphasizing broad themes in United States and world history probing specific historical events, ideas, movements, persons and documents.
6. All historical study involves selection and ordering of information in light of general ideas and values. Standards for history should reflect the principles of sound historical reasoning—careful evaluation of evidence, construction of causal relationships, balanced interpretation, and comparative analysis. The ability to detect and evaluate distortion and propaganda by omission, suppression, or invention of facts is essential.
7. Standards should include awareness of, appreciation for, and the ability to use a variety of sources of evidence from which historical knowledge is achieved including written documents, oral tradition, quantitative data, popular culture, literature, artifacts, art and music, historical sites, photographs and films.
8. Standards for United States history should reflect both the nation’s diversity exemplified by race, ethnicity, social and economic status, gender, region, politics and religion, and the nation’s commonalities. The contributions and struggles of specific groups and individuals should be included.

\textsuperscript{82}Symcox, \textit{Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms}, 116.
9. Standards in United States history should contribute to citizenship education through developing understanding of our common civic identity and shared civic values within the polity through analyzing major policy issues in the nation’s history, and through developing mutual respect among its many people.

10. History standards should emphasize the nature of civil society and its relationship to government and citizenship. Standards in United States history should address the historical origins of the nation’s democratic political system and the continuing development of its ideals and institutions, its controversies, and the struggle to narrow the gap between its ideals and practices. Standards in world history should include different patterns of political institutions, ranging from varieties of democracy to varieties of authoritarianism, and ideas and aspirations developed by civilizations in all parts of the world.

11. Standards in United States and world history should be separately developed but inter-related in content and similar in format. Standards in United States history should reflect the global context in which the nation evolved and world history should treat United States history as one of its integral parts.

12. Standards should include appropriate coverage of recent events in United States and world history, including social and political developments and international relations of the post World War II era.

13. Standards in United States and world history should utilize regional and local history by exploring specific events and movements through case studies and historical research. Local and regional history should enhance the broader patterns of United States and world history.

14. Standards in United States and world history should integrate fundamental facets of human culture such as religion, science and technology, politics and government, economics, interactions with the environment, intellectual and social life, literature, and the arts.

15. Standards in world history should treat the history and values of diverse civilizations, including those of the West, and should especially address the interactions among them.83

Unlike their world history counterparts whose first set of standards had to be abandoned and new organizing questions drafted, a subcommittee of area specialists was convened to further diffuse what the ASCD referred to as a “multicultural minefield”.

---

83 National Standards for History: Basic Edition (Los Angeles, CA: National Center for History in the Schools, 1996), 43-44. Also: N.B. the original Criterion 7 is now Criterion 8 because of the addition of subsequent criteria; the original Criterion 13 was revised and moved to Criterion 15.
In the summer of 1992 the United States history group chaired by Nash had completed both the standards and teaching activities for two of the historical eras.\(^84\)

Under the leadership of historian and NHSP Council member Michael Winston, Vice-President Emeritus of Howard University, the committee met three times in Washington, DC, and produced a set of thematic questions adopted by the Council and their body was unofficially named the “Winston committee.” Symcox credited the work of the committee, known as the “Winston report” as building a new consensus on world history.\(^85\)

The committee was comprised of three elementary and high school teachers from the Task Force, six historians from the Council, three historians working with projects in world history and four other world historians consulting with the committee and reviewing their work.\(^86\)

Despite the differences of settling the issues of multiculturalism in United States and world history, the redeeming factor was that the debates, resolutions, voting and revisions were an American exercise in civil discourse among educator-citizens, not a closed-door wrangle settled by high official of state.\(^87\) In correspondence dated October 6, 1992 from Cheney to Crabtree and Nash congratulations were sent on the consensus process and results of drafting committees’ work.

---

\(^84\) Nash et al., *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 172.


\(^86\) Nash et al., *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 172.

\(^87\) Ibid., 174.
What nice work you do! I’ve been saying lately that the best grant I’ve ever given is to your standards setting project.\textsuperscript{88}

Cheney was also to cite her partnership with the NHSP as one of her most notable achievements in her NEH resignation speech when the George H. W. Bush administration changed to the Clinton administration.

**Stakeholders, Stances and Semantics**

There were other issues in the process of the development of the national history standards that led to varying oppositional stances of the stakeholders, but none that would equal the vitriolic rhetoric of the aftermath following the release of the history standards. From the beginning of the NHSP there were divergent viewpoints on the curricular interpretation of whether the history standards should focus on content or process. The mix of scholars and pre-collegiate teachers viewed the history standards differently both philosophically and pedagogically. Those advocating as what can be referred to as the E.D. Hirsch ethos thought that students should master an age-appropriate body of knowledge determined by professionals and scholars. The opposing view-point was one of students using the tools of social inquiry and making connections to construct their meaning of an historical context.

Bicouvaris reflected on the leadership of the Co-Chairs Crabtree and Nash on the sentiments of the participants regarding the issue of process vs. content:

Crabtree and Nash are credited for the diffusion of the issue of content and process. By allowing a large number of voices to be heard in an open fair

\textsuperscript{88}Symcox, *Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms*, 110.
process, Crabtree and Nash opened all views for scrutiny, thus helping to correct misperceptions and exposing unreasonable views.\textsuperscript{89}

To ameliorate this situation so that the historical content would be balanced with historical thinking skills, Crabtree established a model that was based on the feedback from the Focus Groups. Both NCSS and ASCD expressed the need for history to have relevancy in the lives of students and also for students to exercise higher cognitive thinking. The AHA also took the position that the history standards should provide equal opportunities for the development of critical thinking skills and exposure to historical content.\textsuperscript{90}

The ASCD recommended on April 24, 1992 that:

While we acknowledge the importance of a content base in the study of history, content alone is not enough to prepare students for work, citizenship and productive lives. The development of history standards must go beyond the basis of content (what students should know) and include standards by which to measure specific student attitudes and values (what students should be like) and intellectual skills (what students should be able to do).\textsuperscript{91}

Linda Levstik, chair of the NCSS Focus Group, had distinguished in her research on how students learn history as being engaged in the transmission model where students acquire chronological information or the transformation model that history is something one does.\textsuperscript{92} One of the tenets of the NHSP was that students should not be just passive

---

\textsuperscript{89} Bicouvaris, "Building a Consensus for the Development of National Standards in History," 96.

\textsuperscript{90} Symcox, \textit{Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms}, 115.

\textsuperscript{91} Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, “Recommendations to the National History Standards Project” (Alexandria, VA, 24-25 April, 1992), 5.

recipients of historical knowledge, but also engaged in activities that are meaningful and challenging.

The five types of historical thinking that were agreed upon were:

1. Chronological thinking
2. Historical comprehension
3. Historical analysis and interpretation
4. Historical research capabilities
5. Historical issues-analysis and decision-making

This pedagogy mirrored the efforts of the NCHS curriculum materials that emphasized the tales of the ordinary as well as extraordinary individuals.

One of the documents we provided the committee members was the NCHS Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire in which I was a Co-Editor with Charlotte (Crabtree). In it we featured teacher-generated materials that had “dramatic moments” in which students piece together understandings and problems of ordinary people for analysis.

Although this philosophy might be interpreted as a leftist revisionist social history in juxtaposition with Thomas Carlyle’s conservative elitist admission that the “history of the world is but the biography of great men,” the inclusion of ordinary men, women and children was heralded by some historians not even directly involved in the NHSP, as a necessary inclusion in history education.

The questionnaire utilized in this study for the oral history interviews (refer to Appendix A) also focused on the teaching of history as Remini reflected:

There is another dimension, the dimension of ordinary people and what they have contributed and that’s important, so I guess the controversy goes on. We are so limited in the time that we have to teach kids the history of

---


The drafting of the K-4 history standards by elementary teachers was directed by Crabtree and after scrutiny did not experience the controversy that the junior high and secondary standards experienced. The conventional approach that was followed was that of the 1988 Bradley Commission “expanding environments” curriculum but included historical studies and literature that connected with the topics of family, neighborhood and community. The Chicago Public Schools also had adopted a similar scope and later the 1997 ISBE Illinois Learning Standards including local and Illinois history.

The K-4 history standards were published as a separate book that emphasized themes in history patterned after the California Frameworks (1988). Dr. Robert Bain, now Assistant Professor at the University of Michigan Ann Arbor, was then a secondary teacher and reviewer of the world history standards for the Council for Basic Education (CBE).

The CBE, an independent review panel, was responsible for overseeing the revision of the censured history standards. Bain recalled the recommendations for the revision of the standards which he referred to as one of the untold stories:

> Everybody there had some things that they brought to the CBE panel, there were internal documents that on that the committee we talked about, what were the strengths and weaknesses of the standards, where she

---

95Robert V. Remini, interview by author, tape recording, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, 8 April 2005.

96During the summer and fall of 1995 there were three sessions held in Philadelphia, Washington and Williamsburg, VA by the CBE Commission.
[Crabtree] wanted the K-4 standards, which almost went untouched, no one talked about the controversy in K-4, but in the K-4 document Diane [Ravitch] wanted the panel to come out strongly against which she calls the “expanding horizons” view of social studies curriculum. The one that starts with first graders studying me, then the family, then the community, then the neighborhood, etc… She [Ravitch] wanted the committee to come out against that in favor of an historical approach to K-4 education, she made a special presentation and it was debated and voted down, the committee decided that they did not want to take a stand that Diane wanted and that would have been a perfect opportunity for her to bail; she didn’t, she stayed firmly committed to the process even though one perspective that she really wanted to get put across, but the rest of committee members didn’t take up…so it was that kind of give and take, because the CBE committee realized the importance of the work we were doing as a possible force for mediating the impact of the political controversy.97

The importance of the recommendations was that the NSHP revised the history standards based on the critical review by the CBE and took each comment under consideration.

Another insight to the development of the world history standards was that of the historian Dunn, who eventually became head of the world history standards project. Although he was not involved in the NHSP at the beginning of the project, his impact was crucial development of the designated periods for the world history standards and in the mandatory revisions by the CBE.

The subject matter should be taught along a chronological line to connect the links of cause and effect as they [students] move forward. The periodizations that were developed did not emphasize Western civilization, but placed it in a perspective of a thematic approach.98


The periods that were established by the world history committee were not the traditional categories of ancient, medieval and modern history, but one Symcox called a Kuhnian paradigm shift. The eras intentionally overlapped each other to incorporate both the closure of certain developments and the start of others.99

Era 1: The Beginnings of Human Society
Era 2: Early Civilizations and the Emergence of Pastoral Peoples, 4,000-1000 BCE
Era 3: Classical Traditions, Major Religions and Great Empires, 1000 BCE-300 CE
Era 4: Expanding Zones of Exchange and Encounter, 300-1000 CE
Era 5: Intensified Hemispheric Interactions, 1000-1500 CE
Era 6: Emergence of the First Global Age, 1450-1770
Era 7: An Age of Revolutions, 1750-1914
Era 8: A Half-Century of Crisis and Achievement, 1900-1945
Era 9: The 20th Century Since 1945: Promises and Paradoxes100

Inasmuch the structure and membership of the NHSP was organized to encourage a collegial blend of scholarship with practitioners in history education, there were several issues that would come to the forefront with the politicization of the standards which will be shown. The federal funding of the NHSP lead to speculation that the voluntary history standards would be tied to a national curriculum like the British model, or more important to mandated national examinations.

Although the emphasis of the NHSP was to develop a useful framework and expectations for teachers and students and states developing standards, the issue of implementation and how the standards would be used became the center of the political controversy. None of the other core disciplines developing standards would become

100Ibid.
engaged in a national contentious arena that challenged the interpretation of what Dr. Michael Apple, the John Bascom Professor of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, refers to as “cultural reproduction” in his Cultural Politics and Education (1996) and what was considered an attack on our national identity by revisionist social historians.

In addition to Apple’s stance reflected in his works questioning the effects of the movement of national standards, national curricula and national testing, in his review of Ravitch’s National Standards in American Education: A Citizen’s Guide (1995), he apprised the influence of politics.

Ravitch wrote National Standards while in residence at The Brookings Institution in Washington. As with many of these kinds of think tanks, it too, has moved significantly to the right...Much of our public discussion involves quite simplistic neo-conservative versions of the issue of a ‘common culture’. Other elements that surround what has been called the ‘conservative restoration’ are becoming dominant. My basic point is to remind the reader that Ravitch’s book was itself written under a particular political aegis, and our very idea of democracy is in the process of being transformed.101

CHAPTER THREE

THE POLITICIZATION OF THE STANDARDS

Mr. President, what is more important of our Nation’s history for our children to study
– George Washington or Bart Simpson?--Senator Slade Gorton (January 18, 1995 United States Senate, 104th Congress Congressional Record S1026)

The purpose of Chapter Three is to examine the further consensus process and revisions that were caused by the politicization of the National Standards for History. In the spring of 1994, the position statements, debates, compromises and negotiations had forged the pathway to the final versions of the history standards. The thirty-one United States history standards were completed first and had been written to correspond to the ten chronological categories or Eras (refer to Appendix A, U.S. History Standards for Grades 5-12):

Era 1: Three Worlds Meet (Beginnings to 1620)
Era 2: Colonization and Settlement (1585-1763)
Era 3: Revolution and the New Nation (1754-1820s)
Era 4: Expansion and Reform (1801-1861)
Era 5: Civil War and Reconstruction (1850-1877)
Era 6: The Development of the Industrial United States (1870-1900)
Era 7: The Emergence of Modern America (1890-1930)
Era 8: The Great Depression and World War II (1929-1945)
Era 9: Postwar United States (1945 to early 1970s)
Era 10: Contemporary United States (1968 to the present)

The very composition of the standards and the interpretation of the format of the exemplars (the teaching examples that are also referred to in the literature as descriptors)

would prove to be the vortex of the political controversy (refer to Appendix A, Elements of a History Standard). The national history standards were grounded in the pedagogy of teaching students the importance of both historical knowledge and critical thinking skills and were accompanied by over 2,600 teaching activities. These teaching exemplars were included to illustrate to teachers how the content of the standards could be taught and also for strategies that could be implemented in the classroom. The thirty-one United States history content standards (what students should know) were further divided and supported by sub-standards (what students should be able to do) (refer to Appendix A, Elements of a History Standard). The world history standards also followed the same compositional format. The teaching exemplars would later become the political flashpoints of the controversy, as will be shown.

Symcox notes that the last formal meeting of the NHSP Council in May 1994 was celebratory in nature because the appearance of consensus was achieved on the United States history standards.\(^2\) Education Week captured the ambience of the meeting attended by the Council, several Forum members and the NEH and DOE administrators as:

One by one, men and women gathered around the conference tables offering final words and praise for the American history documents that were nearly completed. ‘Extremely admirable’ enthused the American Federation of Teachers liaison to the project, Ruth Wattenberg.\(^3\)

Symcox had reflected that the May 19, 1994 statement by Finn would be a foreshadowing of the future political controversy. Finn questioned the very acceptance of the history standards by mainstream America:

\(^2\)Symcox, Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms, 120.

In its valiant efforts to gain the approbation of innumerable constituencies within the education and history communities whose blessings have been though desirable, I believe the project may have been given too short shrift to the need for these Standards also to be accepted by legislators, school board members business leaders, moms and dads, voters and taxpayers, mayors, newspaper editors and talk show hosts… If these Standards were the subject of the Wichita Rotary Club one noontime, what would be said of them? How will they go down with the Chamber of Commerce? With the American Legion? With the League of Women Voters? ... By columnists and commentators across the spectrum? By callers to the Rush Limbaugh show?  

Symcox later recalled what a sense of accomplishment that the majority of the NHSP United States history members felt because there was a degree of consensus and closure on their work on the standards.  

In June of 1994, Crabtree retired from UCLA and Nash became Director of the NCHS. There were many tasks to be completed to meet the fall deadline for the publications of the United States and world history standards. The K-4 team, under the leadership of Sara Shoob of the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), completed the work to include additional historical literature and deeper scientific teaching examples such as Jonas Salk, Thomas Edison and the American space program. As part of the continuous feedback process, commentaries and letters were sent to the editorial teams by the Task Forces that reflected their concerns for revisions including the text and teaching activities.

---


5Linda Symcox, interview by author, tape recording, San Diego, CA, 16 April 2004.

6Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 184.
Because the majority of the intensive revisions were for the world history standards, fifteen educators gathered at the NCHS offices at UCLA in the summer of 1994 for a week to work with Dunn, Nash and Symcox to address the concerns of introductions to the historical eras as recommended by Rabb.\(^7\)

Another part of the process was that drafts were sent to the members and officers of the Council, Forum, Focus groups and participating organizations. An example of the feedback for the work done by the committees was chronicled as thus:

The NCHE reported that the overwhelming opinion of their focus group was that the draft statement is an important and original achievement given serious new direction to history education and that it is a remarkable piece of work for which the authors deserve the profound gratitude of all of us who work as teachers in the field of world history, from Grade Five through graduate school.\(^8\)

There were other laudatory comments concerning the design of the world history standards:

The Organization of History Teachers (OHT) wrote that it applauds the innovative work on standards for teaching world history and strongly endorse this articulation of the standards.\(^9\)

Dunn recalled that every commentary, suggestion and item of feedback was given value to address the concerns to refine the document because of the previous world history controversy with the Criteria and that the final drafts were given great scrutiny for

\(^7\)Ibid.


\(^9\)Organization of History Teachers, “Response to the Proposed World History Standards, From Early Humans through the Present” (20 July 1994), also referenced by Nash.
clarity and to be bias-free.\textsuperscript{10} Michael Winston also supported the additions to the latest version as a “significant improvement over its predecessors with the introductions to each era.\textsuperscript{11} Although Nash and colleagues commented that the CCSSO stated that the world history document should set the standard for a true world history, some critics did not change their positions.\textsuperscript{12}

Paul Gagnon did not deviate from his stance on the standards project with his position on the West which was also shared and supported by Shanker and Finn, but later also expressed another concern:

\begin{quote}
The central failure of the standards document is their length and pretension. They produced encyclopedia, not cores…These standards leave students and teachers still caught between those professional educators who put academic prowess for the masses as a last priority and academicians who cannot bring themselves, or each other, to leave anything out.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

The professional organizations represented by Shanker (AFT) and Finn (Educational Excellence Network) and Gagnon were only a few of the influences upon the national history standards (refer to Illustration 4). Their alliance was a precursor of the controversy that was to come, and more importantly it was evident that no matter what the expertise and stance of the historians that they in fact, still did not agree and that there were many degrees of consensus and discourse. The final revisions of the world history

\textsuperscript{10}Ross E. Dunn, interview by author, tape recording, San Diego, CA, 16 April 2004.

\textsuperscript{11}Nash et al., \textit{History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past}, 184.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., 186.

standards reflecting further commentaries were completed by Dunn, Nash and Symcox in August of 1994.\(^\text{14}\)

In September of 1994, before the history standards were even released, there were ominous indications of the portent of the political controversy that was to imminently unfold in appraising the drafts. Secretary of Education Riley expressed his disdain for the history standards and the political message they were sending:

\begin{quote}
This was not our grant. This is not my idea of standards. This is not my view of how history should be taught in America’s classrooms. We have to acknowledge both the peaks and valleys in our past and recognize the contributions of all Americans regardless of their station in life. But the message must be a positive one. Our schools should teach our students to be proud to be Americans.\(^\text{15}\)
\end{quote}

No matter what safeguards were in place for a broad-consensus building process or accommodations to the divergent thinkers of the task force and advisory committees prepared the NHSP directors and participants for their upcoming trial in the court of public opinion. There were many other influences that affected the stances of the stakeholders in the process of the drafting, writing and revisions of the United States History and world history standards (refer to Illustration 4).


Figure 4. The Influences Upon the National History Standards
For instance, on the global level was the establishment of national standards by our international counterparts such as Britain and Canada and reports such as the TIMSS that ranked the abysmal performance of American students generating the rationale for the national standards movement. Later, the controversy over the adoption of the NHSP national history standards reverberated to both domestic and international academia. On the national level were the recommendations and influence of governmental agencies such as the DOE, NEH, and Congressional legislation mandating the improvement of student achievement coupled with fiduciary strings. These mandates in the forms of grants to states supported the standards movement for the local development of standards-based frameworks including the Illinois State Board of Education.

Political agendas were evidenced in the contrarian ideological views with the inclusiveness of “political correctness” vs. the nativist fervor to protect the *status quo* by the special interest groups, think tanks, political parties, blue ribbon panels and task force committees. Ethics, scholarship and expertise were contributed by the participants of history educators and practitioners, administrators, curriculum specialists and professional organizations in the social sciences in the development of the standards, but they had not anticipated that their contributions had to be justified.

When the national history standards were attacked, none of the NHSP participants were sacrosanct; classroom teachers were challenged and criticized in the national spotlight for their work. In a rebuttal letter to the Editor of the *New York Times* two panel members, John Pyne and Gloria Sesso, who were both social studies practitioners, addressed the issue of political correctness:
As two of the history teachers involved in the writing of the National U.S. History Standards, we are appalled that we have become the object of a virulent ideological attack by Lynne Cheney and her cohorts. Scouring the hundred of specific student activities that we helped draft, they have a national issue out of perhaps a dozen examples, and in the process have suggested that everyone involved in the project is obsessed with political correctness. All of the classroom teachers who wrote the Standards and developed the activities are mainstream educators with long experience in the classroom and are highly regarded by their colleagues, by students, and by parents. To be labeled as some sort of left-wing radicals by critics such as Ms. Cheney is an injustice to classroom teachers everywhere.16

Dunn would later come to the defense of the world history teachers in rebutting the claims of Cheney’s Washington Post, November 11, 1994 op-ed piece attacking the world history standards:

Cheney states that ‘there’s nothing wrong with studying the rest of the world, but not through this massive amount of detail’. When Cheney speaks of ‘massive detail’ she likely refers to events that were not part of her own traditional education… However, teachers and scholars of today who are conversant with the history of Africa, Asia and Latin America are likely to find very little in these standards that they would characterize as recondite. But how could anyone suppose that the experienced, pragmatic teachers who developed this document would be interested in cramming it with historical obscurities?17

The expectations and leadership of the NCHS in overseeing the NHSP encouraged the collegiality of diverse participants and their myriad of philosophies, pedagogical strategies and areas of specializations to achieve consensus in creating the national history standards. However, the controversy jeopardized the project and the crisis that ensued produced ramifications that some historians and practitioners claim are


17 Ross Dunn, “Attack on National World History Standards” (15 November 1994), distributed by listserv to subscribers of World-L@UBVM.cebuffalo.edu.
still evident in the current No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (2001) legislation with the omission of history as a core subject. In October 1994, the three volumes of the Standards for National History went to press and the contemporary culture wars would ensue with the scrutiny of policymakers, legislators and the media.

**Culture Wars Revisited**

Ravitch chronicles the importance of the timing of the October 20, 1994, *Wall Street Journal* article by Cheney approximately two weeks before the official release of the national history standards. “The End of History” article that appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* blasted the National United States History Standards. Cheney’s article set off a heated debate about history in the schools among editorialists, historians, talk show hosts on radio and television, and elected officials. Cheney’s apocalyptic reference to “The End of History” was that to an article written in 1989 by Francis Fukuyama whose premise, based on Hegelian philosophy, predicted “the end of history” and caused much discourse in both intellectual and political circles.

Symcox analyzes why Cheney attacked the United States history standards in her opinion piece rather than the world history standards that had been previously problematic as:

Cheney had sponsored the standards project in the first place, and since she had remained silent about it since her 1992 resignation speech in which she sang its praises, it seemed strange that such a public assault would come from her. Just as surprising was the fact that she focused her comments on the American history standards rather than on the world history standards which had been the recurring locus of controversy the

---


entire project. One can only surmise that her motives were political, and that a critique of the world history standards would not have resonated with the American public. Perhaps what Cheney needed politically was to sponsor a wedge issue: a debate who owns our national past. It was highly unlikely that the public would have become engaged in a debate over who owns the world’s past.20

Dunn reflected that the attack by Cheney was part of a very well-orchestrated script and political agenda by politicians who had easy access to the media and distorted not only how the standards were developed, but what they actually were.21 The impact of the controversy that Cheney triggered spanned approximately eighteen months in the national press, over the airwaves, and in the halls of Congress.22 Rabb reflected on his surprise that the national science standards had not encountered the same kind of controversy:

A friend of mine who was at the National Academy of Sciences said he was indeed very grateful that we got all of the heat, because they were expecting the heat because of the fact they had to treat Darwin in their scientific standards. So much energy was expended on history that the scientists got off Scot-free, when indeed to them I guess there would have been much larger issues for them to take on…. I think it was just bad luck that history got zapped in that way, and it has done an enormous amount of harm to the teaching of history, which I deeply regret, and it’s terrible for the current and future generations, and there it is, it was out of our hands….23

One of the key players in the evolving political attack of the national history standards was that of John Fonte. Nash and colleagues reference his role as thus:

---
20 Symcox, Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms, 127.
22 Symcox, Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms, 127.
John Fonte, an educational consultant who received a Ph.D. in history in the 1970’s but had almost no publications in the discipline, reportedly identified himself in a meeting of the conservative National Association of Scholars as the ‘person who did the analysis of the standards for Cheney’. She soon appointed him the executive director of a committee she was forming to assess all national standards.\(^{24}\)

Dunn further asserted especially in the later meetings during the public controversy in Washington, D.C. such as those at the Brookings Institution, Fonte was Cheney’s ever-present mouthpiece.\(^{25}\) Fonte was later to become a visiting scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, a Washington, D.C. think tank. Although the bulk of the criticism was indeed aimed at the United States history standards as Symcox notes, through further research it was revealed that the world history standards did not escape scrutiny. Fonte attacked the world history standards for their negativism and anti-West-tone:

*The National Standards in World History* produced by the National Center for History in the Schools at the University of California at Los Angeles are riddled with serious problems; conceptual, intellectual, normative, and practical, from start to finish. They present an overwhelming amount of material on non-western history, literature, archaeology, anthropology, architecture and mythology that very few teachers (and few scholars) are familiar with; a conceptual framework of world history that minimizes the intellectual and political history of Europe and the West; a subtle but pervasive anti-West bias….. The UCLA standards are more indicative of a proposed research agenda for a new academic field than a guide to national school standards. Moreover, it is a research agenda for a new kind of world history that de-emphasizes the role of the West wherever it can.\(^{26}\)

---

\(^{24}\)Nash et al., *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 191.

\(^{25}\)Ross E. Dunn, interview by author, tape recording, San Diego, CA, 16 April 2004.

The rhetoric and polemics that were exchanged were a precursor to the Senate censure that placed the history standards into a national spotlight. Nash and colleagues commented on the further criticism:

In demonizing the guidelines, critics found it useful to claim that the standards were written not just by a rogue group of historians, but by a UCLA cabal in particular, or even by one or two people. John Fonte, repeatedly referred to the guidelines as the “UCLA standards” and like Cheney, assiduously avoided any mention of the central role that school teachers played in the project.27

Nash became the “chief architect” and “main author” of the standards, thereby shrouding the roles of teachers, administrators, and curriculum experts.28

Nash recalled that the teachers were insulted that it was even insinuated they were involved in some sort of conspiracy to distort history and that their reputations as teaching professionals were undermined by political banter.29

David Vigilante, an active Republican and high school teacher known for leading students to honors in national competitions in knowledge of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, confronted the ideologues with the sentiments:

I would suggest Fonte et al., had best get out of the way because they will become mere bumps in the road paved by teachers who want to teach and who need the guidance and wisdom that the standards present…Jefferson would be proud because we will be helping to prepare better citizens, citizens who are mature enough to look beyond ‘myths’ and can admit to our failures as a nation….. citizens who will help to make the history of

27Ibid., 73-81.
28Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 198.
our nation richer through the truth, learning and understanding of real history.\textsuperscript{30}

The politicization of the national history standards was not the first time history education was involved in cultural wars as previously chronicled, but the controversy questioned not only what would be taught, but who would have that determination. Rabb cautioned about the political fervor:

\begin{quote}
We just stood there appalled that people intervened and what they thought, many of them, people who were not trained in history in any way at all, I mean Lynne Cheney is not trained as an historian…People coming to us and telling us \textit{what history ought to be}. At the time, what occurred to us was would they really go tell doctors what prescriptions to give and what procedures to follow? Or in the recent Terri Schiavo case,\textsuperscript{31} I guess that is what they are prepared to do, they know better than the doctors. It seems to be no area of professional training and expertise which is immune to this kind of intervention, we were, I guess, amongst the first….\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

To acknowledge that the development of the history standards was devoid of politics as compared to their controversial aftermath was the perspective, albeit altruistic, of Ravitch:

\begin{quote}
The development of the national standards was a non-political, non-ideological issue. My vision for history in the nation’s schools includes strengthening the field of history and building a valid consensus, inclusive of organizations like NCSS to create the standards.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{30}Nash et al., \textit{History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past}, 200.

\textsuperscript{31}Terri Schiavo was a 2003 much celebrated right-to-life case in which the U.S. courts intervened to end her life over the objections of her parents and family who wanted her to remain on life support systems while she was in a coma. The case was prominent in the press and legal circles on the issue of euthanasia.

\textsuperscript{32}Theodore K. Rabb, interview by author, tape recording, Princeton University, NJ, 28 April 2005.

\textsuperscript{33}Bicouvaris, “Building a Consensus for the Development of National Standards in History,” 139.
In analyzing the power struggle that was to ensue, Symcox draws a parallel to the French philosopher Foucault and his theory of a knowledge/power nexus operating through the press:

Cheney, with her position as ex-chair of the NEH, and with direct access to a mainstream newspaper, the *Wall Street Journal*, not only set the terms of the debate, but dictated the script that others would follow. Her framing discourse focused on the teaching examples, rather than the actual standards, and these consequently become the storm center of the debate. It would have been difficult to create the impression of multicultural excess by focusing on the actual standards, instead Cheney, and the other critics who followed her strategy, targeted a small handful, (perhaps twenty-five) of the classroom activities, here the critics misunderstood, or in many cases, misrepresented, the purpose of the teaching examples.

Foucault asserts that power is strategic and war-like and knowledge appears to be profoundly linked to a whole series of power effects. This chain of thought can be extended to two applications in the political controversy concerning the standards: 1.) that the attack on the history standards was but a part of a larger political agenda as espoused by Nash, Crabtree and Dunn and that the controversy served the function as an opportunistic catalyst to set that agenda in motion; and 2.) the ownership of “official knowledge” engaged both sides into a “culture war” that evolved into a power struggle over the supremacy of one’s principles, ideology and belief systems. To further explain the frame of reference of both sides of the power struggle, the authors Timothy Kelly, Kevin Meuwissen and Bruce Vansledright explain:

To the framers, the *Standards* were the product of a best-possible collaboration of K-12 educators, curriculum specialists, expert historians, and other academicians and interest groups concerned with history.

---


teaching. To critics, they were an attempt to revise/or reduce the narratives and collective memories that were traditionally central to the history curriculum. This debate spilled from more insular academic and political communities into public discourse...36

The element of politics has a dynamic effect on the ramifications of a “culture war,” in this case a very public showdown of cultural relativism vs. the tenets of a liberal education. This dynamic was evidenced in Rabb’s response to the release of the standards:

I was very saddened that it became a political football there were reasonable and legitimate issues to have differences over, as I say, Paul Gagnon’s piece in The Atlantic. I didn’t agree with him, but it raised issues in which he felt what should have been done or could have been done, or could have been done differently, which is fine....and many different purposes people think that history ought to serve and that has consequences for instruction and what history ought to be about. All of those responses I think one could have dealt with in a classic fashion, you talk these things through and try to achieve some kind of consensus. Some people will never be quite happy, but once it becomes a political response, and then it becomes an either/or situation, then all rational thought, all academic discourse really comes to an end, and it was just very sad to see that happen to the history standards.37

The allegation that the motivation behind the controversy of the history standards was only but a component of a larger well-organized political attack that had been recognized by Nash, Crabtree, Dunn, Symcox, Rabb and others found resonance with defenders outside the realm of academia, professional organizations and special interest groups. The media was to become yet another stakeholder in the controversy as a conduit of political criticism. In an article, “Eating Her Offspring”, that appeared in the New


York Times, Frank Rich tried to put the controversy in perspective as part of a bigger picture:

Did Mrs. Cheney turn against the Standards and the NEH because both have changed so radically since the ’92 election, or simply because she will stop at nothing to be a major player in the Gingrich order? The evidence suggests she has deliberately caricatured her own former pet project (the Standards) as P.C. hell-incarnate so it can be wielded as a Mapplethorpe-like symbol to destroy the agency she so recently championed….. as Mrs. Cheney distorted the Standards, so she also may have distorted the chronology of how her once beloved project ‘went wrong’, according to three sources who worked on it, a 100 page draft of the opening section was available to Mrs. Cheney when she was still at the NEH and still singing the standards praises. The draft contained some of the same elements----the treatment of the Constitution, for instance, that Cheney so strenuously denounces now.38

The explanation that Cheney gave about her awareness of the history standards and her involvement in the NHSP was documented by Symcox:

Cheney, whose passion for history was well-known, admitted that she never read a version of the standards until someone called it to her attention in late summer or fall of 1994. Cheney claimed that she never kept close tabs on the project while she headed the NEH. ‘Typically’, she said, ‘the chairman does not see projects until after they are completed.’ As for letters she wrote in praise of the project’s progress, Cheney later said that ‘she did not recall writing any such letters.’ ‘People wrote letters for me that I sometimes signed because they were an important part of the grant-writing process.’39

39 Symcox, Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms, 144-145.
The Role of the Media and Political Influence

Nash recalled how he found out about the controversy that was about to unfold:

I got a call in the middle of the night when Lynne Cheney’s piece (October 20, 1994) appeared in the Wall Street Journal. To say I was shocked was an understatement. I had no idea what we were in store for....

Jon Weiner in his article in The New Republic, gives great detail to what Nash, Crabtree and Dunn refer to as the right-wing assault beginning with Cheney and the dramatic radio and television antics of Rush Limbaugh. In front of the television camera Limbaugh tore pages out of a United States history textbook declaring George Washington was gone from our national history and that the history standards “should be flushed down the toilet.” Cheney and Limbaugh, the standard-bearers and cultural warriors of conservatism catapulted the national history standards and the political controversy into mainstream journalism with a crusade that eventually led to the floor of the United States Senate on January 18, 1995. The media exposure spanned from the morning to the evening news on radio and television:

Adversarial debates at least gave each side to present its views. For weeks, Nash and Cheney duked it out in TV and radio. In one twenty-four hour period, beginning on October 26, they went at each other on PBS’s McNeill-Lehrer Report, ABC’s Peter Jennings’ World News Tonight, the Pat Buchanan radio show, and Bryant Gumbel’s Today show. Over the next few weeks, Cheney debated other historians such as Joyce Appleby, 1997 president of the American Historical Association, Alan Brinkley, an American historian at Columbia, and Eric Foner, who had just finished a term as president of the Organizations of American Historians.

---

40 Gary B. Nash, interview by author, tape recording, Bunche Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, 19 April 2004.


42 Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 193.
Nash reflected that the publicity that was brought by the media attention was:

the best advertising we ever received,\(^{43}\) everybody was contacting the
NCHS to order the standards, to see what the controversy was all about.\(^{44}\)

There were two issues that were prominent on the conservative agenda. The first
was the intent of the NHSP and the expenditures allocated for the history standards
project. Two days after the actual October 26, 1994 release of the history standards, the
Washington Times featured an article criticizing the history standards and stating that the
NHSP had wasted $2.2 million of the taxpayers’ money.\(^{45}\) Cheney came to also name the
NHSP history standards as the “UCLA standards” in yet another article and villainized
the participants as left-wing radicals that dishonestly re-wrote history. To sum up this
rationale, Nash’s summary of Cheney’s philosophy of ownership was, “I paid for x and
they came out y.”\(^{46}\)

The second issue was the vortex of the controversy, which Dunn refers to as “the
numbers game” or “sins of omission.”\(^{47}\) The actual history standards became a flashpoint
because critics actually counted how many times individuals, events or concepts
appeared. The purpose of the teaching examples, as pointed out in the November 15,

\(^{43}\)Nash further commented in the interview that in the fall of 1994 over 30,000 copies of the
history standards were sold in a few months.

\(^{44}\)Gary B. Nash, interview by author, tape recording, Bunche Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, 19

\(^{45}\)Symcox, Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms, 128.

\(^{46}\)Gary B. Nash, interview by author, tape recording, Bunche Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, 19
April 2004.

1995 *Education Week* article, was that the exemplars were written by teachers to engage students in critical thinking skills through the utilization of a variety of strategies. The critics misrepresented the standards and teaching examples by inferring that because certain individuals or events were not mentioned, that they would never be taught in the classrooms.

Cheney in her the “End of History” article charged:

Harriet Tubman, the African American who led slaves to freedom before the Civil War is mentioned six times when George Washington makes only a fleeting appearance and Thomas Edison gets ignored altogether. The word ‘Constitution’ does not appear in any of the thirty-one overarching statements about American history.48

In retrospect, to counter the attack of the history standards concerning the “Father of Our Country”, George Washington, Nash articulated:

If George Washington had read the attacks on the National History Standards, launched even before they were published in book form, he would have thought the standards had been written by Thomas Paine and Charles Lee, two of his fiery contemporary detractors. But steady and conscionable, Washington had the habit of reading carefully the work of adversaries before attacking them. If he had read the National History Standards, he would have been furious with the apparently deliberate distortions of Lynne Cheney, Rush Limbaugh, Slade Gorton and others who leaped into the ‘Great History War of 1994-95.’49

Nash further cautioned about the misrepresentation that was intentionally presented to the media:

If newspapers readers and TV watchers believed Cheney, Limbaugh, and Gorton’s description of the National History Standards, they would have


concluded that the authors of the books, teachers and academic historians from across the country, had taken a leave of their senses, or joined CIA defectors working for an alien government. Equally senseless must have been the thirty national organizations involved in reviewing multiple drafts of the history standards, making recommendations for revisions and satisfying themselves that they were ready for dissemination for voluntary use in the schools. And downright stupid must have been the thirty members of the National Council for History Standards, which included the presidents of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Council for History Education, the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, and the Council of State Social Studies Specialists (NCSS), that approved the United States history Standards in May 1994.50

The misrepresentation was that just because individuals, events or concepts were not stated per se in the standards but were stipulated in the teaching exemplars meant that these topics would be replaced in the curriculum. The criticism evolved over a ten month continuum from Cheney’s first article to the censure of the history standards in the Senate. Most of the critics of the national history standards had not even read the entire editions of the history standards, nor contacted the NCHS for copies for clarification.

Bain, as part of the Council for Basic Education (CBE) committee that reviewed the revised history standards after the Senate censure recalled:

The bulk of the problem was in what we call the exemplars, (teaching examples) and it was very clear to the Council for Basic Education that those teaching examples to accompany the standards were skewed in one direction. In part, I am pretty confident the reason they were skewed is because when the standards were constructed they had all these teachers together. And as teachers do, when they get together they talk about how they teach things. And so I think that Ross (Dunn) and Gary (Nash) decided to collect these ways to teach the standards.

Almost without fail, people talk about the unusual things that they would include. That very rarely could I remember teachers talking about the best

50Ibid.
lesson they had about teaching George Washington. On the other hand, a conversation about how they are going to teach about Crispus Attucks or how they are going to teach about Harriet Tubman or what documents they found, those things might surface more frequently. So, I think what ended up happening was they simply collected those.

Unlike the standards, which were vetted very carefully, and there was a set of rubrics through which they filtered those standards, the exemplars were not vetted, were not filtered. They didn’t and weren’t held up to any criterion or credentials. That was for the standards, a fatal flaw because had they not done that, had they vetted them; number one, there would have been balance number two, had they not included them, or included them as a second document, they wouldn’t have confused the standards with the teaching examples.

When the criticism emerged by counting the number of times names were mentioned and it was the exemplars. So, that it was never quite clear they ways in which those things played out. So, one of the big recommendations the Council of Basic Education made was to simply cut out the exemplars. Keep the standards as separate, it will also not raise the confusion of national standards vs. national curriculum. I think actually that went a long way to differentiating and diffusing the controversy.  

Bain’s keen insights as to the confusion of the exemplars as being standards was not only the crux of the controversy, but the criticism also entailed what standards and exemplars if any were to be included in the document. These points were to become the major recommendations for revisions to the NHSP committees.

There was a great deal of discourse among historians about the context of the controversy as recounted by Robert V. Remini, who was later to become the Official Historian of the House of Representatives under the George W. Bush administration:

I became aware of the controversy when Lynne Cheney, who was the chairperson of the NEH, came out and blasted the standards because they didn’t include Daniel Webster and enough discussion of the Constitution and gave too much attention to social history and people like Calamity Jane [for example], and that got the people up in arms thinking that this

---

was a ‘new wave’ of teaching history, teaching kids the history of nothing at all.

Instead of teaching them how this country came to be, why it is such a great country, how it operates… it’s amazing how so many people don’t know how Congress operates, and so she immediately called into account the people who were responsible. They were trying to say that they were not trying to deny the importance of things like the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and people like Webster and such. Gary Nash is a very respected historian, and anything he puts his hand to, I would tend to respect.52

The first Wall Street Journal article by Cheney opened a floodgate of media attention that further entrenched the rhetoric of righteousness and promulgated a positioning of conservative and liberal stances. To further support Cheney’s accusations was a follow-up in the November 8, 1994 Wall Street Journal with letters to the editor headlined “The History Thieves.”53 Although the editorial letters offered no specific examples, the rhetoric was accusatory that the history standards were anti-American and a threat to our democratic ideals and national identity as evidenced by these excerpts:

The standards writers had taken a page out of the book that was developed in the Councils of the Bolshevik and Nazi parties and successfully deployed in the on the youth of the Third Reich and Soviet Empire (Balint Vazsonyi, Senior Fellow of the Potomac Foundation). Now, thanks to Mrs. Cheney’s revelations, we learn that their standards are nothing more than a cynical play to indoctrinate children with their own hatred of America; to steal the American birthright from the children of our country; to teach our children to feel guilt over their own heritage (Kim Weissman).

Kudos to the clever crafters of the National Standards for United States History, from the tone of Mrs. Cheney’s editorial I assume that these guardians of political correctness made little or no mention of the Declaration of Independence…..

52Robert V. Remini, interview by author, tape recording, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, 8 April 2005.

53Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 192.
I am alarmed by a vision of a land filled with the Sierra’s equivalent of the “Hitler Youth” (J.D. Dampman).\(^{54}\)

There was no mistaking that the history standards controversy evoked a “culture war.” Nash and colleagues commented on the access to the media Cheney had:

As the first wave of criticisms blanketed the nation’s newspapers and magazines, most Americans keeping up with current events might easily have concluded that what critics dubbed the “UCLA standards” were equivalent to the treason texts of the 1920’s and 1930’s. For citizens who might have missed the press barrage, *Reader’s Digest* reprinted Lynne Cheney’s article in the January 1995 issue, which arrived in millions of American homes before Christmas 1994.\(^{55}\)

What Nash, Crabtree and Dunn termed the “right-wing assault,” not only did it attack the semantics and syntax of the history standards, but also the pedagogy in the classroom. Charles Krauthammer in his November 4, 1994 *Washington Post* article, “History Hijacked” admonished the “hands-on” and other student-centered approaches to the teaching of history.

The whole document strains to promote the achievement of minorities, while straining equally to degrade the achievements and highlight the flaws of the white males who ran the country for the first two centuries. But even more corrosive than the ethnic cheerleading is the denigration of learning itself. Nash wants to have mock trials, to stage debates, to get kids even writing history themselves….but how can they discuss anything without first having mastered dates, facts, places and events.\(^{56}\)

The history standards were also criticized in the media because of their supposed tone of negativity and omnipresent theme of oppression and that they contained racial

---

\(^{54}\) Ibid., 192-193.
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\(^{56}\) Ibid., 190-191.
undertones. Conservative columnist John Leo in a November 14, 1994 *U.S. News and World Report* article noted:

> By the allocation of the text, America today seems to be about 65 percent Indian (American) with most of the rest of us black, female or oppressive.57

The media coverage in print, radio and television did not come without repercussions and it was apparent to Nash and other historians and participants of the NHSP that a public relations campaign had to be launched to counter the allegations of the conservatives.

After Oliver North and G. Gordon Liddy lambasted the ‘standards from hell’ on their radio shows, the DOE informed Nash that its switchboards were flooded with calls from people angrily asking, ‘why are the Feds telling our schools that our kids can’t learn about George Washington anymore?’58

Ravitch notes that although criticism of the history standards appeared in mainstream publications such as *Time,* noting that the document was “so insistent on resurrecting neglected voices that it was guilty of disproportionate revisionism”, other print media came to support the national history standards. The national history standards were endorsed by the leading newspapers of *The New York Times,* the *San Francisco Chronicle,* the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and the *Los Angeles Times.*59

Prominent historians that were not involved in the NHSP were divided in their opinions about the national history standards. John Patrick Diggins, a conservative

---
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historian, of the City University of New York, (CUNY) disagreed with the standards because they misled students by concentrating on social issues and neglected the nature of powering history. Diggins criticized the standards because he espoused in his assessment of differentiating the fundamental characteristics of the West and “non-west” as the West having the cultural attributes of: “liberty and democracy,” “science and technology” and “work and productivity” and the non-West (the majority of the world’s population) as representing “patriarchy and hierarchy,” “sorcery and totems” and “hunting and gathering.”

Another critic, Sheldon M. Stern, historian at the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston, found fault with the United States history standards as having an ideology of “presentism”:

Many critics of the proposed national United States history standards have stressed examples of apparent political motivation in the selection of material. But the most serious flaw in the standards goes much deeper than a weakness for ideological trends of the movement---it is the failure to employ or encourage a sense of history. Their presentism, their timidity telling the whole story, their underestimation of the students’ minds, reveals a failure to grapple with what American students really need to know and what they are capable of understanding.

Students taught by these standards alone are likely to develop a smug, superior and self-righteous attitude toward people and conflicts of the past...as for the preparation of citizens, the standards are particularly superficial and judgmental in evaluating political history.

---
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Ravitch notes that Walter A. McDougall of the University of Pennsylvania concluded that the standards wrongly represented the nation’s history as a struggle of minorities and women against white males.

If Europeans braved the unknown to discover a New World, it was to kill and to oppress. If colonists carved out a new nation out of the woods, it was to displace Native Americans and impose private property. The only embarrassment to liberal academics was that their quiet conquest of America’s school rooms had been revealed by the controversy.  

The very idea that the proposed history standards would be utilized in public school classrooms brought opposition from conservatives and Christian fundamentalists. Even though the history standards were voluntary and secular in nature, the elements of religion and family values were concerns for conservatives. Phyllis Schlafly in radio broadcast and in her monthly newsletter, *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*, published by the Eagle Trust Fund, tore apart the history standards in her article, “How the Liberals Are Rewriting History”:

> The whole idea of the Federal Government writing or financing public school curricula is an elitist, totalitarian notion that should be unacceptable in America. The leftwing revisionist *National History Standards* are permeated hostility to Western/Christian civilization, multicultural items that have little or no importance in American history and a radical, feminist, ideology based on victimology.  

One of the most influential groups was the Christian Coalition headed by televangelist Pat Robertson and his executive director Ralph Reed. Nash and colleagues purport that in exchange for their support, Republican candidates would reciprocate by backing their education agenda.


64Nash et al., *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 218-219.
The coalition called for abolishing the NEH and NEFA and converting these agencies into voluntary organizations, funded through private contributions. Also on the agenda was to abolish the DOE and transferring its funding to families and local school boards, repealing Goals 2000, and enacting school-choice legislation through a tax-supported plan extending parental choice equally to public, private and religious schools.65

The national history standards were thrust into a political controversy in both legislative bodies of Congress. The Contract With America (1994) designed by Representative Newt Gingrich, a former history professor, and Representative Dick Armey, was a strategic anti-Clinton attack to regain both houses based on a moral vision. Nash and colleagues contend that the Christian Coalition’s assertion that the passage of the Goals 2000 Program was an “extraordinary usurpation of American tradition of local control of education.” Gingrich and Armey planned a vote in the first one hundred days of the 104th Congress for a Family Reinforcement Act.66 Although the act proposed to:

strenthen the rights of parents in their children’s education including their rights to protect children against education programs that undermine the values taught in the home.67

The Family Reinforcement Act was part of a larger Republican agenda to return funding back to the states, strengthen local determination and control and to un-do much of the Clinton legislation.68

65Ibid., 219.

66“Christian Coalition Presents the Contract with the American Family”, http://www.cc.org/publications/ca/speech/contract.html; also cited by Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 219; Symcox, Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms, 156.
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To counter the conservative media blitz that was initiated by Cheney in late October 1994, Nash met with Charles Quigley, director of the Center for Civic Education and head of the project to develop the National Civic Standards. The civic standards were developed at the same time as the history standards but were a separate project and were to be presented to the Secretary of Education in mid-November. The purpose of the meeting was to strategize because realistically, if the history standards were jeopardized by the ultra conservative educational climate, so might the civics, geography, science and the arts standards. Quigley and Nash also met with three public relations specialist from the DOE on November 16, 2004.\textsuperscript{69}

The timing of the release of the history standards coming under scrutiny could not have come at a worse time.

The election of 1994, when the Republicans took control of the Senate and captured the House for the first time in forty years, Newt Gingrich was going to be Speaker of the House and Republicans would enjoy a majority on all House committees, what was not clear was the degree to which the conservatives’ agenda to halt the national standards movement and repeal Goals 2000 would move forward.\textsuperscript{70}

Quigley and Nash began a lobbying campaign to counteract the smear campaign against the history standards meeting with prestigious groups such as The National Trust for Historic Preservation, representatives from the NEH, DOE, Republican and Democratic House Education and Labor Committees, the Senate Education, Arts and Humanities subcommittees. Nash subsequently had drafted a letter to Congress members promising that the National Standards for History would be published as a “basic

\textsuperscript{69}Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 195.

\textsuperscript{70}Ibid.
"edition" omitting the teaching examples. The letter was never distributed and decision had been made by Senate advisers to do so after the Christmas intercession.\textsuperscript{71}

The most critical meeting in Washington D.C. before the senate censure was January 12, 1995 at the Brookings Institution. Attendees were the key developers of the history standards, Nash, Dunn, Joyce Appleby and Daniel Woodruff. Invited critics were Shanker, Ravitch Wattenberg (AFT), Elizabeth Fox Genovese and Gilbert Sewall from the NCHFS and historian Joy Hakim. Others included observers from the DOE, NEH, staffers from the House and Senate, Christopher Cross, president of the CBE, a reporter from \textit{Education Week}, the education director of Pew Charitable Trust and John Fonte.\textsuperscript{72}

In addition to the teaching examples, Criterion 1 was attacked, precisely, “the passive absorption of facts, dates and names” by Shanker which had previously been reviewed without criticism by the AFT, task forces and committees. Other objections ranged from the inclusion of the Bantu migrations being in the world history standards to Fonte’s accusation that the standard writers wished to divide the country into warring ethnic and racial groups.\textsuperscript{73}

Despite the criticism, Nash was committed in his determination:

I had to defend the criteria and there was no way they would be sabotaged or compromised.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{71}Ibid., 228.

\textsuperscript{72}Ibid., 229. Symcox also notes that this was the very recommendation that the CBE would later advise, post- controversy, 154.

\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., 230. Symcox also cites Shanker’s concern of the standards being uncritical of non-Western civilizations, 124.

\textsuperscript{74}Gary B. Nash, interview by author, tape recording, Bunche Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, 19 April 2004.
It should be noted that Fonte was not invited to this meeting that Cheney had declined; in essence Fonte was the ex officio emissary for Cheney. Fonte had been a former speech writer for Senator Gorton and Nash maintains he had assisted Gorton once again for the censure speech delivered in the Senate. Directly after the Brookings Institution meeting a press conference was held that was supposed to be impromptu; however, it was noticed that Fonte had read a prepared statement that had mocked the consensus building. It was very apparent that Fonte was the “front man” for Cheney.

On January 18, 1995 Republican Senator Slade Gorton (R) of Washington introduced a secondary amendment to the Unfunded Mandates Bill, part of the Republican’s Contract with America, which was tactic to attach a rider to a major bill to assure passage. Democrats could vote for the resolution then go back to deliberations on the unfunded mandate reforms.

Nash and colleagues purported that the speech delivered on the floor of the Senate was strikingly similar to the previous remarks of both Cheney and Fonte:

what is a more important part of our Nation’s history for our children to study—George Washington or Bart Simpson? Is it more important that

75 Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 231.
76 Ross E. Dunn, interview by author, tape recording, San Diego, CA, 16 April 2004.
77 Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 232.
78 In the teaching exemplar on the influence of the media on contemporary American culture, the exemplar reads “Analyze the reflection of values in such popular TV shows as “Murphy Brown”, “Roseanne”, “Married with Children” and the “Simpsons”. Compare the depiction of values to those expressed in shows like “Ozzie and Harriet”, “The Honeymooners”, “Father Knows Best”, “My Three Sons”, “All in the Family” and “The Bill Cosby Show.” National Standards for United States History,” 1996, 245.
they learn about Roseanne Arnold or how America defeated Communism as a leader in the free world….

According to the document the answers are not would Americans would expect. With this set of standards, our students will not be expected to know George Washington from the man in the Moon according to this set of standards, American democracy rests on the same moral footing as the Soviet Union’s totalitarian dictatorship.\footnote{Congressional Record, 18 January 1995, S1026.}

The Senate passed by a vote of 99-1 the following resolution:

The NEGP and NESIC should not approve or certify the standards developed by the NCHS, that future guidelines for history should not be based on standards developed primarily by the NCHS prior to February 1, 1995 and that any new project supported by federal funds should show a decent respect for the contributions of western civilization.\footnote{Nash et al., History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past, 235.}

The lone dissenter was Senator Bennett Johnston (D) of Louisiana who did not vote because he supported the standards, but rather because of his intense objection to them. Although Gorton did not get his original stipulation barring federal funds to the NCHS, it blocked the NESIC, the authorized body to certify all national standards from adopting the history standards as is. The way the censure took place was also significant:

To well-informed observers in the Senate gallery, it was obvious the action had been hasty and purely procedural. The Senate held no hearings on the history standards; the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities had taken no action; and not one of the teachers and scholars who had produced the guidelines had been consulted. It was also apparent that most of the senators voted on the resolution without ever having seen the standards in order to move the debate back to the unfunded mandates bill that was on the floor.\footnote{Ibid.}
Unlike the history standards, the civic standards did not have any public criticism or political attacks. Sandra Stotsky in her research at the Harvard Graduate School of Education found:

Unlike the proposed standards for United States and World History, which have been severely criticized by numerous scholars and national figures, and in an unprecedented spectacle, denounced by an almost unanimous vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the proposed national standards for civics and government have met with nothing but praise from newspaper editorial writers, scholars, political commentators, public officials and other national leaders since they were issued at a press conference hosted by former Chief Justice Warren E. Burger at the U.S. Supreme Court.

At a time when there are multiple points of view about almost anything relating to the cultural content of the school curriculum, it is refreshing that we seem to have found common ground on at least one major document about what we stand for as a nation. The document has clearly struck a broad range of readers as academically sound, comprehensive and non-partisan.

Two central groups of standards, those that might have occasioned a reaction and perhaps still may, describe what the authors see as distinctly American values, principles and beliefs, and how these are embedded in the Constitution. However much is slighted in the U.S. history standards, the Constitution is clearly the centerpiece of this document.82

The reaction at NCHS that the history standards were censured in a national spotlight brought disbelief and a realization of the capabilities of power in Washington, D.C.:

It was a reality check for all of us about how politics can interfere with education. Despite all the angry communications we received, there was a huge outpouring of support from educators, historians and individuals across the United States and other countries who understood what really happened in Washington.83

---
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In order to rescue the history standards if they were to be a part of the national standards movement, and independent review panel had to be established to diffuse the political controversy. Robert Schwartz, of the Pew Charitable Trusts, approached the Ford Foundation, John D. Rockefeller and Catherine T. Mac Arthur Foundation and the Spencer Foundation to be co-funders of a commission under the aegis of the Council for Basic Education to oversee a revision of the history standards. In June of 1995, the CBE under the direction of Christopher Cross convened two panels, one in United States history and another in world history.\textsuperscript{84}

It should be noted that the CBE and Mac Arthur Foundation were also connected with Chicago Teachers Union/Chicago Public Schools \textit{Transformation for Learning Outcomes Project} making the Chicago Public Schools to be the first urban district in the country to develop and adopt learning standards in the core disciplines including those in history and social sciences. Support also included monies and professional development to the CTU for the training of CPS teachers.

It was the intent of the CBE not to drastically overhaul the criteria and standards, but to provide recommendations for revisions. The ultimatum was that the CBE would work closely with the NCHS and produce a basic edition to replace the first edition devoid of the teaching examples along with some minor changes. What was similar to Rugg’s books being taken out of mainstream circulation was this parallel:

The NCHS assured the CBE commission that it would not reprint the first edition because the new book superseded it. But Nash and his associates rejected the ‘defective Corvair’ theory that the first editions of U.S. and world history standards be ‘recalled’ or withheld from teachers, librarians

\textsuperscript{84}Nash et al., \textit{History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past}, 254.
or any citizens who wanted them. If anything, these books had become an important artifact of American history and a collector’s item.\textsuperscript{85}

On October 11, 1995, the CBE released the panel’s report, \textit{History in the Making: An Independent Review of the Voluntary National History Standards}. The NCHS worked collaboratively to revise both sets of history standards. On April 3, 1996, the NCHS released the revised edition of the \textit{National Standards for History}. Symcox analyzed that the political climate had changed dramatically:

This time the Center was in control of when and how news about the standards would be released: it was able to marshal advance support in the press and to release the standards preemptively before the hostile pundits could attack them. By careful planning with UCLA’s public relations department, the Center was able to control the initial spin on the revised book.

The 104\textsuperscript{th} Congress did not think it opportune to renew their attack and had discredited itself. It failed to pass its beloved ‘\textit{Contract with America},’ its leader Newt Gingrich had been accused of verbal excesses and financial irregularities and it had closed down the federal government in January 1996 because it failed to approve the federal budget in time for the new year.\textsuperscript{86}

Even the critics turned a page for reform, with both Ravitch and Schlesinger Jr., co-authoring an article in the \textit{Wall Street Journal} calling for continued reform to coincide with the UCLA press releases.

One of the strongest sentiments that was stirred by the intervention of government to censure the history standards was the imperative of academic freedom.

Although professional organizations situate the imperative of academic freedom as a bedrock of democracy, it shares a contested history along with other civil liberties. Indeed, criticisms of universities and schools as

\textsuperscript{85}Ibid.
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repositories of academic freedom and dissent according to Giroux have a long and inglorious history in the United States, most notably during the infamous McCarthy era that stretches back to attacks of the religious fundamentalists of the 19th century.  

One of the most vociferous professional organizations to defend academic freedom is the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), a participant of the NHSP. NCSS has a history of advocacy for academic freedom issuing position statements in 1969 and revised in 2007 that endorsed the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. NCSS defines academic freedom in their position statement as:

A teacher’s academic freedom is his/her right and responsibility to study, investigate, present, interpret, and discuss all the relevant facts and ideas in the field of his/her professional competence. This freedom implies no limitations other than those imposed by generally accepted standards of scholarship. As a professional, the teacher strives to maintain a spirit of free inquiry, open-mindedness, and impartiality in the classroom. As a member of an academic community, however, the teacher is free to present in the field of his or her professional competence his/her own opinions or convictions and with them the premises from which they are derived.

The historian Eric Foner cautioned that the censure by the Senate would impede the spirit of academic freedom in his February 13, 1995 article in the New York Times:

An ominous precedent—the Senate manipulating federal funds to promote an official interpretation of American history. This kind of thing used to happen regularly with other countries, but until recently was held to be inappropriate for a society that values freedom of thought….I find it hard to understand why conservatives like Mrs. Cheney, who favor a radical

---
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reduction in the Federal government’s powers are not disturbed by this governmental attempt to dictate how scholars and teacher’s ought to interpret the nation’s past.\textsuperscript{90}

On March 1, 1995, Sandi Cooper, Chair of the Faculty Senate at CUNY echoed this ethos in her critique of the Senate resolution to New York Senator Daniel Moynihan:

\begin{quote}
I am afraid you have been hornswoggled, cut off at the pass and taken for a ride, sir. You and your senatorial colleagues, those of you that bothered reading and thinking, that is—really have better things to do than collectively threaten academic freedom; imply that there is one politically-correct view of the past: and promise to defend the National Council as well as NEH because of some alleged left wing cast to modern social science scholarship that the triumphalists require, without the Soviet Union as their favorite demon. Having just learned of the excellent resolution voted by the University Faculty Senate of the State University of New York, I shall persuade the university senate of CUNY to endorse the initiative of our upstate colleagues.\textsuperscript{91}
\end{quote}

If there was one lesson that was to come out of the political controversy of the national history standards was the determination of classroom teachers and academia to embrace and exercise their right to academic freedom in the classroom, unlike some of their predecessors that had to submit to loyalty oaths and dismissals.
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CHAPTER FOUR

THE IMPACT OF HISTORY STANDARDS, LEGISLATION AND POLICIES

History, by apprizing them of the past, will enable them to judge of the future.
--Thomas Jefferson, Notes on Virginia, 1784

The purpose of Chapter Four is to analyze the influence and to examine the local curricular applications of the National Standards for History with the development of history standards and supporting teaching materials for both the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). In order to understand the impact and influence of the National Standards for History at the state and local levels, legislation, policies and directives must be delineated that enabled the drafting, adoption and implementation of history standards for Illinois public elementary and secondary school districts, teachers and students.

The researcher, as a “participant-observer” of both the ISBE standards and subsequent standards-related committees, CPS/CTU Framework for Transforming Teaching and Learning and chair of the CPS social science standards CAS committee, has ascertained that there are three major premises that are paramount in comprehending the development of history standards the local level: 1) that the development of local history and social science standards was part of a greater national movement for standards-based education; 2) that the history and social science standards and teacher support materials were drafted by ISBE and CPS concomitantly in stages often overlapping each other (refer to Illustrations 7 and 8) that although Illinois has over 873 public
school districts under the jurisdiction of the Illinois State Board of Education, the largest school district being the Chicago Public Schools, District #299, has a very complex and intriguing political relationship with both ISBE and the General Assembly in Springfield, Illinois.

This political climate fluctuates from autonomy, to mandated court decrees on compliance issues with interplay between downstate sovereignty and the third largest school district in the nation run by the mayor of Chicago. The most prominent display of this autonomy of CPS was the development of the Chicago Academic Standards (CAS) (1996) in the core academic areas that preceded the mandated Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) in all public school districts which were adopted by the Illinois General Assembly in July of 1997. This educational policy resulted in Chicago Public Schools teachers designing and implementing instruction addressing a dual-system of standards until the CAS were eventually rescinded on September 24, 2003 with the CPS Board of Education Policy 03-0924-PO02 (refer to Appendix C).

Currently, there is a hierarchy of standards-based instruction and educational policies that stratify the accountability measures in public schools linking standards to assessments (refer to Illustration 6). These measures have been promulgated with federal, state and local initiatives that follow a path from the top at the national level with the voluntary national history standards that eventually leads to the local level with history practitioners in the classroom and everyday instruction. This hierarchy will be detailed in length later in the chapter with a thorough explanation of Illustration 6.
In providing a rationale for the impact of the standards movement, the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL), a non-profit organization that has gathered educational research for over forty years, has compiled a definitive compendium of resources on standards from states in all core disciplines to meet the challenges of NCLB (2001). McREL attributes Ravitch, a major stakeholder of the NHSP, as a principal founder of the movement:

There appears to be three principal reasons advanced for the development of standards: standards serve both to clarify and to raise expectations and standards provide a common set of expectations. Former Assistant Secretary of Education Diane Ravitch is commonly recognized as one of the chief architects of the modern standards movement. In her book, *National Standards in American Education: A Citizen’s Guide* (1995), Ravitch provides a common-sense rationale for the standards: Americans expect strict standards to govern construction of buildings, bridges, highways, and tunnels shoddy work would put levels at risk. They expect stringent standards to protect their drinking water, the food they eat and the air they breathe….Standards are created because the improve the activity of life….Standards can improve achievement by clearly defining what is to be taught and what performance is expected….¹

The reform efforts for the need for contemporary standards in history education that began with the *Nation at Risk* (1983), not only had a national impact, but also created a movement at the state levels. In a 2003 study at Indiana University of history teacher certification across the states, the researchers Sarah Brown and John Patrick, with Patrick also being a member of the NHSP, further noted:

During the last twenty years history educators have noted a sea of change in the concern expressed by scholars, policymakers, and the general public about the teaching and learning of history in the schools. The 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, was a catalyst for this movement with its focused

attention and support for a core curriculum based on academic subjects. Subsequent movements for national goals, national standards, and history-specific testing in that National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP’s) illustrated the influence of *A Nation at Risk* and the growing concern for the inclusion of history in a substantive, strengthened academic core curriculum.²

The importance of *A Nation at Risk* was that it was the first call to the individual state boards of education to develop a cohesive introspection of their state-wide curricula initiatives for academic rigor. This national focus on the ability of American students to compete globally with a strengthened core curriculum including history and the social sciences advocated by the *A Nation at Risk* was later fortified with directives and funding of the *America Goals 2000 Act* under the Clinton administration.

To initially comprehend the myriad and complexity of educational policies concerning standards at the national, state and local levels, there are five strata delineated in the standards-based hierarchy depicted in Illustration 6. The illustration is arranged in a top-down model beginning at the apex with Level I listing the federal initiatives that have been previously chronicled in earlier chapters, that filter down to the various levels impacting state, district and local curricular policies in the classroom. Levels I and II pertain to the ramifications for states, state boards of education and in particular, the implications for ISBE; Levels III, IV and V focus on the local directives of ISBE and CPS in standards-based education for teachers and students.

---
To further associate the inter-relationships of standards, assessments and instruction that will be discussed in this chapter, Levels I through V must be further delineated to demonstrate the educational policies, commissions and reports that ensued:


**Level II** *Illinois Goals in History and the Social Sciences* mandated by the *Illinois School Reform Act* (1985); state assessments in history and the social sciences in Grades 4, 7 and 11, the *Illinois Goals Assessment Programs* (IGAP’s) (1988-1994); *Teacher Content Standards in the Social Sciences* (2000-current); *Illinois Learning Standards* (ILS) (1997); *Illinois Standards Achievement Tests* (ISAT’s) in history and social sciences in Grades 4 and 7 (1997); Prairie State Achievement Examinations (PSAE’s) in Grade 11 in history and the social sciences (1997); *Performance Descriptors* in history and the social sciences (2001); revision of ISBE state teacher certification examinations in history and the social sciences (1996-1998); revocation of student assessments in history and the social sciences (ISAT’s and PSAE’s) by Illinois General Assembly Public Act 094-0875 in school year 2004-2005 (2003); *Illinois Assessment Frameworks* (IAF’s) in the Social Sciences (2007)

**Level III** CPS Framework for Transforming Teaching and Learning in the Social Sciences (1993); *Chicago Academic Standards* (CAS) in history and the social sciences (1996); *Chicago Academic Standards Examinations* (CASE) in history and the social sciences Grades 8, 9-12 (1997-2002); CPS Board Report 03-0924-PO02 rescinding the policy on the CAS and CASE (2003); creation of the CPS secondary course frameworks in U.S. and World History (2004)

**Level IV** CPS Progress Tests in NCLB subjects (reading, writing, mathematics and science only at elementary and secondary levels (2004); *Learning First* elementary examinations in reading and mathematics at elementary
Level V CPS teacher-designed assessments matched to ILS and Illinois Assessment Frameworks (IAF’s) (2007-current); secondary on-site history departmental assessments and Public Law 195 (U.S. and Illinois Constitutions) examinations (current); random sampling of NAEP U.S. History examinations in Grades 4,8 and 12 with systemic administration (current)

The influential path of the NHSP voluntary national history standards as a blueprint for state and local curricula evolved through both legislation and policy directives with ISBE and CPS. The stakeholders developing these curricular initiatives were either directly linked to the NHSP, professional organizations and/or were history practitioners.

**Illinois: A Microcosm of the National Influence on State Initiatives**

The impact of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) was that it served as an impetus to the states to ascertain what mandated initiatives were in place to structure and implement educational policies in the core disciplines. In 1985, as response to this call to action, the Illinois General Assembly enacted the *School Reform Act 105ILCS5/2-3.64*, which mandated by law in the Illinois School Code that state goals be established in the academic core curriculum areas (refer to Appendix B). Currently, the ISBE has thirty state goals in the academic areas, referred to as the Fundamental Learning Areas (FLA’s) or core disciplines, which are considered the “umbrella statements” that broadly encompass the
tenets of each discipline (language arts, mathematics, science, history and the social sciences and the fine arts).

Figure 5. The Influence of National History Standards on Local Curricula
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Figure 6. The Hierarchy of Standards-Based Education
Prior to 1985, each of the Illinois public school districts, including CPS, were autonomous to develop their own curricula because there were no state-mandated directives which addressed a uniform structure, nor were there state assessments linked to a formalized framework. Accountability for mastering the curricula in the core disciplines was left up to the individual districts which administered local assessments and varied from district to district. This variance meant that the academic rigor that *A Nation at Risk* advocated was not only difficult to ascertain state-wide, but also on a national level.

The ISBE state goals were later to become the anchors for the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) that were adopted in July 1997 and, in essence, were the nascent stage of standards-based education in Illinois by providing uniformity in expectations for what students “should know and be able to do.” The focus, content and wordage of the state goals have not changed since their inception, and provided a blueprint for the teaching and learning of history and the social sciences as well as the other disciplines. For example, the current ILS have the state goals utilized as both the organizational headers and as the foundation of the enumeration format (refer to Appendix B) that structures the state framework.

The *ISBE Social Science State Goals 14-18* are the most numerous of the all the disciplines goals, with Goal 16 specifically delineating the teaching and learning of history:

**State Goal 14:** Understand political systems, with an emphasis on the United States.

**State Goal 15:** Understand economic systems, with an emphasis on the United States.
State Goal 16: Understand events, trends, individuals and movements shaping the history of Illinois, the United States and other nations.

State Goal 17: Understand world geography and the effects of geography on society, with an emphasis on the United States.

State Goal 18: Understand social systems, with an emphasis on the United States.

State Goal 16 for history encompasses both United States and world history and later when the accompanying ILS were adopted (1997) it became the most voluminous with verbiage consisting of seven pages with ten historical eras in local, state and United States history and eleven historical eras in world history (refer to Appendix B).

In 1994, in response to the federal initiatives of the Goals 2000, the ISBE funded a multi-year project to develop state standards under the directive of State Superintendent Spagnola. The other states also grappled with the task of developing standards and frameworks tied to accountability measures. The ILS necessitated that that teacher support materials also be developed for districts for state-wide implementation of the standards. The curricula materials are currently found on the ISBE website, www.isbe.net, and these prototypes are referenced in Appendix B. In addition, the development of the support materials will be described chronologically (refer to Illustration 7).

It must be prefaced that the drafting and adoption of the social science ILS (1997) was part of a larger national standards reform movement that was unprecedented in nature, yet concomitantly a unique manifestation of local control designed by Illinois teachers and academia and led by an Illinois NHSP committee member and history practitioner.
One of the most influential pioneers of the standards movement and authentic assessment is Dr. Richard J. Stiggins, interviewee, author, founder and president of the Assessment Training Institute (1992) of Portland, Oregon. Stiggins also became a key stakeholder because he not only served as a consultant to ISBE by providing training for the Standards Aligned Classrooms (SAC) initiative (2002-2004), which is currently not funded due to budget constraints, but he also served as a consultant to the CPS on standards-based education.

One of the caveats of the national standards movement was that the standards would eventually become a national curriculum and states would not have the ability to design and implement their own accountability system and how much these reforms would actually cost. Stiggins provided his insights on the charge that was given to Illinois and the other states with his perspective:

what society has come to realize in the 1990s and the new millennium is that we have to have everyone (the students) meet standards and re-design schools to service that agenda. That evolution has been more important than the act of any single individual or any organization. I am a local control freak, I think asserting a national curriculum these days would not be a good idea, and that in the United States, this is a statement of my values. I think and hope the pendulum swings back to the states (in reference to the 2001 NCLB), that we may have state and local control, but who knows these days. I just can’t imagine a national curriculum in that regard….

---

Figure 7. Illinois State Board of Education Policy Development in the Social Science Standards
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Figure 8. Chicago Public Schools Policy Development in the Social Science Standards
One of the key links to the *National Standards for History* that is evidenced in the ILS history and social science standards are the stakeholders that were involved. Dennis Schillings, member of the NHSP National Council for History Standards (NCHS) oversight committee and 1993-1994 Past-President of NCSS, was appointed to Social Science Team Leader of the project that drafted, revised and adopted the ISBE history and social science standards. His leadership direction was evident inasmuch he was part of the writing and consensus process of the NHSP committee work and was a veteran secondary history practitioner.

Schillings not only had been a “participant-observer” of the NHSP that wrote the original and later revised national history standards in 1996 after the consensus committee work by the CBE was completed, but also was a witness to the controversy. This placed Schillings in the unique position of concomitantly contributing to the national history standards and leading the ILS social science standards project that spanned 1994-1997. Although there were other goals committees (political science, geography, economics and the behavioral social sciences), Schillings also directly led the history committee that was responsible for the ISBE United States history and world history standards.

In addition, the same time the NHSP, which was the official government-sponsored project, was drafting and revising history standards, NCSS had undertaken an independent organizational-funded initiative to develop comprehensive interdisciplinary standards, the *Expectations of Excellence, Curriculum Standards for the Social Studies* (1994). Schillings commented on the endeavor:
NCSS would succeed in providing a coordinated, systematic study
drawing upon such disciplines as anthropology, archeology, economics,
geography, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology,
religion, and sociology as well as appropriate content from the humanities,
mathematics and natural sciences.4

As former Past-President of both NCSS and ICSS, Schillings was part of a
network both at national and state levels across the social science disciplines (history,
political science, geography, economics and the applied behavioral social sciences of
sociology, psychology and anthropology) that were in the loop of the national standards
movement.

For example, Dr. Norman Bettis of Illinois State University was recruited to be on
the ILS geography committee and was also Co-Chair of the National Geography
Standards: Geography for Life (1994) project. Moreover, Schillings had a leadership
track record through various ISBE state superintendents and social science personnel
having worked on a number of assessment committees. The researcher was also a
contributing writer to these assessment committees. Several other members of these
previous teams were also asked to serve on the ILS social science committees. The Social
Science writing teams for the ILS consisted of twenty-eight members that had
representation from ISBE, academia, elementary and secondary teachers that were
geographically representative of various public school districts throughout Illinois,
consultants, administrators and a parent.5

4Dennis Schillings, “President’s Message,” The Social Studies Professional 177
(September/October, 1993): 2.

5The specific team participants breakdown for the ILS Social Sciences were: 1 parent; 5
consultants, 4 elementary teachers, 4 secondary teachers, 6 professors, 1 junior high teacher; 5 ISBE
Another key link to the NHSP Illinois connection was another “participant-observer,” Ann Pictor, ISBE Principal Education Consultant, who was a member of the NHSP Council of State Social Studies Specialists (CSSSS) Focus Group to review the standards and who served as a liaison and resource to the ISBE social science writing teams. It is the contention of the researcher that these crucial associations of NHSP stakeholders and committee members that led the ILS history and social science writing teams was a critical determinant in the drafting, development and eventual adoption of these standards.

The influence of the NHSP on local curricula is (refer to Illustration 5) evidenced in the both the format and verbiage of the ISBE standards. The ISBE standards have not been amended since their adoption in July of 1997, and all subsequent standards support materials are anchored to the phrasing of the these standards. Format similarities are found in the delineation of specific grades or grade levels (benchmarks), the inclusion of the chronological eras (refer to Chapter 2 and Chapter 3; also Appendix B) and the inclusion of critical thinking skills explained as the “Habits of Mind”, all of which were originally in the *California Frameworks* (1988) which were developed with the collaboration of the NCHS at UCLA.

(1994); NCHS at UCLA *Exploring the American Experience, National Standards for United States History, Grades 5-12* (1994); *National Standards in American Education* by Diane Ravitch, Brookings Institution (1995) and Finn and Ravitch, *Education Reform 1994-1995, A Report from the Educational Excellence Network*, Hudson Institute (1995), all of which were all related in some way to the NHSP or the stakeholders of the *National Standards for History*. Other materials were from McREL, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), *Setting Strong Standards* (1995), Albert Shanker’s Address, *Achieving High Standards* to the 1993 AFT Quest Conference, NAEP data and the NCSS *Expectations of Excellence* (1994). It should be noted that there was representation from the AFT#1 from Chicago on the ILS steering teams and focus groups.

The late Dr. Arthur Zilversmit, Distinguished Service Professor of History Emeritus of Lake Forest College in Illinois and member of the ISBE history steering committee, commented on the political nature of the composition and concerns of the writing teams who had representative members that served in the capacity of “consultants”.

In Illinois the politics of school reform involved a number of other issues and several different groups. Among the most important of these was the business community, which provided much of the impetus for the imposition of state standards. The idea of a curriculum that would produce students with a predictable base of knowledge and skills fits a business model of schooling. It would be efficient in producing a relatively uniform product, suitable for a variety of social functions. As David Tyack has shown, this business-efficiency model has been influencing education for most of the 20th century. This business model, however, conflicts with the historic tradition of American education, local control over the curriculum. A second group that played an important role in the standards movement

---

in Illinois was that of representatives of the ‘religious right’ who were concerned with what they perceived as the imposition of values by the schools and undermining of parental authority.7

Before the history and social science standards, as well as the other content areas, were adopted by the Illinois General Assembly, a vetting process was mandated similar to the one the *California Frameworks* and later the NHSP utilized with educators.

The State Board of Education shall establish the academic standards that are to be applicable to pupils who are subject to state tests under this section beginning with the 1998-1999 school year. However, the State Board of Education shall not establish any such standards in final form without first providing opportunities for public participation and local input in the development of the final academic standards. Those opportunities shall include a well-publicized period of public comment, public hearings throughout the State, and opportunities to file written comments.8

Zilversmit provided further insights on the process that was implemented in Illinois before the standards were officially adopted by the General Assembly.

This final draft was sent by the superintendent of public instruction to a 25-member External Standards Review Team, a committee dominated by businessmen. It also included a representative of the Chicago Urban League, two representatives of teachers’ unions, and three representatives of the Christian Coalition and other groups of the religious right.9

Once the ISBE history standards were adopted the dissemination and implementation of the standards was paramount to assist the public school teachers to improve instruction, and also to tie the standards to measures of accountability. In 1997

---


the IGAP’s social science examinations in Grades 4, 7, and 11 were replaced by the ISAT examinations in Grades 4 and 7 and the Prairie State (PSAE) examination in Grade 11.

Mr. Richard Carlson, interviewee, ISBE Social Science Consultant in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction in the Division of Standards, became involved with the ILS in 1998 to develop support materials. Carlson recalled that:

after the national standards were used in the development of the *Illinois Social Science Standards* our job was to get these standards implemented in schools across the state of Illinois. Since that time we added these resources to the website. The indicators (what students should be able to perform) eventually were expanded into performance descriptors which are breakdowns of the skills in the standards. There are 10 stages, from first grade to twelfth, for example, if the student will be able to ‘know the social history of Illinois, the United States and the world,’ it needed to be more specific because the standards are general broad statements (refer to Appendix B for an example of a Stage H ILS performance descriptors).

To make the performance descriptors that were released in 1999 more “teacher friendly,” examples of performance-based assessments or prototypes were developed by classroom teachers and piloted on Illinois public school students. Carlson commented on this process:

teachers from all benchmark grade levels (early elementary, late elementary, middle/junior high school, early high school, late high school (refer to Appendix B to view format) and represented geographically and professors from various colleges and universities, especially Dr. Larry McBride from Illinois State University, who spearheaded the project, worked together. When possible parents, business and community members participated, several levels of review were used just like the national history standards went through….11


11Ibid.
These classroom assessments aligned to the standards in history and the social sciences that were developed are currently listed on the ISBE website.

The next initiative to be undertaken by ISBE was the development of the ISBE Teacher Content Standards that can be viewed at www.isbe.net/profprep. The Content Area Standards for Educators in the core disciplines were first released in 2000, with a second edition following in 2002. In essence, these were performance descriptors for teachers and the history section had eight standards based on competencies of both knowledge and performance indicators for the classroom. There were also 29 common core standards for all social science teachers.

The headers for each history standard begins as “the competent history teacher” then lists the core knowledge and performance expectations aligned to the ISBE learning standards in United States and world history. The ISBE history Teacher Content Area Standards are:

The competent history teacher:
1) understands major trends, key turning points, and the roles of influential individuals and groups in the United States history from the colonial era through the growth of the American Republic; 2) understands major trends, key turning points, and the roles of influential individuals and groups in United States history from the Civil War through World War 1; 3) understands major trends, key turning points, and the role of influential individual and groups in United States history in the twentieth century and beyond; 4) understands major trends, key turning points, and the roles of influential individuals and groups in world history from prehistory to the Age of Exploration; 5) understands major trends, key turning points, and the roles of influential individuals and groups in world history from the Age of Exploration to the present; 6) understands major trends, key turning points, and the roles of influential individuals and groups in the State of Illinois from the colonial era to the present; 7) understands
comparative history; and 8) understands the major interpretations in the field of history.\textsuperscript{12}

The purpose of the teacher content standards was two-fold: 1) to have a framework of accountability for teacher education programs in colleges and universities for pre-service teachers and 2) to link these teacher standards to the ISBE state certification examinations.

The content standards in history and the social sciences were not only measures of accountability for the state certification exams, but also provided expectations for the professionalism of teachers and their competency in the classroom. Brown noted that:

Illinois has developed core content standards for all social science teachers and specific standards designations for six disciplines in this area. The history designation consists of eight standards that refer to content knowledge in United States history, world history and Illinois history. The first six standards address specific time periods about which teachers are expected to be knowledgeable, while standards seven and eight require teachers to be aware of comparative history and historical interpretations. It becomes clear that teachers are expected to be aware of and teach about differing interpretations and research in the discipline.\textsuperscript{13}

Subsequently the state certification examinations in history and the social sciences, as well as other content areas, were revised during the period 2000-2002 to include to both the knowledge and performance indicators. Not all states developed history-specific teacher content standards.

In a 2003 Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Digest Report on State Certification Requirements for History Teachers, the following trend was reported:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12}Content Area Standards for Educators, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Edition, Illinois State Board of Education, 2002, 197-200.
\item \textsuperscript{13}Brown, “History Teacher Certification Standards in the States,” 373.
\end{itemize}
As part of the standards movement nationwide, some states have created content and performance standards for the preparation and certification of teachers. Most states identify these standards as the minimal qualifications teachers are expected to demonstrate upon licensure. While many states have developed general standards for their teachers, a recent survey investigated content and performance standards designed specifically for history, social science, or social studies teachers.\footnote{ED482210 2003-12-00, State Certification Requirements for History Teachers by Sarah Drake Brown, 3.}

The findings of the aforementioned research of Brown and Patrick (2003) are summarized as thus:

Thirty-four states with content standards for teachers have developed history-specific content standards for teachers; nine states use the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards based on the NCSS \textit{Expectations of Excellence} and twelve states refer to their certification requirements in place of standards\footnote{Ibid. Citation from Sarah Drake Brown and John J. Patrick, History Education in the United States: A Survey of Teacher Certification and State-Based Standards and Assessments for Teachers and Students. Paper presented to the Conference on Innovations in Collaboration: A School-University Model to Enhance History Teaching, K-16, Alexandria, VA, June 28, 2003.}

Another implementation initiative of ISBE that included the history and social science standards, as well as the other content areas, was the Standards Aligned Classrooms (SAC) project that spanned the years 2002-2004. The SAC project had intensive professional development to build learning teams in six Illinois regions that utilized the “trainer of trainers” model with SAC coaches. The SAC coaches were trained with authentic assessment materials written by Stiggins and involved teachers and administrators to design instruction for students. Lesson plans and authentic assessments aligned to the history and social science standards were designed by trained teachers and
placed on the ISBE website. It was heralded as a ground-breaking program to counteract the AYP challenges of NCLB:

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), passed by Congress in 2001, is one of the federal government’s most sweeping changes to education in a generation. While the intentions of NCLB are well meaning, school systems throughout Illinois are left on their own to find the resources needed to meet the rigorous standards of NCLB by earning passing grades on the ISAT’s.\(^{16}\)

Stiggins recalled his involvement in the SAC project that was curtailed due to a lack of funding:

that project had its genesis in a presentation that I did to the state legislature four or five years ago, I had one hour to speak to the political leaders and told them we had to do something different in respect to assessment to get teachers to do a better job. Jay Linksman [Executive Director of Professional Development for Will, Grundy and Kendall counties] and his team organized the professional development. An awful lot of people were impacted… but the most exciting part was the showcase conferences the teachers put on so teachers could learn sound instructional practices. Basically our mission in that program was and is to have teachers assess accurately and use the assessment process and its results to benefit students’ learning.\(^{17}\)

The most current initiative of ISBE involving the history and social science standards was the development of the Illinois Assessment Frameworks (IAF’s) in Grades 5, 8 and 11 that were disseminated in September of 2007 (refer to Appendix B). This was especially an important directive inasmuch the state examinations in the social sciences were rescinded by the General Assembly in 2006, (refer to Appendix B) as a budgetary cut to fund the subjects mandated by NCLB. The frameworks were designed by teams of academia and teachers for the major benchmark levels (Grades 5, 8 and 11) to assist

\(^{16}\)www.sac-success.org/sponsorship.

teachers to design their own assessments aligned to the standards. Their importance was that they still addressed the academic rigor of the NAEP examinations for elementary and secondary students. Carlson reflected on the impact of the cessation of state history testing due to the NCLB legislation\(^{18}\) and the future impact of the NAEP’s:

In Illinois we have lost our state social science assessments in Grades 4 and 7 and the Prairie State in Grade 11 in high school. In looking at that, the first reaction is that is not a good thing and it probably isn’t. But what did we do before all of these tests? We still do this stuff, someone taught us citizenship, the history of the country, the connection globally. We learned these things and didn’t have to take state tests. We don’t know the impact yet, Illinois is required to administer the NAEP’s [U.S. History] in grades 4, 8 and 12, it will be a piece of very telling evidence…..\(^{19}\)

It should be noted that any state that receives NCLB Title I grant monies has to administer the NAEP examinations to collect aggregate data. Ravitch concurs on the respect that the NAEP’s engender:

One organization that made a decisive difference in public discussion was the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the federally funded testing program that since 1970 had issued regular reports on student achievement in major academic subjects. NAEP was the only consistent national barometer of educational performance and a constant reminder of the need for improved achievement. NAEP kept public attention focused squarely on important academic subjects: reading, writing, mathematics, science and history.\(^{20}\)

Although the IAF’s in history and the social sciences might seem as a futile tool to implement the standards with no state assessments, the frameworks further clarified the critical thinking skills such as historical analysis (refer to Appendix B) at the


benchmark levels and would later serve as guideline for the CPS curriculum maps and the secondary course frameworks.

**The Chicago Public Schools History Curricula Initiatives**

The CPS had three major initiatives that encompassed the development of curricula in the history and social science standards that preceded or overlapped the ILS of the ISBE and involved the national standards movement and stakeholders (refer to Illustration 8). In the summer of 1993, writing teams of elementary and secondary teachers in the six content areas of social sciences, biological and physical sciences, fine arts, language arts, mathematics and physical development and health were assembled for five weeks of produce the *Framework for Transforming Teaching and Learning* which consisted of learning outcomes in these content areas (refer to Appendix C).

What was unusual about the project was that it first emanated from the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU) AFT#1 and not from the Chicago Public Schools. Shanker, who was President of the AFT and NHSP committee member, is referenced by Ravitch:

> In the curriculum wars of the 1990s, the outcome was decisively influenced by one individual... Albert Shanker's courageous voice insistently reminded the nation that the American teachers want higher standards, reasonable standards, and good behavior in the classroom.\(^{21}\)

In 1993, the late John Kotsakis, Assistant to the CTU President Thomas Reece, and Dr. Deborah Walsh Lynch, had founded the QUEST Center at the CTU headquarters in Chicago. Lynch was not only a protégé of Shanker and had worked with him at the AFT headquarters in Washington, D.C., but later would herself become president of the AFT#1. The QUEST Center was a cutting edge concept that the AFT affiliates would

\(^{21}\)Ibid.
become involved in the emerging standards movement and develop quality staff
development to train teachers with these reform efforts to improve instruction. The
training for the CTU, CPS teachers and administrators was from the Council for Basic
Education (CBE), the same national non-profit organization that oversaw the NHSP
revisions of the post-controversy national history standards.

It should be noted that although the CBE disbanded in 2004, it had been very
influential for over fifty years assisting humanities scholars program and during the
national standards movement was in the forefront with educational policy-makers
assisting twenty-five states including Illinois, twenty-eight school districts including the
CPS, and eight countries in developing programs for excellence in education.22

In recalling the involvement with the CBE and the origination of the project,
Lynch recalled:

The CTU had a MacArthur grant of 1.3 million dollars over 3 years to
fund the Quest Center. John and I had co-written that grant and I returned
from Washington D.C. to direct the Quest Center after 8 years at AFT. I
had known Ruth [Ruth Mitchell, Patte Barth and A. Graham Down23, 
Executive Director of the CBE, conducted the training] through various
AFT-standards-based activities and initiatives. They had designed an at-a-
glance poster model of the national standards. Peter Martinez of the
MacArthur Foundation and the Executive Director from the Joyce
Foundation both believed in John and I, but would only fund the project if
we could get CPS on board with it. They saw the wisdom of
institutionalizing the work into the system.24

22http://education.stateuniversity.com/1888Council-Basic-Education.

23A. Graham Down was also a member of the NHSP History Forum Group representing the CBE.

24Dr. Deborah Lynch, written correspondence to questionnaire, 25 May, 2008.
This cooperative curriculum endeavor gained national attention and was heralded as the first effort of this kind in both mindset and magnitude.

The Chicago Teachers Union and the city’s board of education, working in quiet partnership despite the district’s bitter budget battles, have developed a set of standards that spells out what Chicago students should learn. Written to mesh with state goals for learning, the brief descriptions of what students should know and be able to do are markedly different from the detailed sets of curriculum objectives that now exist for each grade noted Ruth Mitchell, a consultant who worked on the standards project. ‘This is not a list of objectives, she said, this is a composite vision of what students should know and be able to do, and not something to go through and check off’.25

The CTU/CPS collaboration (refer to Appendix C) resulted in Chicago becoming the first urban school district in the nation to develop learning outcomes based on the national standards that were still in the process of development. Lynch further commented on the collaboration:

With my recent AFT experience on both standards and labor-management cooperation, John and I discussed how to get CPS involved in the standards effort as a labor-management initiative to improve and reform our schools. I had been exposed to the great Adam Urbanski in Rochester, New York, Tom Mooney in Cincinnati, and other AFT leaders that were involved in labor-management partnerships to restore public confidence in the schools. John was a visionary and progressive and he thought a partnership around standards might be the first inroad into other significant labor-management initiatives in what was a historically contentious relationship between CTU and CPS. 26

The learning outcomes were offered to the public in draft form for feedback and there were also focus groups for parents, business groups, teachers, community groups and other professionals before the systemic roll-out of the outcomes. The systemic

---


26 Ibid.
CTU/CPS professional development began before the 1993 school year and continued throughout the year with the plan for eventual follow-up of support materials.

An example of the influence of *California Frameworks* (1988) and drafts of the NHSP history standards is evidenced in the locution and ethos of the description of the Definition of the Social Sciences as a Learning Area for full text (refer to Appendix C).

The social sciences outcomes recognize the importance of social history and multicultural perspectives in addition to political history to understanding our society and world. Social sciences instruction should convey information about diverse cultures and perspectives, movements, and events, with particular consideration of those which have been historically omitted from or misrepresented in standard curricula.27 These learning outcomes were aligned to the ISBE goals and were released when the ILS project was in its planning stages to develop a state framework and standards. In reflecting on the unprecedented labor-management effort and impact Lynch further recollected:

> even the joint CPS-CTU letter on front of the packet (refer to Appendix C) was a huge shift for the union, and we had lots of convincing on the on the union side that working together on this was a good thing to do. It was an incredible experience working with all those CTU members who were so committed to teaching in their disciplines, we used to say how lucky we were to work in such rarefied air……at our level we proved labor and management could work together. There were disappointments when different CPS leaders came and went, with different priorities. The state changed things on us and there was never any really deep commitment from CPS or CTU, so that the project was not fought enough-or at all. Certainly Tom Reece at CTU didn’t really care if it failed or succeeded. He originally agreed just to placate us and go along with an AFT-encouraged process. We wanted the classroom teacher to benefit from our work and we needed good committed leaders at the very top, and so far we haven’t seen that in CPS.28

---


28 Ibid.
The second initiative of history and social science standards was the Chicago Academic Standards Project (CAS) that included frameworks and performance expectations that were released in draft forms in 1996 before the ILS were finished.

The Chicago Academic Standards were developed with technical assistance from renowned leaders in the development of standards-based instruction. The Curriculum Framework Statements, which complement, align with and delineate the Chicago Academic Standards, were developed by teams of teacher-writers. Following an extensive review process, the statements were revised and augmented to meet the concerns of local school councils, administrators, community representatives, parents, area specialists, university personnel, the teaching staff at large and other stakeholders.29

The training materials distributed to the core subject areas writing teams were from the New Standards Project, but were only available for mathematics, science and English Language Arts for “applied learning.”30 The National Standards for History was used for the Social Science writing team with the California Frameworks (1988). The formal professional development roll-out came in the spring of 1997 before the ILS were mandated by the Illinois General Assembly in July of 1997. The purpose and legality of the CAS were explained as thus:

The Chicago Academic Standards (CAS) and Curriculum Framework Statements (CFS) were developed in response to Illinois Public Law 88-686, which was passed in August 1996, and incorporated as Chapter 105, Article2-3.63 in the Illinois School Code. The law stipulates that the Illinois State Board shall require each school district to set student learning objectives which meet or exceed goals established by the state.31

---

29Chicago Public Schools, Instructional Intranet, http://intranet.cps.k12.il.us/Standards/CAS/CAS.


31Chicago Public Schools, Instructional Intranet, http://intranet.cps.k12.il.us/Standards/CAS/CAS.
When the CAS was released, the *National Standards for History* had been written, censured in the Senate, and revised. This project had different priorities, there was no collaboration with the CTU and deadlines were in place to insure that the CAS was intentionally released before the ILS was formally adopted.

There were several features analogous to the national history standards not only in verbiage (refer to Illustration 5) but also in format. The national history standards are arranged so that certain content is covered at age-appropriate grade levels. For example, in the primary grades (refer to Appendix A) the family, community and local history are part of the curriculum.

Although there had been many “scope and sequence” curriculum charts that were distributed previously in CPS, there weren’t any that were aligned to the ISBE social science mandates (e.g., Public Law195, the federal and Illinois constitutions test) or the state assessments. The IGAP’s social science assessments were still in place at this time in grades 4, 7 and 11 and it was a general practice that U.S. history be taught in seventh or eighth grade and again at grade 11 at the secondary level.

To coordinate with the CAS, a scope and sequence chart (refer to Appendix C) was developed by researcher to align the CAS with the content reflected not only at the state, but also at the national level. For example, the national history standards suggest that local or state history be taught in Grades K–4 (refer to Appendix A) and this is reflected in the alignment for CPS for the CAS (refer to Appendix C).

While some school districts have required adopted textbooks at grade levels the CPS does not have this operational policy except for summer school remediation classes.
This means from school to school, classroom to classroom there is great variation on what exactly is being taught. This is commonly referred to as “shotgun curriculum” because of the random focus of instruction. To try and ameliorate this situation, the CAS were aligned not only to the Illinois state goals, but were further defined with curriculum framework statements (CFS) to give greater direction to the teachers for instruction (refer to Appendix C) which were in the same format of the sub-standards of the national history standards (refer to Appendix A, *Elements of a National History Standard*).

To insure that the CAS were being taught and implemented, the Chicago Academic Standards Examinations (CASE) were mandated in all grade levels in the core content areas. This policy, tied to measures of accountability was in place from 1997 until 2003 when it was rescinded (refer to Appendix C) on September 24, 2003 with *Board Report 03-0924-PO02*. Before this change in policy, teachers had to design instruction for a dual system of standards (the state ILS and CPS CAS), prepare students for the ISAT examinations, CASE assessments, the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) and Tests for Academic Proficiency (TAP) at the secondary level.

With the enactment of NCLB (2001) schools not performing to the expected criteria on the state assessments (the ISAT’s and secondary PSAE’s) and making AYP would be liable for being on the state watch list for academic warning. The priority of CPS then shifted from local assessments to the state assessments to be in compliance, as attested by the systemic change in the CPS board policy.

The third CPS curricular initiative that was influenced by the national history standards was the 2004-2006 development of the secondary history course frameworks
and curriculum maps that are still being utilized in the one hundred and sixteen high schools of CPS. It was during this time that Stiggins was a consultant to the Office of Standards-Based Instruction. The history course frameworks were developed as a concerted effort with the Office of Mathematics, Office of Literacy and Office of Science and to design with the instructional coaches in each of the six high school regions course frameworks to be implemented in the 2004 school year.

The spectrum of secondary schools in CPS ranges from magnet, regular, specialized schools such as math and science or the fine arts, to smaller schools-within-a-school housed inside a larger high school. The rationale was that if uniform course frameworks were implemented that had academic rigor, the Prairie State scores with the mandated American College Testing (ACT) components would have gains. It was also at this time that CPS received 23 million dollars from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to improve academic achievement at the secondary level.

It must be noted that since the Prairies State (PSAE) examination in the social sciences for grade 11 was eliminated, the focus would be on the ACT reading examination in the social sciences. As a “participant-observer” of this process there were three curricular concerns: 1) to implement as many as possible of the secondary history and social science ISBE descriptors and draft components of the Grade 11 IAF in case the social science examination would return, 2) to cover the survey of content and academic rigor of the ACT examination, ISBE standards, NAEP’s, Illinois mandates and the national history standards, and 3) to develop high quality teacher support materials for the secondary department chairs and teachers including quarterly curriculum maps.
coupled with not only systemic professional development, but individualized professional
development for the school with the six social science coaches.32

The course frameworks (refer to Appendix C) were written in this order: 1) United States History, 2) World History/Global Studies; 3) United States History I and II for schools having two year United States History courses; and 4) Contemporary American History. The frameworks were vetted with academia in history education programs or whose expertise was in American history or world history and teachers. The inclusion of the elements of the national history standards was evidenced not only in the scope and sequence of the content, but also the critical thinking skills of the “Habits of Mind” (refer to Glossary).

The quarterly curriculum maps were subsequently developed for each of the course frameworks (refer to Appendix C) so teachers could plan by semesters and department examinations or classroom assessments could be aligned. This process entailed summer staff development, city-wide department chair meetings, on-site coach staff development and regional staff development in the six high school regions over a three year period from 2004-2006 coordinated with the Regional Educational Officers.33

Stiggins reflected on the intent of the process and the commitment that must be undertaken for it to succeed:

32Summer curriculum work by coaches in 2004, 2005 and 2006 were enhanced by monthly meetings of coaches (2004-2006) with researcher with dissemination to department chairs documented through agendas and systemic professional development materials.

33The initial orientation of the Course Frameworks were held at Clemente, Kenwood and Corliss High Schools in the summer of 2004, teachers and administrators from two regions attending each site for cluster training; agendas from training subsequently dated for July 2004 and August 2005.
for students to progress, school districts need to be clear about what standards students need to master. In order to do this, school districts must 1) have their “standards house” in order for academic achievement; 2) design and integrate curriculum maps that are locally developed for K-12 and 3) the curriculum maps need to be de-constructed and put into student friendly terms.34

In 2007, due to budgetary cuts, the social science coaches positions were cut, but have since have been re-instated and there has been another re-organization including the Deputy of Chief of Curriculum and Assistant Deputy Chief of Curriculum, who originated and supported this initiative, have left the CPS.

CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The greatest challenge will come when the history standards will need to be revised.
--Gary Nash (Bunche Hall, UCLA, April 19, 2004)

The purpose of Chapter Five is to reflect on the current issues concerning history standards and the subsequent implications for history education. The effort of the NHSP to develop national standards in history was an ideological challenge that had critics, controversy and antithetical discourse about the very nature of history education. Yet, as a reform effort in education policy-making, it also had historians and history teachers address contemporary challenges to historical scholarship such as equity. Nash appraised the “demographic revolution” as thus:

The teaching of history has changed dramatically in recent years because teachers have been awakened by seeing the composition of their own classrooms change so swiftly during the last two decades. The public schools have been re-populated with people of different skin shades, different languages, different accents, and different cultures of origin. In Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, San Antonio, Washington, D.C., El Paso and New Orleans, children of color occupy more than three-quarters of all classroom seats in public schools, and in a few of the cities comprise more than 90 percent of all public school children.¹

The profile of the CPS as a major urban school district is consistent with Nash’s evaluation with the 407,955 students, 84.3% being low income, and having a racial

composition of 46.2% African American, 41.2% Latino, 3.5% Asian Pacific Islander, 2.9% multi-racial and 0.2% Native American, reflecting a 94% minority population.²

The history standards were designed to be inclusive, representing the demographics of the United States and to provide equity for students, not in quantifiable indicators such as per pupil expenditures, but in access for students to excellence in teacher instruction with focused criteria and strategies. Optimally, with implementation of the academic rigor of the history standards through effective teaching strategies and authentic assessment, “equal educational opportunity” would be provided as defined by Keppel.³

Ravitch reflected on the intent of the undertaking of developing national standards that was deemed altruistic by some opponents:

My own view is that the purposeful effort to construct national standards is a promising undertaking that offers the hope of promoting change in many parts of the educational system. It will be a magnet for criticism, not only from those who fear the heavy hand of government intrusion, but also from educationists who distrust any emphasis on disciplinary knowledge and who find it hard to believe that children from disadvantaged backgrounds can respond to intellectual challenge.⁴

The state of history education is currently in a reform cycle within the framework of standards-based education with the rationality that if uniform standards are required in states and schools, the playing field will be leveled. Stiggins commented on the ethical mission of schools and of standards:

What society has begun to say is schools will be held accountable for more than just providing an opportunity to learn. With regards to the standards, they [schools] will be held accountable to meeting the standards because it is so fundamental to further learning and ultimately for societal success. The evolution of this effect is that society is saying we can no longer have losers, we can no longer have kids giving up in hopelessness…

In analyzing contemporary reform initiatives, there are several policy issues that are impacting history standards, education, curriculum and teachers. Ravitch commented on the innovations teachers have previously experienced:

There have been eras of failed revolutions. One movement after another arrived, peaked, and dispersed. Having observed the curriculum reform movement, the technological revolution, the open education movement, the free school movement, the de-schooling movement, the accountability movement, the minimum competency movement, the back-to-basics movement, a veteran teacher may be excused for secretly thinking, when confronted by the next campaign to ‘save’ the schools, ‘this too shall pass’.  

The current educational and political reality is that standards-based education is in the curricula forefront again and contemporary research is emerging that is causing debates to re-design the voluntary national standards to once again “raise the bar” for

---

5 Currently 37 states and the District of Columbia are in the process of revising one or more of the core content standards (Illinois is not). “The State of State Standards,” Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, 2006, Executive Summary, 7.


criteria for our students to compete internationally. This emerging trend could be either a departure or a continuation of the damage of the aftermath of the controversy concerning the national history standards.

In a recent article by Ravitch commenting on the possibility of new standards she posited:

The debacle of the history standards doomed the NESIC. Some believe it doomed the national standards movement itself. And it is true that what already been an uphill battle has, for the time being at least, taken on Sisyphean proportions. Although the nonpartisan Council for Basic Education subsequently reworked the history standards, the damage was done. Eighteen months of verbal battle had made the history standards a symbol of the impossibility of forging national standards that might win broad public support. Meanwhile, despite the protestations about, variously, the impossibility and the danger of a national curriculum, the reality is that most American public schools already have one. The idea of national standards has remarkable validity, no matter what the politicians say. National standards, not federal standards managed by the federal government, are a necessity in an advanced society.8

The current discussion that is emerging is that the failings of NCLB (2001) are causing educators to re-visit the relationship of national standards and state standards. In a recent article by Randi Weingarten, current President of the 1.4 million membership of the AFT, she addressed this concern:

There are many areas in education around which we need to build a consensus. A good place to start would be revisiting the issue of national standards. Abundant evidence suggests that common, rigorous standards lead to more students reaching higher levels of achievement. The countries that consistently outperform the United States on international assessments all have national standards, with core curriculum, assessments and time for professional development for teachers based on those standards. Education is a local issue, but there is a body of knowledge about what children

---

should know and be able to do that should guide decisions about curriculum and testing. I propose that a broad-based group made up of educators, elected officials, community leaders, and experts in pedagogy and particular content, come together to take the best academic standards and make them available as a national model.  

Although this may sound like the same rhetoric when the national standards movement in the 1990s originally emerged, the current criticism is that because of the local control, the fifty states have fifty sets of standards that range in complexity and rigor. Behind this new advocacy for national standards is the Fordham Foundation led by Chester Finn, Jr. that is leading the Common Core Initiative. “Fordham will push for better state standards even as we fight for great national standards.”

The Common Core Standards Initiative is currently supported by the NGA Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). On June 1, 2009 the NGA released a press release that 49 states (including Illinois) have signed the agreement.

By signing on to the Common Core Standards Initiative, governors and state commissioners of education across the country are committing to joining a state-led process to develop a common core of state standards in English-language arts and mathematics for Grades K-12. These standards will be research and evidence-based, internationally benchmarked, aligned with college and work expectations and include rigorous content and skills.

---


It should also be noted that accountability measures are anticipated because this collaboration is in partnership with Achieve, Inc., ACT and the College Board.\textsuperscript{12} The key points to be made are that there are discussions for science to be added inasmuch it was not tested under the NCLB stipulations until 2007, and history and the social sciences are omitted. As previously referenced, primarily by Ravitch, Rabb, Remini, Symcox, Nash and colleagues and others, this could be attributed to the political fallout of the national history standards and the subsequent ramifications of the NCLB (2001) legislation (refer to Illustration 9).

The omission of history and social studies in NCLB legislation has already bonded some history and social science professional organizations into advocacy (refer to Appendix D, \textit{Congressional Crisis in History Statement}, \textit{NCSS Joint Position Statement NCSS Resolutions on Social Science Education} and \textit{NCSS Advocacy Letter to Senator Obama}). It is hoped that this momentum would intensify once the specific details of the Common Core Initiative are released by the DOE which helped fund the project.

Secretary of Education Arne Duncan recently remarked at the National Press Club:

One of the things that I think No Child Left Behind got wrong is No Child Left Behind was very, very loose on the goals. We had 50 different goals and they got dummed down. What is most troubling to me on the standards issue is that far too many states, including the state I come from, Illinois—I think we are fundamentally lying to our children… Let me explain what I mean. When children are told they are “meeting a standard” the logical assumption for a child or parent to think is that they are on track and are successful. Because the standards are dummed down, they are in fact barely able to graduate and are absolutely inadequately prepared to go to a competitive university, let alone graduate.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.

What is clear is that with the omission of history as a “common core”, the discipline will once again be relegated to reading in the content area in the English-Language Arts core and assessment. Current drafts put out for public comment reveal that on the task of “reading a broad range of complex texts” both the Declaration of Independence and the front page of the New York Times dated April 15, 1865, the day after Lincoln was assassinated, are included.14

The instructional focus alone on reading and mathematics is not a liberal education as voiced by the earlier concerns of Ravitch and Finn:

The 800-pound gorilla of the standards movement is, of course, the federal No Child Left Behind Act. Its premise was straightforward: prod all states to set academic standards and accompany them with exams to test students on how well they’ve mastered the material, with annual progress, all with a goal of having 100 percent of young people ‘proficient’ by 2014. They’re worthy skills, but not the whole proper education. But states, local school systems and educators preparing students to take tests in them to the detriment of ‘broad’ and ‘liberal’ and ‘arts’.”15

Coupled with the issue of the marginalization of history and the social studies in instruction is the measure of accountability with assessment. The prospect of the resurrection of history as a core subject with testing also has concerns.

Even if a test in social studies would increase instructional time, what price will students pay for this? When science testing begins in 2007, the number of tests that states will need to administer annually to comply with


15 Chester E. Finn, Jr. and Diane Ravitch, Editors, “Beyond the Basics: Achieving a Liberal Education” (Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2007), 5.
NCLB is expected to rise to 68 million. Do children need an additional test?  

There is a need for discussion for both a re-evaluation and reform of the nature of assessment in history education. Rabb envisioned what the testing should entail:

I can only speak for my discipline, history, but it needs may be instructive. Like all the humanities, history is boundless. Innate to its study and comprehension is a basic structure—narrative—with many components, encompassing biography. Social history, economic change, war, climate, geography, and art. Although for centuries politics was the central focus, during recent decades we have recognized that there are many ways to convey its unique lessons, a sense of perspective. For that agenda, no multiple-choice exam is going to demonstrate proficiency worthy of the name. Like the SAT tests, which now rely on essays to assess competence, historians need writing exercises to evaluate proficiency. And the variety of history makes flexibility essential.

A related issue of professional development for teachers to learn how to develop authentic assessment in history and the social studies needs to be addressed not only in their training, but also at the pre-service level. Stiggins commented on this necessary link.

Research shows that typical teachers will spend a quarter to a third of their professional time in assessment and assessment-related activities. They need to be trained in authentic assessment….very few states require explicitly competence in assessment as a requirement of teacher licensure. If they don’t get training at the university or in their school district, where will they receive it?

The “long walk” that Nash referred to as a greater articulation and collaboration between academia and classroom practitioners must also be re-examined and improved in

---


The No Child Left Behind Act required states to ensure that all teachers were ‘highly qualified’ by the 2005-2006 school year. To be ‘highly qualified’, a teacher must complete a major in an academic discipline or pass a content test. A major in history and adequate pedagogy will prepare teachers to teach the subject, but simply passing a test or concentrating broad-field social studies will yield only more of the same problems we face today. Standards for teachers should also be as specific and content rich as the leading states’ content standards for students. It makes little sense to establish strong standards for students and weak standards for teachers.19

There are also concerns for teachers in history or social studies classrooms that are classified as out-of-field teachers.

According to the U.S. Department of Education’s Center for Education Statistics School and Staffing Survey, in 1999-2000, 71% of middle school history teachers lacked a college major in history or certification in history; 11.5% lacked a college major or certification in history. At the high school level, 62.5% lacked a college major or certification in history and 8.4% lacked a college major, college minor, or certification. Most striking is that the percentage of middle and high school teachers who had neither a college history major nor certification increased since 1987-1988. The high school increase was slight—62.1% to 62.5%, but at the middle school level, out-of-field teachers increased from 67.5% to 71% (Gewertz, 2002).20

There is a local positive result that should be noted with the involvement of the national standards movement. Lynch commented on the professionalism of the teachers through advanced training:


20 State Certification Requirements for History Teachers, ED482210-2003-12-00; work cited, Catherine Gewertz, “Qualifications of Teachers Falling Short,” Education Week 21, no.12 (June 2002): 1, 18.
The other CTU Project that carried on John’s [Kotsakis] vision and experience with the standards was the CTU’s program in support of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Since John, CTU has had this program to help CTU members become Board-certified and has the most successful pass rate of any other such program in the country [96% pass rate on the first try]. This is real union leadership and several of the same teachers who we [the researcher] knew from the standards project got involved in the program as well as Lynn Cherkasky Davis, who now runs the program for the CTU.

Competency for history teachers can also have factors that are not quantifiable by certification examinations. Remini reflected on the qualities of a good history teacher:

Teachers should not teach history unless they have a passion for history, they must keep reading to deepen their knowledge to make their stories in the classroom as relevant as possible for the students.

The combination of quality instruction utilizing the history standards is the optimal pedagogical situation; however, there are few measures to ascertain if the standards are actually being implemented. The only research on the implementation of the ISBE standards is a June 2006 study with a sample of 763 schools conducted (2005), the last year that the state had mandated social studies assessments. The study gauged schools on five levels of implementation of standards-led education from “maintenance” to ‘predominance.”

Their findings from teachers at schools that had the lowest implementation of the ISBE standards (ILS) were that a lack of time for professional development was the

---

21 As reported by Cherkasky Davis, since the inception of the CTU NBPTS Program in 1996, 318 teachers have become Board-certified, 18 are history teachers. Currently there are 8 history teachers in the August 2009 cohort.

22 Dr. Deborah Lynch, written correspondence to questionnaire, 25 May 2008.

23 Robert V. Remini, interview by author, tape recording, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, 8 April 2005.
biggest deterrent followed by class size. Administrators that had a higher level (4 and 5) of implementation allocated resources, time and monies for staff development. In a matched sample of teachers and principals viewing levels of ILS implementation, 85.6% and 5.6% of teachers reported their schools to be in the third and fourth levels of implementation, respectively, while 48.4% and 45.6% of principals reported their schools to be in the thirds and fourth Levels of ILS implementation, respectively. The history standards cannot be effective unless they are implemented in the classroom.

---

Impact of NCLB on History Education

2001 Federal legislation defining core curriculum and focus in reading, mathematics, and science with accountability measures impacting states

- Diminishing of instructional time in history at elementary and secondary levels especially in early grades

- Revocation of state assessments in social sciences/history including Illinois

- Districts and local school sites limiting funding in budgets for history education, textbooks, field trips, and resources

- Focus on history education as “reading in the content area” mentality

- Inadequate training in content demanded of teachers of history

- Crisis in history statement to United States 2004 Senate

- Lobbying and action plans by professional organizations

Note: Illustration by author from research.
© 2005 - Phyllis M. Henry

Figure 9. Impact of NCLB on History Education
Figure 10. The Impact of the National Standards Movement
Recommendations for Future Research

The field for research and studies in history education is wide-open as is the emerging research on accountability and “high-stakes” testing. The accountability research of Au (2007), Amrein (2002), Berliner (2002), Lipman (2004), McNeil (2001), Valenzuela (2001), Watanabe (2007), and O’Connor, Heafner and Groce (2007) is just starting to chronicle the detrimental effects of “teaching to the test”, time on task, or in the case of history and the social studies, the diminution of instructional time. With this in mind, the researcher has several recommendations for future studies to add to the body of research:

1. The advocacy movement in both history and social studies education by professional organizations to place these disciplines back as core disciplines should be chronicled. Current efforts include the formation of the National History Coalition and National Humanities Alliance with advocacy information on their websites as well as the work of the AHA, OAH, OHT, NCHE, WHA, NCSS and the Federation of State Humanities Councils for lobbying, collaboration, position statements and other initiatives to legislators and stakeholders.

2. The successful strategies and training of pre-service teachers by universities in history education could be researched and shared. Professional conferences, articles, and books are traditional venues for dissemination; however, one of the emerging trends is the coordination of university consortia and institutions
to share best practices in pedagogy. The NCHS at UCLA is a national model for this endeavor because they have not only worked with teachers from California, but have developed instructional materials for classroom use in any school district. The ideal collaboration would be of academia and P-20 practitioners to insure the optimal training for “highly qualified” teachers.

3. Current research is needed on the relationship between the NAEP’s and state assessments and instruction in history. The first ever NAEP assessment of world history was scheduled to be given in 2012 to students in twelfth grade. It has been postponed with the intention of including it in the 2018 assessment cycle with frameworks, specifications and background variables currently being developed. Although there are state assessment profiles including data analyzing the areas (www.nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/assesshistory) of citizenship, United States history and social studies, the correlation of data and effective pedagogy needs to be investigated and disseminated to teachers, state curriculum specialists and academia.

4. The impact of NCLB legislation on history and social studies education is becoming more intensified with the re-authorization intended in the present presidential administration and needs to documented and shared. Individual states are developing waivers and changing assessments to meet AYP and guidelines. The issue of the Common Core Initiative assessments could also impact the focus and implementation of state assessments.
5. The revision of state standards in United States and world history is a contemporary educational policy. Also, currently the NCATE standards are being revised to meet the challenges for the training of future history and social studies teachers. These developments influence history education and need to be closely examined and disseminated for their impact to the profession.

6. The Congressional funding of history education and initiatives is an open field in educational policy-making that needs to be scrutinized and researched. The major criticism of NCLB was that it was an under-funded mandate that placed the burden on states for the implementation of assessments which concomitantly had detrimental budgetary effects on history and social studies assessments with their decrease or elimination from state agendas. Currently, in the 2009 legislative session there is a proposed resolution for FY2010 from the Appropriations Committee (H.R.3293) that reflects a 19 million dollars differential (from 119 million dollars to 100 million) to fund the Teaching American History (TAH) grants that couple Local Educational Agencies (LEA) and Institutions of Higher Education (IHE). The final Senate version is yet to be determined for an established program that has received over 700 million dollars to date to improve the teaching of American history. Funding initiatives not only for the TAH, but also the NEH, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and other programs that impact curricular

innovations in the discipline of history need to be examined for the future
training of teachers.

7. A further investigation is necessary to correlate how the national history
standards movement impacted other states. Although there are identifiable
links of content, organizational format and NHSP stakeholders manifested in
Illinois and subsequently the CPS, other state studies could be conducted to
research the curricular evidence of the national history standards. A
comparative study of state frameworks, student assessments, teacher
preparation materials for history certification and revisions in legislation and
state school codes could be scrutinized for a more expansive cohesive national
analysis.

8. The role of international testing and the influence it will have on the
prospective Common Core Initiative, national standards, NAEP’s or other
measures of accountability and assessment is yet to unfold. To counterpoint
Finn and the Fordham Foundation’s position of math, reading and science as
the only core subjects is the Common Core, a Washington organization that
advocates giving students a strong grounding across disciplines including arts
and the humanities.26

In their report, Why We’re Behind: What Top Nations Teach Their Students But
We Don’t (2009), Lynne Munson, Common Core’s President and Executive Director,

26Sean Cavanaugh, “Nations Performing at Top Committed to Broad Curriculum,” Education
Week 10 (June 2009): 1. Also online at www.Edweek.
ascertains that a dedication to teaching children a wide array of subjects is more valuable than a “delivery mechanism” in an accountability system.\textsuperscript{27} According to her recent commentary, too many American schools are sacrificing the arts and humanities to improve reading, math and science scores on the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA). Countries such as Australia, Canada, Finland, Japan, New Zealand and others out-perform American students (2006); yet have a diversified core curriculum including history and the humanities.\textsuperscript{28} International comparisons in examinations include the topics of cross-curricula content and problem solving. The emerging research of McGaw (2007) and Schleicher (2007) attest that this field that is not only necessary, but expansible.

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.
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8. What are some issues that are confronting history education today?

9. What are some suggestions you have for those that want to teach history?

10. How do you perceive the role of the government in history education?
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- [ ] Stamped consent/Assent form(s) are not necessary.
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- [x] Only data analysis and/or writing are on-going.
  - Consent/assent forms are not re-approved for use during the next approval period.

If the current status of your project is such that no new participants are being enrolled, your consent forms have not been re-approved and are thus invalid. If you wish to change the status of your project and enroll additional participants, you must first seek IRB approval by submitting the consent forms; if approved, the consent forms will be stamped and sent back to you for use.

If you wish to amend any part(s) of your project during this one year approval period, you must submit the “Application for Amendment to Research Protocol” form, located on Loyola’s IRB website and submit it to the IRB for review (*see web address below). You may not implement any proposed changes until the IRB has approved them. Furthermore, if you complete data analysis and all research activities outlined in your IRB application, prior to your next expiration date, kindly fill out the “Request to Close a Project” form, also located on the IRB website.

Thank you very much for your continued cooperation. If you have questions please feel free to contact me at (773) 508-3018.
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Dr. Raymond H. Dye, Jr.
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Helen Dobek, Teacher
Richton Elementary and Junior High School
Cleveland, Ohio

John M. Fisher, Teacher
Fifth Avenue Elementary School
Columbus, Ohio

Marilyn McKnight, Teacher
Fountain Inn School
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Lost Lee Mock, Teacher
Riverside Elementary Schools
Alexandria, Virginia

Minna Novick, Curriculum Consultant
Chicago, Illinois

Joan Parish-Meyer, Teacher
University Elementary School
University of California, Los Angeles

Sara Shook, Vice Principal
Cul Run Elementary School
Cameron, Virginia

Linda Symons, Associate Director
National Center for History in the Schools
University of California, Los Angeles

U.S. Curriculum Task Force

Kirk A. Askew, Teacher
Scripps Ranch High School
San Diego, California

Earl Bell, Teacher
The Laboratory Schools
University of Chicago

Charlotte Crabtree, Professor of Education Emeritus
University of California, Los Angeles

Mark W. Gali, Teacher
Guadalupe Junior/Senior High School
Guadalupe, Washington

Melvin Garrison, Teacher
Kearny High School
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Sam Minter, Teacher
Ford Junior High School
Springfield, Missouri

Lawrence A. Miller, Head
Social Studies Department
Baltimore City College High School
Baltimore, Maryland

Lost Lee Mock, Teacher
Riverside Elementary Schools
Alexandria, Virginia

Gary R. Nash, Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles

Minna Novick, Curriculum Consultant
Chicago, Illinois

John J. Patrick, Professor of Education
Indiana University

Daniel A. Preston, Teacher
University High School
University, Florida

John Pena, Humanities Supervisor
West Milford High School
West Milford, New Jersey

Angeline Rinaldi, Teacher
Eaglecrest High School
Aurora, Colorado

William C. Schultheis, Teacher
Lake Clifton Eastern High School
Baltimore, Maryland

Glenn Sesas, Teacher
Hall High School
East Didsbury, New York

Linda Symons, Associate Director
National Center for History in the Schools
University of California, Los Angeles

Helen Tracey, Teacher
Kemper High School
Detroit, Michigan

David Vigilante, Teacher Emeritus
Compass Secondary School
San Diego, California

World History Curriculum Committee

Jean Arno, Teacher
George Washington High School
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

David Bumback, Teacher
Woolarll Elemenary Gifted Center
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Richard Emile, Professor of History
Columbia University

Ainslie E. Eubanks, Professor of History Emeritus
Columbia University

Carol Gluck, Professor of History
Columbia University

Akira Iriye, Professor of History
Harvard University

Henry G. Kirn, Director of Curriculum
West Morris Regional High School District
Chatham, New Jersey

Collin Palmer, Professor of History
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Theodore E. Rabb, Professor of History
Princeton University

Richard Solse, Professor of History
University of Chicago

Michael R. Winston, Vice President Emeritus
Howard University, and President, Alfred E. Houghton Foundation
World History Curriculum Task Force

Sunny Crawford, Teacher
Saldana High School
Saldana, Alaska

Ross Dunn, Professor of History
San Diego State University

Benjamin Elman, Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles

Jean Fleer, Teacher
University of Wisconsin

Jana Flores, Teacher
Pine River Elementary School
Santa Clara, California

Charles Franze, Professor of History Emeritus
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Marya Jo Hitchens, Teacher
West Ridge High School
Denver, Colorado

James Johnson
Friends Seminary
New York, New York

Henry G. Kirman, Director of Curriculum
The Salk Institute for Biological Studies
La Jolla, California

Carrie McEoin, Teacher
San Diego City College
San Diego, California

Susan Meisler, Teacher
Vergennes Union High School
Vergennes, Vermont

Gary R. Nash, Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles

Joe Palermo, Administrative Assistant
Long Beach Unified School District
Long Beach, California

San Robson, Teacher
High School for Creative and Performing Arts
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Blair Strong, Teacher
Aspen High School
Aspen, Colorado

Irene Segade, Teacher
San Diego High School
San Diego, California

Gaelynn Simons, Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles

Linda Simons, Associate Director
National Center for History in the Schools
University of California, Los Angeles

David Vagland, Teacher Emeritus
Camarillo High School
San Diego, California

Scott Waugh, Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles

Julia Stewart Werner, Teacher
Neighborhood School
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Donald Woodruff, President
Fredrickson Academy
Fredrickson, Virginia

National Center for History in the Schools Advisory Board

James Appleby
Department of History
University of California, Los Angeles

Robert Birn
Brooklyn School
Cleveland Heights, Ohio

Jerry H. Brown
Department of History
University of Hawaii

Daniel Berman
Putnam High School
Rosedale, New York

Linda Black
Hollins High School
Hollins, Texas

Douglas Greenberg, President
Chicago Historical Society
Chicago, Illinois

Melinda Hennessy
The Ethical School
La Jolla, California

Linda Heywood
Department of History
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Gary Nash, Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles

Evelyn Hu-DeHart
Ethnic Studies and Asian American History
University of Colorado

Dona Rogers-Booth
Clayton High School
Clayton, Missouri

Gloria Suso
Hill House High School
East Falls, New York

Donald Woodruff
Baltimore, Maryland

Judith P. Zimmer
Department of History
Miami University
National Forum for History Standards

Sara Shoob
National Association of Elementary School Principals
Keith Geiger
National Education Association
George Nielsen
Lutheran Schools

Kathy Belcher
National Congress of Parents and Teachers
Ivan Gluckman
National Association of Secondary School Principals
Charles N. Qualley
Center for Civic Education

Nguyen Minh Chau
National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education
Ruth Granados
Council of the Great City Schools
Christopher Salter
National Council for Geographic Education

Grear Collantes
League of United Latin American Citizens
Joyce McCay
Council for American Private Education
Adelaide Sanford
National Association of State Boards of Education

Marc Curtis
The Atlantic Council of the United States
St. Catherine T. McNamara
National Catholic Educational Association
Ruth Tore
American Association of School Librarians

Glen Caffey
National Education Association
Patricia Gooden Michael
American Association for State and Local History
Clifford Traylor
Native American Heritage Commission

Graham Down
Council for Basic Education
Mabel Lake Murray
National Alliance of Black School Educators
Yuri T. Traut
National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education

Chester Finn
Educational Excellence Network
Cynthia Neverdon-Morrison
Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History
Ruth Warrenburg
American Federation of Teachers

Mary Fassell
Quality Education for Minorities Network

Council of Chief State School Officers
Focus Group

Sue Rensky
California Department of Education
Alan D. Morgan
New Mexico State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Pasquale DeVito
Rhode Island Department of Education
Wayne Neuburger
Oregon Department of Education

Patricia Day, History/Social Studies Consultant
Charles Peters
Oakland Schools, Waterford, Michigan

Plymouth, Massachusetts
Thomas Sobol
New York Commissioner of Education

Mary Fornay
Indiana Department of Education
Robert H. Summersville

Constance Miller Matter
Alabama Department of Education
Maine Department of Education

Staff
Fred Currin, Consultant in International Education, Social Studies and Interdisciplinary Learning

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Focus Group

Glen Blankenship, Social Studies Coordinator
Alan Hall, Teacher

Georgia State Department of Education
Chairman, Social Studies Department
Atlanta, Georgia
Yarmouth High School

Joyce Coffey, Teacher
Yarmouth, Massachusetts

Durham Senior High School
Erich Marnel, Teacher
District 1, Baltmore, Maryland

Shirl Brooksmith, Teacher
Willie Senior High School
Charlottesville, North Carolina
Washington, D.C.

Glen, Teacher
Marilyn McKeough, Teacher
Arroyo Grande High School
Forest Home School

Arroyo Grande, California
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Staff
Karen Steinhilbrick, Assistant Executive Director
Mike Radov, Teacher

Bucks County Intermediate Unit
Tops Middle School

Dekalb, Pennsylvania
Seattle, Washington

Karen beers, Deputy Executive Director
Brian Curry, Policy Analyst

Staff
National Council for the Social Studies
Focus Group

Linda Levstik, Professor of Education
University of Kentucky

Josee Brener, Teacher
King Philip Regional High School
Fosterborough, Massachusetts

Jean Quay, Director, Coordinator/Arkansas State University
Albuquerque Public Schools District
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Mathew Davenyn, Professor of Education
University of California, Berkeley

Rachel Hicks, Teacher
Jefferson Junior High School
Washington, D.C.

Jack Lanen, Coordinator of Secondary
Social Studies, Department of History
Indian University of Pennsylvania

Terry Lindquist, Teacher
Lakeview Elementary
Mettert, Washington

Danny Schillings, Teacher
Homestead Foreign High School
Flaxmore, Illinois

Judith S. Wizenor, Assistant Superintendent
Bethlehem Central Schools
East Matt, New York

Ruben Zepeda, Teacher
Great High School
Van Nuys, California

Council of State Social Studies Specialists
Focus Group

Norman Abramsitz, New York
Margaret ( Peg) Allof, Maryland
Wendy Bonnita, South Dakota
Patricia Boyd, Nevada
Diane Brooks, California
Harvey B. Carmichael, Virginia
John M. Chapman, Michigan
Nidj Clayton, Kentucky
Pat Conneman, New Mexico
Edward T. Costa, Rhode Island
Thomas Douthan, Florida
Patricia Dye, Massachusetts
John D. Hiltong, North Carolina
Curt Ehrman, North Dakota
Mary Forney, Indiana
Rita Gogen, Oklahoma
David W. Gross, Connecticut

Carrie B. Hart, Jr., New Hampshire
H. Michael Harrison, Wisconsin
Lewie E. Heflin, Delaware
Barbara Jones, West Virginia
Sharon Kush, Hawaii
Mary Jean Katz, Oregon
Marjorie Kenney, Colorado
Judith Kightman, Wyoming
Frank Klibiki, Arizona
John LeFever, Nebraska
Richard L. Laphot, Kansas
Connie Miller Matter, Maine
Nancy M. Mathew, Utah
Nanette McGee, Georgia
Marjorie Munti, Alaska
William Miller, Louisiana
Kurt J. Minor, Ohio

John A. Nelson, Vermont
Bruce Opt, Tennessee
Linda Vroman, Pennsylvania
Barbara Perry, Arkansas
Ana Picker, Illinois
Jean Prentiss, Mississippi
Orrville Reddinron, Maine
Michael Ryan, New Jersey
Warren Solomon, Missouri
Larry Stremlond, Washington
Robert R. Swensville, Alabama
Coelho Sudel, Iowa
Elinor E. Tyner, Texas
Margaret B. White, South Carolina
Roger Wingerv, Minnesota
James J. Wozner, Pennsylvania

Organization of American Historians
Focus Group

Joyce Appleby, Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles

Earl Bell, Teacher
The Laboratory Schools
University of Chicago

Alan Brubaker, Professor of History
Columbia University

George Burson, Teacher
Aspen High School
Aspen, Colorado

Albert Camerillo, Professor of History
Stanford University

William H. Chafe, Professor of History
Duke University

Christine L. Compton, Director
National History Education Network

Eric Foster, Professor of History
Columbia University

Mary A. Giunta
National Historical Publications and Records Commission

Scott L. Greenwell, Principal
North Layson Junior High
Layton, Utah

David C. Hammers, Professor of History
Case Western Reserve University

Louis Harman, Professor of History
University of Maryland, College Park

George Henry, Jr., Teacher
Highland High School
Salt Lake City, Utah

Marlmony Jo Heinrich, Teacher
Air Ridge High School
Denver, Colorado

Michael R. Kammin, Professor of History
Cornell University

Hannah J. Kaye, Rosenberg Professor of Social Change and Development
University of Wisconsin, Green Bay

Kenshea C. Keat, Teacher
Niagara High School

Glendale, Wisconsin

Lawrence W. Levine, Professor of History
University of California, Berkeley

William J. McCracken, Teacher
Pine View School
Sarasota, Florida

Lyman D. Oldham, Professor of Education
University of New Mexico

Patricia Perry, Teacher
Apollo High School
Carlsbad, Arizona

John Powers, Humanities Supervisor
West Milford High School
West Milford, New Jersey

Eric Rothchild, Teacher
Scarsdale High School
Scarsdale, New York

Peter Seixas, Professor of Social and Educational Studies
University of British Columbia

Glenna Seser, Teacher
Hall High School East
Dover, New York

George Seresky, Professor
Delaware Community College
Poughkeepsie, New York
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Steven Ted, Teacher
Berkeley High School
Hercules, California

Sanford F. Vanhaelen, Professor of History
Wayne State University

David Viglione, Teacher Emeritus
Gompers Secondary School
San Diego, California

Bertram Wyman-Brown, Professor of History
University of Florida

Deborah White, Professor of History
Rutgers University

Michi Yamazaki, Teacher
Chaminade University of Honolulu
Kaneohe, Hawaii

Charles Anthony Zappia, Professor of History
San Diego Mesa College

Staff

Araita A. Jones, OAH Executive Director

American Historical Association
U.S. History Focus Group

Louis Harlan, Professor of History
University of Maryland, College Park

James G. Horton, Professor of History
George Washington University

Thomas C. Holt, Professor of History
University of Chicago

David Katzman, Professor of History
University of Kansas

Les Lee Morton, Teacher
Riverdale Elementary School
Alexandria, Virginia

Howard Short, Teacher
Columbus River High School
Vancouver, Washington

Kathedra Anderson Stoves, Professor of Teacher Preparation
George Washington University

Staff

James B. Gardner, Acting Executive Director

Noralee Frankel, Assistant Director on Women and Minorities

Robert B. Townsend, Managing Editor

American Historical Association
World History Focus Group

Joseph C. Miller, Professor of History
University of Virginia

Colin Palmer, Professor of History
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Howard Spodek, Professor of History
Temple University

Julia Stewart Werner, Teacher
Nicasio High School
Nicasio, Wisconsin

Judith P. Zinsser, Assistant Professor of History
Miami University

Staff

James B. Gardner, Acting Executive Director

Noralee Frankel, Assistant Director on Women and Minorities

Robert B. Townsend, Managing Editor

National Council for History Education
U.S. History Focus Group

Douglas Greenberg, Chair, 1994
Director, Chicago Historical Society

James Haggard, Principal
Irving Elementary School
Beaverton, Oregon

Miriam U. Chirman, Professor of History Emeritus
University of Massachusetts

Robert D. Cross, Professor of History
University of Virginia

Carl L. Degler, Professor of History
St Andrews University

Paul H. Faggetta, Jr, Professor of History
Arkansas State University

Barry R. Franks, Social Studies Dept. Chairperson
Maple Heights High School
Maple Heights, Ohio

David A. Hendricks, Teacher
Tempe School District
Tempe, Arizona

Ann N. Greene, Teacher
National Cathedral School for Girls
Washington, D.C.

Larry A. Greene, Chairman
Department of History
Seneca High School

Michael S. Henry, Teacher
Jennie High School
Jennies, Maryland

Bryan Hollinshead, Chair, 1993
Publisher/Chairman
American Historical Publications
New York, New York

Diane N. Johnson, Teacher
Anna Amundson County Schools
Arnold, Maryland

Henry G. Kinnan, Director of Curriculum
West Morris Regional High School
Chester, New Jersey

Melissa Kirkpatrick, Information and Research Consultant
Cassandra Associates
Richmond, Virginia
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Josef W. Konvitz, Chair, 1992
Professor of History
Michigan State University

Donald Lakiewicz, Education Consultant
Windemere, Florida

Joel Linnan, Teacher
Mansfield High School
Oakdale, Connecticut

Kurt E. Lechle, Professor of History
University of Wisconsin, River Falls

Arthur S. Link, Professor of History Emeritus
Princeton University

Anna M. Margolis, Head, History Department
The Bryn Mawr School
Bryn Mawr, Maryland

Susan Morea, Education Consultant
BIPACTI
Summerville, South Carolina

Edmund S. Morgan, Professor of History Emeritus
Yale University

Mary Beth Norton, Professor of History
Cornell University

Paul H. Pangrac, Teacher
Garrett Morgan School of Science
Cleveland, Ohio

Theodore C. Parker
Writer/Educator Specialist
Camarillo, California

Kathryn Rish Stier, Professor of History
University of Binghamton

Peg Kilmartin Smith, Teacher
St. John's School
Anoka, Minnesota

Shadalyn Stern, Historian
John F. Kennedy Library
Boston, Massachusetts

Jo Sullivan, Principal
Federal Street School
Salem, Massachusetts

Robert H. Summerville, Social Studies Specialist
Alabama Department of Education

Susan Taylor, Teacher
Withrow School
Cincinnati, Ohio

William L. Taylor, Professor of Social Science
Plymouth State College

Stephan Thornstrom, Professor of History
Harvard University

Carl Umbreit, Professor Emeritus
Case Western Reserve University

W. Jeffrey Walsh, Professor of History
Bowling Green State University, Findlay

James Williamson, Director
Deed Bok Center
Harvard University

Peter H. Wood, Professor of History
Duke University

Staff
Elaine Reed, Executive Secretary

National Council for History Education
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Thomas A. Bisson
Professor of History
Harvard University

Philip Cantor, Chair, 1994
Professor of History
The Johns Hopkins University

Jerry H. Bentley, Editor
Journal of World History
University of Hawaii

Mary Bicouvaris
Associate Professor of Education
Christopher Newport University

Marjorie Birmingham
St. Louis Park High School
Minnetonka, Minnesota

Hank Biren, Teacher
Ramapo High School
Franklin Lakes, New Jersey

Jane Christ, Assistant Director for Education
Connecticut Humanities Council
Middletown, Connecticut

Marie Cleary, Fire College Associate
Fire Colleges Inc.
Amherst, Massachusetts

Timothy Connell, Teacher
Laurel School
Shaker Heights, Ohio

James A. Dinkin, Researcher
Primary Source, Inc.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Susan Douglas, Humanities Coordinator
Tomskville High School
Staten Island, New York

Paul Feld, Curriculum Specialist
Cincinnati Public Schools
Cincinnati, Ohio

Darlene F. Fisher, Teacher
New Trier High School
Evanston, Illinois

Clarett Hagar, Teacher
Hawaii Preparatory Academy
Kamuela, Hawaii

Blythe Hinch, Professor of Education
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey

John D. Hogg, Professor of Education
University of Georgia

David Hinton, Teacher
Laurel School
Cleveland Heights, Ohio

Patricia M. Koplar, Teacher
Milford High School
Milford, Massachusetts

Henry G. Kieron, Director of Curriculum
West Morris Regional High School District
Chester, New Jersey

Jared W. Konvitz, Chair, 1992
Professor of History
Michigan State University

Frederick W. Pfister, Teacher
Canfield Kingwood School
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Theodore K. Ralph, Professor of History
Princeton University

Gary Regan, Teacher
Unity Christian High School
Orange City, Iowa

Linda K. Suvaci
Department of History
Trinity University

Robert J. Steiner, Academic Dean
The Mountair Kimberley Academy
Monrovia, New Jersey

Richard E. Smith, Teacher
East Corinth Elementary School
Corinna, Mississippi

Lawrence A. Spalla, Teacher
Trenty High School
Washington, Pennsylvania

Michael F. Staniunas, Professor of History
Columbia University

Sandra Stewart, Teacher
Hawaii Preparatory Academy
Kamuela, Hawaii
## Organization of History Teachers
### U.S. History Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School/University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Tyler, Chair</td>
<td>Groton School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groton, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl P. Beal, Teacher</td>
<td>The Laboratory Schools, University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Beeler, Teacher</td>
<td>Santa Fe Preparatory School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Buchheim, Teacher</td>
<td>Dunbar High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunbar, Pittsburgh, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom English, Teacher</td>
<td>The George School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newtown, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Gesner, Teacher</td>
<td>Sousa Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Washington, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Goddy, Teacher</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Milford, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Horton, Teacher</td>
<td>The Laboratory Schools, University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Meadows, Teacher</td>
<td>Wilson Magnet School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Payne, Humanities Supervisor</td>
<td>West Milford High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Milford, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## World History Association
### Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School/University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gough, Professor of History</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William B. Jones, Professor of History</td>
<td>Southwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Johnson, Professor of History</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Marmorek, Teacher</td>
<td>Castlerock School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palo Alto, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia O'Neill, Department of History</td>
<td>Central Oregon Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bend, Oregon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Council for Basic Education Review Panels
### World History Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Mulier, Chair</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Ainger, Head of Humanities</td>
<td>U.S. International School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rain, Social Studies Teacher</td>
<td>Cleveland Heights, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Blakely, Professor of European and Comparative History</td>
<td>Howard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Lee Blitch, Regional Vice President-Southwest</td>
<td>AT&amp;T, Dallas, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip D. Curtis, Herbert Blumberg Professor of History</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasenjit Datta, Professor of History</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael F. Jimenez, Assistant Professor of History</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey MacMullen, Professor of History (Emeritus)</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janis Malley, Independent Scholar</td>
<td>Bessemer, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Wallach Scott, Professor of Social Science</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chevelli, Professor of History</td>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council for Basic Education Review Panels
U.S. History Panel

The Honorable Albert Ossio, Chair
Governor, State of Minnesota, 1979-83
Member of U.S. Congress, 1938-1978

Cary Carson
Vice President for Research
Colonial Williamsburg Foundation

Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham
Professor of Afro-American Studies and
African-American Religion
Harvard University

David Hollinger
Professor of History
University of California, Berkeley

Jouette LaFosse
Social Studies Teacher
Carlisle High School
Belmont, California

Diane Ravitch
Senior Research Scholar and
Adjunct Professor of Education
New York University

Rex Shepard
Supervisor, Office of Social Studies
Baltimore Co. Public Schools

Stephan Thernstrom
Professor of History
Harvard University

Rudl Urdal
Assistant Professor of History
Tufts University

Maris A. Vinovskis
Professor of History
University of Michigan
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Standards in History for Grades K-4

Overview

Topic 1: Living and Working Together in Families and Communities, Now and Long Ago
Standard 1: Family Life Now and in the Recent Past; Family Life in Various Places Long Ago
Standard 2: History of Students’ Local Community and How Communities in North America Varied Long Ago

Topic 2: The History of the Students’ Own State or Region
Standard 3: The People, Events, Problems, and Ideas that Created the History of Their State

Topic 3: The History of the United States: Democratic Principles and Values and the Peoples from Many Cultures Who Contributed to Its Cultural, Economic and Political Heritage
Standard 4: How Democratic Values Came to Be, and How They Have Been Exemplified by People, Events, and Symbols
Standard 5: The Causes and Nature of Various Movements of Large Groups of People into and within the United States, Now and Long Ago
Standard 6: Regional Folklore and Cultural Contributions That Helped to Form Our National Heritage

Topic 4: The History of Peoples of Many Cultures around the World
Standard 7: Selected Attributes and Historical Developments of Various Societies in Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Europe
Standard 8: Major Discoveries in Science and Technology, Their Social and Economic Effects, and the Scientists and Inventors Responsible for Them
Chapter 3

United States History Standards for Grades 5-12

Overview

Era 1: Three Worlds Meet (Beginnings to 1620)

Standard 1: Comparative characteristics of societies in the Americas, Western Europe, and Western Africa that increasingly interacted after 1450

Standard 2: How early European exploration and colonization resulted in cultural and ecological interactions among previously unconnected peoples

Era 2: Colonization and Settlement (1585-1763)

Standard 1: Why the Americas attracted Europeans, why they brought enslaved Africans to their colonies, and how Europeans struggled for control of North America and the Caribbean

Standard 2: How political, religious, and social institutions emerged in the English colonies

Standard 3: How the values and institutions of European economic life took root in the colonies, and how slavery reshaped European and African life in the Americas

Era 3: Revolution and the New Nation (1754-1820s)

Standard 1: The causes of the American Revolution, the ideas and interests involved in forging the revolutionary movement, and the reasons for the American victory

Standard 2: The impact of the American Revolution on politics, economy, and society

Standard 3: The institutions and practices of government created during the Revolution and how they were revised between 1787 and 1815 to create the foundation of the American political system based on the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights
Era 4: Expansion and Reform (1801-1861)

Standard 1: United States territorial expansion between 1801 and 1861, and how it affected relations with external powers and Native Americans

Standard 2: How the industrial revolution, increasing immigration, the rapid expansion of slavery, and the westward movement changed the lives of Americans and led toward regional tensions

Standard 3: The extension, restriction, and reorganization of political democracy after 1800

Standard 4: The sources and character of cultural, religious, and social reform movements in the antebellum period

Era 5: Civil War and Reconstruction (1850-1877)

Standard 1: The causes of the Civil War

Standard 2: The course and character of the Civil War and its effects on the American people

Standard 3: How various reconstruction plans succeeded or failed

Era 6: The Development of the Industrial United States (1870-1900)

Standard 1: How the rise of corporations, heavy industry, and mechanized farming transformed the American people

Standard 2: Massive immigration after 1870 and how new social patterns, conflicts, and ideas of national unity developed amid growing cultural diversity

Standard 3: The rise of the American labor movement and how political issues reflected social and economic changes

Standard 4: Federal Indian policy and United States foreign policy after the Civil War

Era 7: The Emergence of Modern America (1890-1930)

Standard 1: How Progressives and others addressed problems of industrial capitalism, urbanization, and political corruption

Standard 2: The changing role of the United States in world affairs through World War I

Standard 3: How the United States changed from the end of World War I to the eve of the Great Depression

Era 8: The Great Depression and World War II (1929-1945)

Standard 1: The causes of the Great Depression and how it affected American society

Standard 2: How the New Deal addressed the Great Depression, transformed American federalism, and initiated the welfare state
Standard 3: The causes and course of World War II, the character of the war at home and abroad, and its reshaping of the U.S. role in world affairs

**Era 9: Postwar United States (1945 to early 1970s)**

Standard 1: The economic boom and social transformation of postwar United States

Standard 2: How the Cold War and conflicts in Korea and Vietnam influenced domestic and international politics

Standard 3: Domestic policies after World War II

Standard 4: The struggle for racial and gender equality and the extension of civil liberties

**Era 10: Contemporary United States (1968 to the present)**

Standard 1: Recent developments in foreign and domestic politics

Standard 2: Economic, social, and cultural developments in contemporary United States
World History Standards for Grades 5-12

Approaches to World History

Era 1: The Beginnings of Human Society

Standard 1: The biological and cultural processes that gave rise to the earliest human communities

Standard 2: The processes that led to the emergence of agricultural societies around the world

Era 2: Early Civilizations and the Emergence of Pastoral Peoples, 4000-1000 BCE

Standard 1: The major characteristics of civilization and how civilizations emerged in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the Indus valley

Standard 2: How agrarian societies spread and new states emerged in the third and second millennia BCE
Standard 3: The political, social, and cultural consequences of population movements and militarization in Eurasia in the second millennium BCE

Standard 4: Major trends in Eurasia and Africa from 4000-1000 BCE

**Era 3: Classical Traditions, Major Religions, and Giant Empires, 1000 BCE-300 CE**

Standard 1: Innovation and change from 1000-600 BCE: horses, ships, iron, and monotheistic faith

Standard 2: The emergence of Aegean civilization and how interrelations developed among peoples of the eastern Mediterranean and Southwest Asia, 600-200 BCE

Standard 3: How major religions and large-scale empires arose in the Mediterranean basin, China, and India, 500 BCE-300 CE

Standard 4: The development of early agrarian civilizations in Mesoamerica

Standard 5: Major global trends from 1000 BCE-300 CE

**Era 4: Expanding Zones of Exchange and Encounter, 300-1000 CE**

Standard 1: Imperial crises and their aftermath, 300-700 CE

Standard 2: Causes and consequences of the rise of Islamic civilization in the 7th-10th centuries

Standard 3: Major developments in East Asia and Southeast Asia in the era of the Tang dynasty, 600-900 CE

Standard 4: The search for political, social, and cultural redefinition in Europe, 500-1000 CE

Standard 5: The development of agricultural societies and new states in tropical Africa and Oceania

Standard 6: The rise of centers of civilization in Mesoamerica and Andean South America in the first millennium CE

Standard 7: Major global trends from 300-1000 CE

**Era 5: Intensified Hemispheric Interactions, 1000-1500 CE**

Standard 1: The maturing of an interregional system of communication, trade, and cultural exchange in an era of Chinese economic power and Islamic expansion
Standard 2: The redefining of European society and culture, 1000-1300 CE

Standard 3: The rise of the Mongol empire and its consequences for Eurasian peoples, 1200-1350

Standard 4: The growth of states, towns, and trade in Sub-Saharan Africa between the 11th and 15th centuries

Standard 5: Patterns of crisis and recovery in Afro-Eurasia, 1300-1450

Standard 6: The expansion of states and civilizations in the Americas, 1000-1500

Standard 7: Major global trends from 1000-1500 CE

**Era 6: The Emergence of the First Global Age, 1450-1770**

Standard 1: How the transoceanic interlinking of all major regions of the world from 1450-1600 led to global transformations

Standard 2: How European society experienced political, economic, and cultural transformations in an age of global intercommunication, 1450-1750

Standard 3: How large territorial empires dominated much of Eurasia between the 16th and 18th centuries

Standard 4: Economic, political, and cultural interrelations among peoples of Africa, Europe, and the Americas, 1500-1750

Standard 5: Transformations in Asian societies in the era of European expansion

Standard 6: Major global trends from 1450-1770

**Era 7: An Age of Revolutions, 1750-1914**

Standard 1: The causes and consequences of political revolutions in the late 18th and early 19th centuries

Standard 2: The causes and consequences of the agricultural and industrial revolutions, 1700-1850

Standard 3: The transformation of Eurasian societies in an era of global trade and rising European power, 1750-1870

Standard 4: Patterns of nationalism, state-building, and social reform in Europe and the Americas, 1830-1914

Standard 5: Patterns of global change in the era of Western military and economic domination, 1800-1914
National Standards for World History (5-12)

Standard 6: Major global trends from 1750-1914

Era 8: A Half-Century of Crisis and Achievement, 1900-1945

Standard 1: Reform, revolution, and social change in the world economy of the early century
Standard 2: The causes and global consequences of World War I
Standard 3: The search for peace and stability in the 1920s and 1930s
Standard 4: The causes and global consequences of World War II
Standard 5: Major global trends from 1900 to the end of World War II

Era 9: The 20th Century Since 1945: Promises and Paradoxes

Standard 1: How post-World War II reconstruction occurred, new international power relations took shape, and colonial empires broke up
Standard 2: The search for community, stability, and peace in an interdependent world
Standard 3: Major global trends since World War II

World History Across the Eras

Standard 1: Long-term changes and recurring patterns in world history

In curricula terminology, this illustration is known as “unpacking the standards.” In this illustration, the national history standards are delineated by their function. The standard (standard 1) serves as a specific focus of content in history; the standard component in boldface further clarifies the standard; the numerical citations are for appropriate grade levels (what students should know and be able to do); and the elaborated standards describe the performance expectations for the students and the critical thinking skills (Habits of Mind) are parenthetically boldfaced. The same elements and format were used for both the ISBE standards and the CAS of the CPS. [National Standards for History, Basic Edition, (1996), 85.]
STATE GOAL 14: Understand political systems, with an emphasis on the United States.

Why This Goal is Important: The existence and advancement of a free society depend on the knowledge, skills and understanding of its citizenry. Through the study of various forms and levels of government and the documents and institutions of the United States, students will develop the skills and knowledge that they need to be contributing citizens, now and in the future.

A. Understand and explain basic principles of the United States government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.A.1 Describe the fundamental principles of government including representative government, government of law, individual rights and the common good.</td>
<td>14.A.2 Explain the importance of fundamental concepts expressed and implied in major documents including the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and the Illinois Constitution.</td>
<td>14.A.3 Describe how responsibilities are shared and limited by the United States and Illinois Constitutions and significant court decisions.</td>
<td>14.A.4 Analyze how local, state and national governments serve the purposes for which they were created.</td>
<td>4.A.5 Analyze ways in which federalism protects individual rights and promotes the common good and how at times has made it possible for states to protect and deny rights for certain groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Understand the structures and functions of the political systems of Illinois, the United States and other nations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.B.1 Identify the different levels of government as local, state and national.</td>
<td>14.B.2 Explain what government does at local, state and national levels.</td>
<td>14.B.3 Identify and compare the basic political systems of Illinois and the United States as prescribed in their constitutions.</td>
<td>14.B.4 Compare the political systems of the United States to other nations.</td>
<td>14.B.5 Analyze similarities and differences among world political systems (e.g., democracy, socialism, communism).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Understand election processes and responsibilities of citizens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.C.1 Identify concepts of responsible citizenship including respect for the law, patriotism, civility and working with others.</td>
<td>14.C.2 Describe and evaluate why rights and responsibilities are important to the individual, family, community, workplace, state and nation (e.g., voting, protection under the law).</td>
<td>14.C.3 Compare historical issues involving rights, roles and status of individuals in relation to municipalities, states and the nation.</td>
<td>14.C.4 Describe the meaning of participatory citizenship (e.g., volunteering, voting) at all levels of government and society in the United States.</td>
<td>14.C.5 Analyze the consequences of participation and non-participation in the electoral process (e.g., women's suffrage, voter registration, effects of media).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Understand the roles and influences of individuals and interest groups in the political systems of Illinois, the United States and other nations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.D.1 Identify the roles of civic leaders (e.g., elected leaders, public service leaders)</td>
<td>14.D.2 Explain ways that individuals and groups influence and shape public policy.</td>
<td>14.D.3 Describe roles and influences of individuals, groups and media in shaping current Illinois and United States public policy (e.g., general public opinion, special interest groups, formal parties, media).</td>
<td>14.D.4 Analyze roles and influences of individuals, groups and media in shaping current debates on state and national policies.</td>
<td>14.D.5 Interpret a variety of public policies and issues from the perspectives of different individuals and groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Understand United States foreign policy as it relates to other nations and international issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.E.1 Identify relationships that the federal government establishes with other nations.</td>
<td>14.E.2 Determine and explain the leadership role of the United States in international settings.</td>
<td>14.E.3 Compare the basic principles of the United States and its international interests (e.g., territory, environment, trade, use of technology).</td>
<td>14.E.4 Analyze historical trends of United States foreign policy (e.g., emergence as a world leader – military, industrial, financial).</td>
<td>14.E.5 Analyze relationships and tensions among members of the international community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Understand the development of United States political ideas and traditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.F.1 Describe political ideas and traditions important to the development of the United States including democracy, individual rights and the concept of freedom.</td>
<td>14.F.2 Identify consistencies and inconsistencies between expressed United States political traditions and ideas and actual practices (e.g., freedom of speech, right to bear arms, slavery, voting rights).</td>
<td>14.F.3a Analyze historical influences on the development of political ideas and practices as enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the Illinois Constitution</td>
<td>14.F.4a Determine the historical events and processes that brought about changes in United States political ideas and traditions (e.g., the New Deal, Civil War).</td>
<td>14.F.5 Interpret how changing geographical, economic, technological and social forces affect United States political ideas and traditions (e.g., freedom, equality and justice, individual rights).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.F.3b Describe how United States political ideas and traditions were instituted in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.F.4b Describe how United States political ideas, practices and technologies have extended rights for Americans in the 20th century (e.g., suffrage, civil rights, voter registration).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE GOAL 15: Understand economic systems, with an emphasis on the United States.

Why This Goal is Important: Why This Goal is Important: People’s lives are directly affected by the economies of cities, states, nations and the world. All people engage in economic activity: buying, selling, trading, producing and consuming. By understanding economic systems—and how economics blends with other social sciences, students will be able to make more informed choices, prudently use resources and function as effective participants in the economies around them.

A. Understand how different economic systems operate in the exchange, production, distribution and consumption of goods and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.A.1a Identify advantages and disadvantages of different ways to distribute goods and services.</td>
<td>15.A.2a Explain how economic systems decide what goods and services are produced, how they are produced and who consumes them.</td>
<td>15.A.3a Explain how market prices signal to producers what, how and how much to produce.</td>
<td>15.A.4a Explain how national economies vary in the extent that government and private markets help allocate goods, services and resources.</td>
<td>15.A.5a Explain the impact of various determinants of economic growth (e.g., investments in human/physical capital, research and development, technological change) on the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.A.1b Describe how wages/salaries can be earned in exchange for work.</td>
<td>15.A.2b Describe how incomes reflect choices made about education and careers.</td>
<td>15.A.3b Explain the relationship between productivity and wages.</td>
<td>15.A.4b Describe Gross Domestic Product (GDP).</td>
<td>15.A.5b Analyze the impact of economic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.A.2c Describe unemployment.</td>
<td>15.A.3c Describe the relationship between consumer purchases and businesses paying for productive resources.</td>
<td>15.A.4c Analyze the impact of inflation on an individual and the economy as a whole.</td>
<td>15.A.5c Analyze the impact of various determinants on the levels of GDP (e.g., quantity/quality of natural/capital resources, size/skills of the labor force).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.A.3d Describe the causes of unemployment (e.g., seasonal fluctuation in demand, changing jobs, changing skill requirements, national spending).</td>
<td>15.A.4d Explain the affects of unemployment on the economy.</td>
<td>15.A.5d Explain the comparative value of the Consumer Price Index (e.g., goods and services in one year with earlier or later periods).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Understand that scarcity necessitates choices by consumers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.B.1 Explain why consumers must make choices.</td>
<td>15.B.2a Identify factors that affect how consumers make their choices.</td>
<td>15.B.3a Describe the &quot;market clearing price&quot; of a good or service.</td>
<td>15.B.4a Explain the costs and benefits of making consumer purchases through differing means (e.g., credit, cash).</td>
<td>15.B.5a Analyze the impact of changes in non-price determinants (e.g., changes in consumer income, changes in tastes and preferences) on consumer demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>LATE ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.B.2b Explain the relationship between the quantity of goods/services purchased and their price.</td>
<td>15.B.3b Explain the effects of choice and competition on individuals and the economy as a whole.</td>
<td>15.B.4b Analyze the impact of current events (e.g., weather/natural disasters, wars) on consumer prices.</td>
<td>15.B.5b Analyze how inflation and interest rates affect consumer purchasing power.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.B.2c Explain that when a choice is made, something else is given up.</td>
<td>15.B.2c Describe how human, natural and capital resources are used to produce goods and services.</td>
<td>15.B.2a Identify and explain the relationship between price and quantity supplied of a good or service.</td>
<td>15.C.3a Identify and explain the effects of various incentives to produce a good or service.</td>
<td>15.C.5a Explain how competition is maintained in the United States economy and how the level of competition varies in different market structures (e.g., monopoly, oligopoly, monopolistic and perfect competition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.C.1b Identify limitations in resources that force producers to make choices about what to produce.</td>
<td>15.C.2b Identify and explain examples of competition in the economy.</td>
<td>15.C.4a Analyze the impact of political actions and natural phenomena (e.g., wars, legislation, natural disasters) on producers and production decisions.</td>
<td>15.C.4b Explain the importance of research, development, invention, technology and entrepreneurship to the United States economy.</td>
<td>15.C.5b Explain how changes in non-price determinants of supply (e.g., number of producers) affect producer decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.C.2c Describe how entrepreneurs take risks in order to produce goods or services.</td>
<td>15.C.2c Describe how entrepreneurs take risks in order to produce goods or services.</td>
<td>15.C.5c Explain how government intervention with market prices can cause shortages or surpluses of a good or service (e.g., minimum wage policies, rent freezes, farm subsidies).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Understand that scarcity necessitates choices by producers.

D. Understand trade as an exchange of goods or services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know that barter is a type of exchange and that money makes exchange easier.</td>
<td>Describe the relationships among specialization, division of labor, productivity of workers and interdependence among producers and consumers.</td>
<td>Explain how comparative advantage forms the basis for specialization and trade among nations.</td>
<td>Describe the relationships between the availability and price of a nation's resources and its comparative advantage in relation to other nations.</td>
<td>Analyze why trade barriers and exchange rates affect the flow of goods and services among nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.D.3c</td>
<td>15.D.4c</td>
<td>15.D.5c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how workers can affect their productivity through training and by using tools, machinery and technology.</td>
<td>Describe the impact of worker productivity (output per worker) on business, the worker and the consumer.</td>
<td>Explain how technology has affected trade in the areas of transportation, communication, finance and manufacturing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Understand the impact of government policies and decisions on production and consumption in the economy.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.E.1a</td>
<td>15.E.2a</td>
<td>15.E.3a</td>
<td>15.E.4a</td>
<td>15.E.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify goods and services provided by government.</td>
<td>Explain how and why public goods and services are provided.</td>
<td>Identify the types of taxes levied by differing levels of governments (e.g., income tax, sales tax, property tax).</td>
<td>Explain why government may intervene in a market economy.</td>
<td>Explain how and why government redistributes income in the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.E.2b</td>
<td>15.E.3b</td>
<td>15.E.4b</td>
<td>15.E.5b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify which public goods and services are provided by differing levels of government.</td>
<td>Explain how laws and government policies (e.g., property rights, contract enforcement, standard weighing/measurement s) establish rules that help a market economy function effectively.</td>
<td>Describe social and environmental benefits and consequences of production and consumption.</td>
<td>Describe how fiscal, monetary and regulatory policies affect overall levels of employment, output and consumption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.E.4c</td>
<td>15.E.5c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the relationship between a country's science/technology policies and its level and balance of trade.</td>
<td>Describe key schools of thought (e.g., classical, Keynesian, monetarist, supply-side) and explain their impact on government policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE GOAL 16: Understand events, trends, individuals and movements shaping the history of Illinois, the United States and other nations.

Why This Goal Is Important: George Santayana said “those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.” In a broader sense, students who can examine and analyze the events of the past have a powerful tool for understanding the events of today and the future. They develop an understanding of how people, nations, actions and interactions have led to today's realities. In the process, they can better define their own roles as participating citizens.

HISTORICAL ERAS

Local, State and United States History (US)
- Early history in the Americas to 1620
- Colonial history and settlement to 1763
- The American Revolution and early national period to 1820s
- National expansion from 1815 to 1850
- The Civil War and Reconstruction from 1850 to 1877
- Development of the industrial United States from 1865 to 1914
- The emergence of the United States as a world power from 1890 to 1920
- Prosperity, depression, the New Deal and World War II from 1920 to 1945
- Post World War II and the Cold War from 1945 to 1968
- Contemporary United States from 1968 to present

World History (W)
- Prehistory to 2000 BCE
- Early civilizations, nonwestern empires, and tropical civilizations
- The rise of pastoral peoples to 1000 BCE
- Classical civilizations from 1000 BCE to 500 CE
- Fragmentation and interaction of civilizations from 500 to 1100 CE
- Centralization of power in different regions from 1000 to 1500 CE
- Early modern world from 1450 to 1800
- Global unrest, change and revolution from 1750 to 1850
- Global encounters and imperialism and their effects from 1850 to 1914
- The twentieth century to 1945
- The contemporary world from 1945 to the present
## Apply the skills of historical analysis and interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.A.1a</strong> Explain the difference between past, present and future time; place themselves in time.</td>
<td><strong>16.A.2a</strong> Read historical stories and determine events which influenced their writing.</td>
<td><strong>16.A.3a</strong> Describe how historians use models for organizing historical interpretation (e.g., biographies, political events, issues and conflicts).</td>
<td><strong>16.A.4a</strong> Analyze and report historical events to determine cause-and-effect relationships.</td>
<td><strong>16.A.5a</strong> Analyze historical and contemporary developments using methods of historical inquiry (pose questions, collect and analyze data, make and support inferences with evidence, report findings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.A.1b</strong> Ask historical questions and seek out answers from historical sources (e.g., myths, biographies, stories, old photographs, artwork, other visual or electronic sources).</td>
<td><strong>16.A.2b</strong> Compare different stories about a historical figure or event and analyze differences in the portrayals and perspectives they present.</td>
<td><strong>16.A.3b</strong> Make inferences about historical events and eras using historical maps and other historical sources.</td>
<td><strong>16.A.4b</strong> Compare competing historical interpretations of an event.</td>
<td><strong>16.A.5b</strong> Explain the tentative nature of historical interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.A.1c</strong> Describe how people in different times and places viewed the world in different ways.</td>
<td><strong>16.A.2c</strong> Ask questions and seek answers by collecting and analyzing data from historic documents, images and other literary and non-literary sources.</td>
<td><strong>16.A.3c</strong> Identify the differences between historical fact and interpretation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Understand the development of significant political events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.B.1a (US) Identify key individuals and events in the development of the local community (e.g., Founders days, names of parks, streets, public buildings).</td>
<td>16.B.2a (US) Describe how the European colonies in North America developed politically.</td>
<td>16.B.3a (US) Describe how different groups competed for power within the colonies and how that competition led to the development of political institutions during the early national period.</td>
<td>16.B.4 (US) Identify political ideas that have dominated United States historical eras (e.g., Federalist, Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, Progressivist, New Deal, New Conservative).</td>
<td>16.B.5a (US) Describe how modern political positions are affected by differences in ideologies and viewpoints that have developed over time (e.g., political parties’ positions on government intervention in the economy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.1b (US) Explain why individuals, groups, issues and events are celebrated with local, state or national holidays or days of recognition (e.g., Lincoln’s Birthday, Martin Luther King’s Birthday, Pulaski Day, Fourth of July, Memorial Day, Labor Day, Veterans’ Day, Thanksgiving).</td>
<td>16.B.2b (US) Identify major causes of the American Revolution and describe the consequences of the Revolution through the early national period, including the roles of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin.</td>
<td>16.B.3b (US) Explain how and why the colonies fought for their independence and how the colonists’ ideas are reflected in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.</td>
<td>16.B.5b (US) Analyze how United States political history has been influenced by the nation’s economic, social and environmental history.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.2c (US)</td>
<td>Identify presidential elections that were pivotal in the formation of modern political parties.</td>
<td>16.B.3c (US)</td>
<td>Describe the way the Constitution has changed over time as a result of amendments and Supreme Court decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.2d (US)</td>
<td>Identify major political events and leaders within the United States historical eras since the adoption of the Constitution, including the westward expansion, Louisiana Purchase, Civil War, and 20th century wars as well as the roles of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.</td>
<td>16.B.3d (US)</td>
<td>Describe ways in which the United States developed as a world political power.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.1 (W)</td>
<td>Explain the contributions of individuals and groups who are featured in biographies, legends, folklore and traditions.</td>
<td>16.B.2a (W)</td>
<td>Describe the historical development of monarchies, oligarchies and city-states in ancient civilizations.</td>
<td>16.B.3a (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.2b (W)</td>
<td>Describe the origins of Western political ideas and institutions (e.g. Greek democracy, Roman republic, Magna Carta and Common Law, the Enlightenment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.3b (W)</td>
<td>Identify causes and effects of the decline of the Roman empire and other major world political events (e.g., rise of the Islamic empire, rise and decline of the T’ang dynasty, establishment of the kingdom of Ghana) between 500 CE and 1500 CE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.4b (W)</td>
<td>Identify political ideas from the early modern historical era to the present which have had worldwide impact (e.g., nationalism/Sun Yat-Sen, non-violence/Ghandi, independence/Kenyatta).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.5b (W)</td>
<td>Describe how tensions in the modern world are affected by different political ideologies including democracy and totalitarianism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.3c (W)</td>
<td>Identify causes and effects of European feudalism and the emergence of nation states between 500 CE and 1500 CE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.5c (W)</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship of an issue in world political history to the related aspects of world economic, social and environmental history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.B.3d (W)</td>
<td>Describe political effects of European exploration and expansion on the Americas, Asia, and Africa after 1500 CE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Understand the development of economic systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.C.1a (US)</td>
<td>Describe how</td>
<td>16.C.2a (US)</td>
<td>16.C.3a (US)</td>
<td>16.C.5a (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>Describe how slavery and</td>
<td>Describe economic</td>
<td>Analyze how and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people in Illinois</td>
<td>indentured servitude</td>
<td>motivations that</td>
<td>why the role of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engaged in</td>
<td>influenced the early</td>
<td>attracted</td>
<td>the United</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>economy of the</td>
<td>Europeans and</td>
<td>States in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities with</td>
<td>United States.</td>
<td>others to the</td>
<td>world economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Americas, 1500-</td>
<td>has changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and traders in</td>
<td></td>
<td>1750.</td>
<td>since World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>War II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Hawk War.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economy of the</td>
<td>Explain how individuals,</td>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Analyze the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students' local</td>
<td>including John</td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community has</td>
<td>Deere, Thomas</td>
<td>among the</td>
<td>between an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changed over</td>
<td>Edison, Robert</td>
<td>American economy</td>
<td>in United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time.</td>
<td>McCormack, George</td>
<td>and slavery,</td>
<td>economic history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Carver and</td>
<td>immigration,</td>
<td>and the related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Ford, contributed</td>
<td>industrialization,</td>
<td>aspects of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to economic change</td>
<td>labor and</td>
<td>political, social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through ideas,</td>
<td>urbanization, 1700-</td>
<td>and environmen-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inventions and</td>
<td>present.</td>
<td>tal history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.C.2c (US)</td>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>16.C.3c (US)</td>
<td>16.C.4c (US)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>Describe how economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>developments and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>events</td>
<td>government policies after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including</td>
<td>1865 affected the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>industrialization,</td>
<td>country’s economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immigration,</td>
<td>institutions including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Great</td>
<td>corporations, banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depression,</td>
<td>and organized labor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the shift to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economy and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the rise of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technology that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>influenced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>history from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development era</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.C.4b (US)</td>
<td>Analyze the</td>
<td>16.C.4b (US)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact of</td>
<td>Analyze the impact of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>westward</td>
<td>westward expansion on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expansion on</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the United</td>
<td>economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.C.5b (US)</td>
<td>Analyze the</td>
<td>16.C.5b (US)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between an</td>
<td>between an issue in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issue in United</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States economic</td>
<td>economic history and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>history and</td>
<td>related aspects of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the related</td>
<td>political, social and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aspects of</td>
<td>environmental history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>political,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.1a (W)</strong></td>
<td>Identify how people and groups in the past made economic choices (e.g., crops to plant, products to make, products to trade) to survive and improve their lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.2a (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe the economic consequences of the first agricultural revolution, 4000 BCE-1000 BCE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.3a (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe major economic trends from 1000 to 1500 CE including long distance trade, banking, specialization of labor, commercialization, urbanization and technological and scientific progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.4a (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe the growing dominance of American and European capitalism and their institutions after 1500.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.5a (W)</strong></td>
<td>Explain how industrial capitalism became the dominant economic model in the world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.1b (W)</strong></td>
<td>Explain how trade among people brought an exchange of ideas, technology and language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.2b (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe the basic economic systems of the world’s great civilizations including Mesopotamia, Egypt, Aegean/Mediterranean and Asian civilizations, 1000 BCE - 500 CE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.3b (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe the economic systems and trade patterns of North America, South America and Mesoamerica before the encounter with the Europeans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.4b (W)</strong></td>
<td>Compare socialism and communism in Europe, America, Asia and Africa after 1815 CE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.5b (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe how historical trends in population, urbanization, economic development and technological advancements have caused change in world economic systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.2c (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe basic economic changes that led to and resulted from the manorial agricultural system, the industrial revolution, the rise of the capitalism and the information/communnication revolution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.3c (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe the impact of technology (e.g., weaponry, transportation, printing press, microchips) in different parts of the world, 1500 - present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.4c (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe the impact of key individuals/ideas from 1500 - present, including Adam Smith, Karl Marx and John Maynard Keynes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.5c (W)</strong></td>
<td>Analyze the relationship between an issue in world economic history and the related aspects of political, social and environmental history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.C.4d (W)</strong></td>
<td>Describe how the maturing economies of Western Europe and Japan led to colonialism and imperialism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**D. Understand Illinois, United States and world social history.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe key figures and organizations (e.g., fraternal/civic organizations, public service groups, community leaders) in the social history of the local community.</td>
<td>Describe the various individual motives for settling in colonial America.</td>
<td>Describe characteristics of different kinds of communities in various sections of America during the colonial/frontier periods and the 19th century.</td>
<td>Describe the immediate and long-range social impacts of slavery.</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship between an issue in United States social history and the related aspects of political, economic and environmental history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the ways in which participation in the westward movement affected families and communities.</td>
<td>Describe characteristics of different kinds of families in America during the colonial/frontier periods and the 19th century.</td>
<td>Describe unintended social consequences of political events in United States history (e.g., Civil War/emancipation, National Defense Highway Act/decline of inner cities, Vietnam War/anti-government activity).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.D.2c (US)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the influence of key individuals and groups, including Susan B. Anthony/suffrage and Martin Luther King, Jr./civil rights, in the historical eras of Illinois and the United States.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.D.1 (W)</td>
<td>Identify how customs and traditions from around the world influence the local community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.D.2 (W)</td>
<td>Describe the various roles of men, women and children in the family, at work, and in the community in various time periods and places (e.g., ancient Rome, Medieval Europe, ancient China, Sub-Saharan Africa).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.D.3 (W)</td>
<td>Identify the origins and analyze consequences of events that have shaped world social history including famines, migrations, plagues, slave trading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.D.4 (W)</td>
<td>Identify significant events and developments since 1500 that altered world social history in ways that persist today including colonization, Protestant Reformation, industrialization, the rise of technology and human rights movements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.D.5 (W)</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship between an issue in world social history and the related aspects of political, economic and environmental history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Understand Illinois, United States and world environmental history.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.E.1 (US)</td>
<td>Describe how the local environment has changed over time.</td>
<td>16.E.2a (US)</td>
<td>Identify environmental factors that drew settlers to the state and region.</td>
<td>16.E.3a (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.2b (US)</td>
<td>Identify individuals and events in the development of the conservation movement including John Muir, Theodore Roosevelt and the creation of the National Park System.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.3b (US)</td>
<td>Describe how the largely rural population of the United States adapted, used and changed the environment after 1818.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.4b (US)</td>
<td>Describe different and sometimes competing views, as substantiated by scientific fact, that people in North America have historically held towards the environment (e.g., private and public land ownership and use, resource use vs. preservation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.5b (US)</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship between an issue in United States environmental history and the related aspects of political, economic and social history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.2c (US)</td>
<td>Describe environmental factors that influenced the development of transportation and trade in Illinois.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.3c (US)</td>
<td>Describe the impact of urbanization and suburbanization, 1850 - present, on the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.1 (W)</td>
<td>Compare depictions of the natural environment that are found in myths, legends, folklore and traditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.2a (W)</td>
<td>Describe how people in hunting and gathering and early pastoral societies adapted to their respective environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.3a (W)</td>
<td>Describe how the people of the Huang He, Tigris-Euphrates, Nile and Indus river valleys shaped their environments during the agricultural revolution, 4000 - 1000 BCE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.4a (W)</td>
<td>Describe how cultural encounters among peoples of the world (e.g., Colombian exchange, opening of China and Japan to external trade, building of Suez canal) affected the environment, 1500 - present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.5a (W)</td>
<td>Analyze how technologic al and scientific developments have affected human productivity, human comfort and the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.2b (W)</td>
<td>Identify individuals and their inventions (e.g., Watt/steam engine, Nobel/TNT, Edison/electric light) which influenced world environmental history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.3b (W)</td>
<td>Explain how expanded European and Asian contacts affected the environment of both continents, 1000 BCE - 1500 CE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.4b (W)</td>
<td>Describe how migration has altered the world’s environment since 1450.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.E.5b (W)</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship between an issue in world environmental history and the related aspects of political, economic and social history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE GOAL 17: Understand world geography and the effects of geography on society, with an emphasis on the United States.

Why This Goal Is Important: The need for geographic literacy has never been greater or more obvious than in today’s tightly interrelated world. Students must understand the world’s physical features, how they blend with social systems and how they affect economies, politics and human interaction. Isolated geographic facts are not enough. To grasp geography and its effect on individuals and societies, students must know the broad concepts of spatial patterns, mapping, population and physical systems (land, air, water). The combination of geographic facts and broad concepts provides a deeper understanding of geography and its effects on individuals and societies.

A. Locate, describe and explain places, regions and features on the Earth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.A.1a Identify physical characteristics of places, both local and global (e.g., locations, roads, regions, bodies of water).</td>
<td>17.A.2a Compare the physical characteristics of places including soils, land forms, vegetation, wildlife, climate, natural hazards.</td>
<td>17.A.3a Explain how people use geographic markers and boundaries to analyze and navigate the Earth (e.g., hemispheres, meridians, continents, bodies of water).</td>
<td>17.A.4a Use mental maps of physical features to answer complex geographic questions (e.g., how physical features have deterred or enabled migration).</td>
<td>17.A.5 Demonstrate how maps, other geographic instruments and technologies are used to solve spatial problems (e.g., land use, ecological concerns).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.A.1b Identify the characteristics and purposes of geographic representations including maps, globes, graphs, photographs, software, digital images and be able to locate specific places using each.</td>
<td>17.A.2b Use maps and other geographic representations and instruments to gather information about people, places and environments.</td>
<td>17.A.3b Explain how to make and use geographic representations to provide and enhance spatial information including maps, graphs, charts, models, aerial photographs, satellite images.</td>
<td>17.A.4b Use maps and other geographic instruments and technologies to analyze spatial patterns and distributions on earth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Analyze and explain characteristics and interactions of the Earth’s physical systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.B.1a</strong> Identify components of the Earth’s physical systems.</td>
<td><strong>17.B.2a</strong> Describe how physical and human processes shape spatial patterns including erosion, agriculture and settlement.</td>
<td><strong>17.B.3a</strong> Explain how physical processes including climate, plate tectonics, erosion, soil formation, water cycle, and circulation patterns in the ocean shape patterns in the environment and influence availability and quality of natural resources.</td>
<td><strong>17.B.4a</strong> Explain the dynamic interactions within and among the Earth’s physical systems including variation, productivity and constructive and destructive processes.</td>
<td><strong>17.B.5</strong> Analyze international issues and problems using ecosystem and physical geography concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.B.1b</strong> Describe physical components of ecosystems.</td>
<td><strong>17.B.2b</strong> Explain how physical and living components interact in a variety of ecosystems including desert, prairie, flood plain, forest, tundra.</td>
<td><strong>17.B.3b</strong> Explain how changes in components of an ecosystem affect the system overall.</td>
<td><strong>17.B.4b</strong> Analyze trends in world demographics as they relate to physical systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Understand relationships between geographic factors and society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.C.1a</strong> Identify ways people depend on and interact with the physical environment (e.g., farming, fishing, hydroelectric power).</td>
<td><strong>17.C.2a</strong> Describe how natural events in the physical environment affect human activities.</td>
<td><strong>17.C.3a</strong> Explain how human activity is affected by geographic factors.</td>
<td><strong>17.C.4a</strong> Explain the ability of modern technology to alter geographic features and the impacts of these modifications on human activities.</td>
<td><strong>17.C.5a</strong> Compare resource management methods and policies in different regions of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.C.1b</strong> Identify opportunities and constraints of the physical environment.</td>
<td><strong>17.C.2b</strong> Describe the relationships among location of resources, population distribution and economic activities (e.g., transportation, trade, communications).</td>
<td><strong>17.C.3b</strong> Explain how patterns of resources are used throughout the world.</td>
<td><strong>17.C.4b</strong> Analyze growth trends in selected urban areas as they relate to geographic factors.</td>
<td><strong>17.C.5b</strong> Describe the impact of human migrations and increased urbanization on ecosystem s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17.C.1c  Explain the difference between renewable and nonrenewable resources.

17.C.2c  Explain how human activity affects the environment.

17.C.3c  Analyze how human processes influence settlement patterns including migration and population growth.

17.C.4c  Explain how places with various population distributions function as centers of economic activity (e.g., rural, suburban, urban).

17.C.5c  Describe geographic factors that affect cooperation and conflict among societies.

D. Understand the historical significance of geography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.D.1  Identify changes in geographic characteristics of a local region (e.g., town, community).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.D.2a  Describe how physical characteristics of places influence people’s perceptions and their roles in the world over time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.D.3a  Explain how and why spatial patterns of settlement change over time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.D.4  Explain how processes of spatial change have affected human history (e.g., resource development and use, natural disasters).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.D.5  Analyze the historical development of a current issue involving the interaction of people and geographic factors (e.g., mass transportation, changes in agricultural subsidies, flood control).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 17.D.2b  Identify different settlement patterns in Illinois and the United States and relate them to physical features and resources. |
| 17.D.3b  Explain how interactions of geographic factors have shaped present conditions. |

STATE GOAL 18: Understand social systems, with an emphasis on the United States.

Why This Goal Is Important: A study of social systems has two important aspects that help people understand their roles as individuals and members of society. The first aspect is culture consisting of the language, literature, arts and traditions of various groups of people. Students should understand common characteristics of different cultures and explain how cultural contributions shape societies over time. The second aspect is the interaction among individuals, groups and institutions. Students should know how and why groups and institutions are formed, what roles they play in society, and how individuals and groups interact with and influence institutions.
A. Compare characteristics of culture as reflected in language, literature, the arts, traditions and institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.A.1 Identify folklore from different cultures which became part of the heritage of the United States.</td>
<td>18.A.2 Explain ways in which language, stories, folk tales, music, media and artistic creations serve as expressions of culture.</td>
<td>18.A.3 Explain how language, literature, the arts, architecture and traditions contribute to the development and transmission of culture.</td>
<td>18.A.4 Analyze the influence of cultural factors including customs, traditions, language, media, art and architecture in developing pluralistic societies.</td>
<td>18.A.5 Compare ways in which social systems are affected by political, environmental, economic and technological changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Understand the roles and interactions of individuals and groups in society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.B.1a Compare the roles of individuals in group situations (e.g., student, committee member, employee/employer).</td>
<td>18.B.2a Describe interactions of individuals, groups and institutions in situations drawn from the local community (e.g., local response to state and national reforms).</td>
<td>18.B.3a Analyze how individuals and groups interact with and within institutions (e.g., educational, military).</td>
<td>18.B.4 Analyze various forms of institutions (e.g., educational, military, charitable, governmental).</td>
<td>18.B.5 Use methods of social science inquiry (pose questions, collect and analyze data, make and support conclusions with evidence, report findings) to study the development and functions of social systems and report conclusions to a larger audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.B.1b Identify major social institutions in the community.</td>
<td>18.B.2b Describe the ways in which social institutions meet the needs of society.</td>
<td>18.B.3b Explain how social institutions contribute to the development and transmission of culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Understand how social systems form and develop over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>LATE ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>EARLY HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>LATE HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.C.1 Describe how individuals interacted within groups to make choices regarding food, clothing and shelter.</td>
<td>18.C.2 Describe how changes in production (e.g., hunting and gathering, agricultural, industrial) and population caused changes in social systems.</td>
<td>18.C.3a Describe ways in which a diverse U.S. population has developed and maintained common beliefs (e.g., life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; the Constitution and the Bill of Rights).</td>
<td>18.C.4a Analyze major cultural exchanges of the past (e.g., Colombian exchange, the Silk Road, the Crusades).</td>
<td>18.C.5 Analyze how social scientists’ interpretations of societies, cultures and institutions change over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.C.3b Explain how diverse groups have contributed to U.S. social systems over time.</td>
<td>18.C.4b Analyze major contemporary cultural exchanges as influenced by worldwide communications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Social Science – Goal 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORICAL ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION (STANDARD A) (REFER TO ITEM THINKING SCALE FOR PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>HISTORICAL ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION (STANDARD A) (REFER TO ITEM THINKING SCALE FOR PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>HISTORICAL ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION (STANDARD A) (REFER TO ITEM THINKING SCALE FOR PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.01 Understand and use common chronological terms and processes, including: Identifying the temporal structure of a historical narrative, including its beginning, middle and end (the latter defined as the outcome of a particular problem in the beginning); measuring and calculating calendar time by years, decades, centuries and millennia from fixed points of the Gregorian calendar system using B.C. and A.D.; constructing time lines by designating appropriate equidistant intervals of time and recording events according to the temporal order in which they occurred.</td>
<td>16.8.01 Identify multiple causes and effects when analyzing historical events.</td>
<td>16.11.01 Make connections between historical and current events; verify with supporting details/facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.02 Identify primary sources.</td>
<td>16.8.02 Identify the differences between primary and secondary sources.</td>
<td>16.11.02 Evaluate the credibility of primary and secondary resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.03 Interpret tables, charts and graphs that represent simple historical, social, political, geographic and economic data.</td>
<td>16.8.03 Use visual and literary sources, including: a) photographs, paintings, cartoons, and architectural drawings and b) novels, bibliographies, poetry, and plays to clarify, illustrate, or elaborate upon information presented in historical narratives or arguments.</td>
<td>16.11.03 Interpret historical models or quantitative data in charts, tables, graphs, and diagrams as evidence to assist in identifying historical patterns and developing interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.04 Understand “point of view;” distinguish fact from opinion in historical narratives.</td>
<td>16.8.04 Recognize the differences between two interpretations/points of view of a single historical event and differentiate between unsupported expressions of opinion and informed hypotheses grounded in historical evidence and reasoning.</td>
<td>16.11.04 Compare historical arguments, adjudicating between conflicting interpretations of historical events by evaluating the credibility and effectiveness of a historian’s argument, including the quality of evidence cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.11.05 Identify the reasons why historians working in different time periods can arrive at different conclusions about the same event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Social Science – Goal 16

### Grade 5

**WORLD HISTORY (STANDARDS B-D)**

16.5.42 Identify sources of civilization in river valleys, including: Mesopotamia and the “Fertile Crescent” (Tigris and Euphrates Rivers), Egypt (Nile River), India (Indus and Ganges Rivers), and China (Huang Ho River).

16.5.43 Identify the political and cultural characteristics of ancient Egypt, including: the role of the Pharaoh as absolute ruler and head of Egyptian religion, the worship of many gods (polytheism), the building of pyramids as tombs for the afterlife, the importance of mummies in preserving the body for the afterlife, class distinctions of ancient Egypt (e.g., nobles, soldiers, freemen, peasants, and slaves), hieroglyphics as a writing system (deciphered in the 19th century using the Rosetta Stone).

16.5.44 Identify the development of alphabets and writing systems in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the Indus Valley.

16.5.45 Identify the common bonds (e.g., language and literature, religion, empire, war, loteria during the Persian Wars) and distinct differences (e.g., beliefs about government, views of literature, art, philosophy, rivalries during the Peleponesian Wars) between the ancient Greek city-states, with a focus on Athens and Sparta.

### Grade 8

19% Analyze the geographic, political, social, economic, and religious structure and contributions of ancient civilizations, including: Mesopotamia, Egypt, India, and China.

16.8.43 Identify the sources of the ethical teachings and central beliefs of Judaism and Christianity.

16.8.45 Identify the contributions of the following ancient civilizations: Babylonians (e.g., first written code of law), Hebrews (e.g., monotheism), Phoenicians (e.g., development of simple alphabet), India (tradition of great literature), and China (accomplishments in art and architecture, and innovations in science and technology).

16.8.46 Compare the democracy of ancient Athens with that of the modern U.S. using the following criteria: direct vs. representative democracy, definition of citizenship, and rights of women.

### Grade 11

24% Define the concept of “civilization” (e.g., the minimum components essential for the development of civilization including technology, division of labor, government, calendar, and writing systems; the definition of civilization as a society with advanced levels of economic, political, religious, and artistic accomplishments).

16.11.49 Understand the elements of Judaism and events that led to the spread of Judaism (e.g., significant individuals, sacred writings, central beliefs, and ethical teachings of Judaism; origins and significance of Judaism as the first monotheistic religion; how Judaism survived and evolved despite continuing dispersion of the Jewish population; how Judaism compares to other world religions; the spread of Judaism and explain how they are reflected in the moral and ethical traditions of Western civilization).

16.11.50 Understand environmental, social, political, and cultural factors that shaped the development of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the Indus Valley (e.g., religious traditions and how they shaped culture; urban development, social hierarchy, religion, and government; the significance of Hammurabi’s Code, the importance of river systems and physical settings in the development of early civilizations; cultural and scientific contributions including calendars and architecture; the role of social class and gender in Ancient civilizations).

16.11.51 Understand the social and political framework of Athenian society (e.g., social structure, significance of citizenship, and development of democracy in city-state of Athens; life in Athens during the Golden Age of Pericles; strengths and weaknesses of Greek democracy; key differences between Athenian or direct democracy and representative democracy; lack of minority protection in Athenian direct democracy).
Stage H - Social Science

Descriptors (1999)

16A - Students who meet the standard can apply the skills of historical analysis and interpretation.

1. Define the concept of a "watershed" event in history.
2. Explain why a primary source may not necessarily provide an accurate description of an historical event.
3. Identify the point of view of the author as found in a primary source document.
4. Identify any inconsistencies of an author as found in a primary source document.
5. Assess the value of posed and candid photographs as primary sources.

16B - Students who meet the standard understand the development of significant political events.

1. Evaluate the consequences of constitutional change and continuity over time. (US)
2. Summarize the significant events that occurred during the development of the Supreme Court of the United States. (US)
3. Describe the contributions of individuals or groups who had a significant impact on the course of judicial history. (US)
4. Describe the significant events and contributions of individuals or groups in the development of United States diplomatic history. (US)
5. Identify common political trends in the eastern and western hemispheres after 1500 CE (e.g., colonization, de-colonization, nationalism). (W)
6. Analyze the political cause and effect relationships created by European exploration and expansion in the eastern and western hemispheres. (W)
7. Identify the contributions of significant individuals to worldwide political thought (e.g., Locke, Burke, Marx) after 1500. (W)

16C - Students who meet the standard understand the development of economic systems.

1. Describe the impact of trade on political, social, economic, and environmental developments in a place or region of the United States, 1865 - present. (US)
2. Explain how changes in science and technology affected the exchange of goods and services, economic institutions, and the movement of people among different regions of the United States, 1865-present. (US)
3. Explain how entrepreneurs organized their businesses and influenced government to limit competition and maximize profits. (US)
4. Describe the economic causes of conflict in United States History since 1865 (e.g., Indian Wars, Civil War, urban unrest). (US)
5. Describe significant people, ideas, and events in the rise of organized labor from 1865-1914. (US)
6. Analyze the impact of long-term economic trends on the political, social, economic, and environmental developments of societies in different parts of the world, 1500 CE to present. (W)
7. Explain how changes in science and technology affected the exchange of goods and services among people of different geographical regions of the past. (W)
8. Describe the global impact of long-term economic trends from 1500-present (e.g., long distance trade, banking, specialization of labor, urbanization, technological/scientific progress). (W)

**16D** - Students who meet the standard understand Illinois, United States, and world social history.

1. Analyze the changing roles and status of men, women, and children from the colonial period through the 19th Century. (US)
2. Compare the importance of people's customs and traditions during the historical development of a geographic region during the colonial/frontier periods and the 19th Century. (US)
3. Describe family life of select groups of people during the colonial/frontier periods and the 19th Century. (US)
4. Analyze the consequences of discrimination past and present. (W)
5. Analyze the impact of mass migrations of people upon the political, economic, social, and environmental aspects of a world region. (W)
6. Assess the impact of significant individuals or groups on world social history (e.g., religious leaders, philosophers). (W)
7. Describe how the work of artists around the world (e.g., musicians, artists, filmmakers) reflects social issues. (W)

**16E** - Students who meet the standard understand Illinois, United States, and world environmental history.

1. Analyze the social, political, and economic effects on the abandoned environment of a significant migration of people from one region to another. (US)
2. Describe the demographic distribution of people before and after a significant migration in United States history. (US)
3. Describe the effects on the environment of the dispersion of European colonists in North America after 1500CE. (US)
4. Describe how major migrations have affected the cultural features of cities and rural communities in the United States. (US)
5. Assess the effect of the industrial revolution on the physical environment in the United States. (US)
6. Assess the effects on the environment of the historic process of suburbanization and rural depopulation. (US)
7. Assess the effects of a significant past natural environmental disaster on the physical and cultural features of the landscape of a place or region in the United States. (US)
8. Describe the social, demographic, political, and economic effects on the abandoned environment of a significant migration of people in World History. (W)
9. Describe the environmental effects of the "Colombian Exchange." (W)
10. Describe how major migrations have affected the cultural features of cities and rural communities. (W)
11. Assess the effect of the industrial revolution on the physical environment in an industrialized country. (W)
12. Assess the impact on the environment of the industrial revolution on a traditional agrarian culture. (W)
13. Assess the effects on the environment of the historic process of suburbanization and the depopulation of rural regions. (W)
Public Act 094-0875

SB2829 Enrolled

AN ACT concerning education.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly:

Section 5. The School Code is amended by changing Sections 2-3.12, 2-3.25d, 2-3.25f, 2-3.25g, 2-3.59, 2-3.63, 2-3.64, 10-17, 10-21.9, 27-1, 29-5, and 34-18.5 as follows:

(105 ILCS 5/2-3.64) (from Ch. 122, par. 2-3.64)
Sec. 2-3.64. State goals and assessment.
(a) Beginning in the 1998-1999 school year, the State Board of Education shall establish standards and periodically, in collaboration with local school districts, conduct studies of student performance in the learning areas of fine arts and physical development/health.

Beginning with the 1998-1999 school year until the 2004-2005 school year, the State Board of Education shall annually test: (i) all pupils enrolled in the 3rd, 5th, and 8th grades in English language arts (reading, writing, and English grammar) and mathematics; and (ii) all pupils enrolled in the 4th and 7th grades in the biological and physical sciences and the social sciences (history, geography, civics, economics, and government). Unless the testing required to be implemented no later than the 2005-2006 school year under this subsection (a) is implemented for the 2004-2005 school year, for the 2004-2005 school year, the State Board of Education shall test: (i) all pupils enrolled in the 3rd, 5th, and 8th grades in English language arts (reading and English grammar) and mathematics and (ii) all pupils enrolled in the 4th and 7th grades in the biological and physical sciences. The maximum time allowed for all actual testing required under this paragraph shall not exceed 25 hours, as allocated among the required tests by the State Board of Education, across all grades tested.

Beginning no later than the 2005-2006 school year, the State Board of Education shall annually test: (i) all pupils enrolled in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades in reading and mathematics and (ii) all pupils enrolled in the 4th and 7th grades in the biological and physical sciences. In addition, the State Board of Education shall test (1) all pupils enrolled in the 5th and 8th grades in writing during the 2006-2007 school year; (2) all pupils enrolled in the 5th, 6th, and 8th grades in writing during the 2007-2008 school year; and (3) all pupils enrolled in the 3rd, 5th, 6th, and 8th grades in writing during the 2008-2009 school year and each school year thereafter. After the addition of grades and change in subjects as delineated in this paragraph and including whatever other tests that may be approved from time to time no later than the 2005-2006 school year, the maximum time allowed for all State
testing in grades 3 through 8 shall not exceed 38 hours across those grades.

Beginning with the 2004-2005 school year, the State Board of Education shall not test pupils under this subsection (a) in physical development and health, fine arts, and the social sciences (history, geography, civics, economics, and government). The State Board of Education shall not test pupils under this subsection (a) in writing during the 2005-2006 school year.
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Ms. Phyllis Henry
Roberto Clemente High School
1147 N. Western Avenue
Chicago, IL 60622

Dear Ms. Henry:

I want to personally thank you for the expertise, effort and creativity you have provided to the Illinois Academic Standards Project during the first phase of draft writing. I am encouraged by the evolving materials and look forward to seeing the completed drafts when they are ready to be circulated to local schools and educators for review and comment in the fall.

You represent a great many of your peers by agreeing to help with this important effort. It is my hope that you will continue to participate in this project and help assure its completion by:

- working with your team members on an as needed basis;
- communicating with your colleagues during the coming year and encouraging their contributions throughout the review and comment period; and
- where appropriate, using or encouraging the use of the draft standards in actual classroom and school settings so we can gather feedback based on authentic applications.

Thank you again for your participation and I look forward to your continued involvement as we all work to clearly define high standards for all students throughout Illinois.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph A. Spagnolo
State Superintendent
of Education
APPENDIX C

CPS K-12 HISTORY/ SOCIAL SCIENCE FRAMEWORK
CPS LEARNING OUTCOMES: FRAMEWORK FOR TRANSFORMING TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
CPS PROTOTYPES OF CHICAGO ACADEMIC STANDARDS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
CPS POLICY RESCINDING CHICAGO ACADEMIC STANDARDS
CPS COURSE FRAMEWORKS IN THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD HISTORY
CPS PROTOTYPE OF QUARTERLY COURSE PLANNING MAP IN AMERICAN HISTORY
CPS PROTOTYPE OF QUARTERLY COURSE PLANNING MAP IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN HISTORY
### OFFICE OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

#### SOCIAL SCIENCES IN THE CLASSROOM

**BASED ON THE INTEGRATION OF THE FIVE ILLINOIS STATE GOALS 14-18**

**AT EACH GRADE LEVEL**

**AND COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE MANDATES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KINDergarten</strong></td>
<td>Self, Family, Community Workers, Neighborhood; National Holidays and Symbols; Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST</strong></td>
<td>School, Community, City, County, Country; National Holidays and Symbols; Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND</strong></td>
<td>Communities: Urban and Rural; Historical and Contemporary; Diverse Cultures; Historical Native Americans; Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIRD</strong></td>
<td>Communities: Local, State, Nation; Chicago (History, Government, Economics, Geography, Cultures); Great Lakes Area and Midwest; Washington, D.C.; Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOURTH</strong></td>
<td>Illinois (History, Government, Geography, Economics, Cultures); U.S. States/ Capitals; Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIFTH</strong></td>
<td>U.S. History- Exploration, Colonization, Westward Movement; The Americans; Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIXTH</strong></td>
<td>Western/Non-Western Civilizations – Ancient to Modern Times; Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEVENTH</strong></td>
<td>American History: Pre-Columbus to 1877; U.S Constitution; Civics; P.L. 195 * (or in 8th Grade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIGHTH</strong></td>
<td>American History: Reconstruction to Present; U.S. Global Issues; U.S. and Illinois Constitution Tests * P.L. 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NINTH</strong></td>
<td>World Studies (Integration of all Goals 14-18); Civics; Service Learning*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENTH</strong></td>
<td>United States History (Integration of Goals 14-18); Civics, Voter Education; Service Learning*; P.L. 195*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEVENTH</strong></td>
<td>Social Science Elective (optional); Voter Education; Service Learning*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWELFTH</strong></td>
<td>Social Studies Elective required (if not taken in Grade 11); Civics, Voter Education; Service Learning*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Local Determinant

This scope and sequence chart was developed by the researcher and was systemically distributed by the Office of Curriculum and utilized by CPS teachers. It is based on the *National Standards for History*, the ISBE Goals and mandates in Illinois School Code.
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To the Chicago Community,

The world is changing. Right now, the United States is striving to maintain its place in an increasingly competitive global economy. In Chicago, this means that we must rethink what our students will need in order to take part in this new and demanding future. The Chicago Public Schools Learning Outcomes provide a concrete direction. They are a clear set of expectations for what all Chicago students should know and be able to do.

Discussions about academic standards began in 1993 among representatives of the Chicago Board of Education, the Chicago Public Schools, and the Chicago Teachers Union, just as similar efforts were taking place on the national level. In these early meetings we explored ways to define common expectations for student learning and achievement.

The Joyce Foundation and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation together took a direct interest in these discussions. The foundations provided funds which, combined with resources from the Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Teachers Union, allowed for this collaboration to continue its work towards defining academic goals. The assistance of the Council for Basic Education, nationally recognized for its experience in the standards debate, was also enlisted. The Chicago Learning Outcome Standards Project led to the development of the Framework for Transforming Teaching and Learning.

The Learning Outcomes build on previous efforts and were originally developed by six teams of Chicago teachers over an intensive, five-week period during the summer of 1993. They were offered to the community in draft form for examination, criticism, and comment. Feedback gathered during the initial review process was used to develop the Learning Outcomes. These outcomes reflect the unique needs of Chicago in addition to being compatible with emerging national standards.

Our city's future demands high expectations for education. We believe that all Chicago students can achieve these Learning Outcomes if they, along with educators, parents, and the community, believe in and commit to making sure they will be reached. This document is meant to be dynamic. As this and other components of the framework are developed and implemented (i.e., performance standards and assessments, system-wide assessment, and professional development), the input and collaboration of teachers and administrators, parents and community members, business and professional people will continue to be important. Your support will help provide quality education for all our students.

Thank you,

Angie K. Johnson
General Superintendent of Schools
Chicago Public Schools

Thomas H. Reece
President
Chicago Teachers Union
PRINCIPLES GUIDING THE STANDARDS PROJECT

The following principles guided the development of the Learning Outcomes and undergird every subject:

- **The Learning Outcomes apply to all students.** The quality of education suggested by these outcomes has traditionally been provided to a privileged few. These outcomes are for all Chicago students, recognizing certain implications consistent with laws governing special education and bilingual education.

- **The Learning Outcomes reflect a multicultural and diverse world.** The multiracial, multicultural, multilingual makeup of society is an asset and a resource for enriching the lives of all students. These outcomes cover a broad range of knowledge in all of the disciplines as well as relevant perspectives and values of different cultures.

- **Communication and higher order thinking are integral to learning.** The ability to think critically, solve problems, and communicate effectively is embedded in every aspect of learning and doing. Using language, whether written or spoken, is basic to every subject.

- **Technology is essential.** The use of technology has permeated all areas of learning and doing. Chicago students will need access to the tools of technology and must develop the ability to use them effectively.

- **The Learning Outcomes reflect an interdisciplinary world.** Learning is most meaningful when students see the rich connection within and across the disciplines. Teachers are encouraged to combine Learning Outcomes from different subjects in order to enhance and deepen students' understanding. Symbols in the outcomes highlight such connections.

- **Knowledge is constructed and cumulative.** The knowledge and abilities acquired by the end of fourth grade form the foundation for the eighth-grade benchmark, which in turn provides building blocks for the benchmark at eleventh grade.

- **The Learning Outcomes are dynamic.** What Chicago students need in order to be successful in the 1990s is likely to change by the new millennium. Outcomes must evolve accordingly.

DEFINITIONS

Learning Outcomes are specific statements of what students should know and be able to do in academic disciplines.

Performance Standards are the criteria by which students are determined to have attained a specified level of proficiency in relation to a Learning Outcome.

State Goals for Learning are general statements of what students in Illinois should know and be able to do within each of the six fundamental learning areas.

Benchmarks are the grade levels designated at which a student’s performance will be assessed. In addition, the benchmarks define the accumulation of learning. The fourth-grade benchmark, for example, defines the accumulation of learning from kindergarten through the end of fourth grade, not just what is learned in the fourth grade alone.
FRAMEWORK FOR TRANSFORMING TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Framework for Transforming Teaching and Learning consists of four major components: learning outcomes, performance standards and assessments, systemwide assessment, and professional development.

Learning Outcomes contained in this chart reflect the diverse thinking filtered through the experience and expertise of classroom teachers. The outcomes were drafted by Chicago teachers and subject-area specialists, assisted by representatives of the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU) Quest Center and the Chicago Public Schools Office of Instructional Services. This team was aided by consultants from the Council for Basic Education (CBE), a nationally recognized authority on educational standards. The Learning Outcomes are derived from the emerging national standards, previous work produced by the Chicago Public Schools, and other sources.

The work of the team was guided both by a view of what an educated citizen should be and by these criteria:

- The outcomes should be concise and easily understood.
- They should be amenable to multiple assessments.
- They should encourage integration of the various content areas where appropriate.
- They must be linked to the Illinois Goals for Learning and the Illinois Public School Accreditation Process.

The Learning Outcomes define the expectations for everyone. Students who wish to pursue advanced levels of proficiency in an area of learning should be given the time and opportunity to do so. Schools may elect to develop supplemental Learning Outcomes that address local needs or priorities.

Performance standards and assessments are developed at the local school site based upon the learning outcomes contained in this chart and others adopted by schools. Performance standards are the criteria by which students are determined to have attained a specified level of proficiency in relation to a learning outcome.

In an effort to use the Learning Outcomes contained in this chart, CTU Quest Center Schools in collaboration with CPS central office staff are developing a number of curriculum, instruction, and assessment prototypes.

A systemwide assessment will be adopted by the Board of Education which is aligned with the Learning Outcomes. Currently the systemwide assessment issue is being studied by a task force which represents a broad cross section of constituencies associated with the Chicago Public Schools. Collaboration such as this will be necessary to ensure the adoption of an assessment system which meets the needs of the entire district.

Professional development to assist in the implementation of the Framework for Transforming Teaching and Learning is recognized to be a priority. New and innovative arrangements, such as the partnership responsible for this chart, will be sought in order to provide high-quality professional development opportunities while working within the constraints of limited resources.
Mathematics

Mathematics literacy is for everyone. The Learning Outcomes take into account the need for in-school experiences which reflect the student's world and the world of work. They were written with the expectation that teachers will help students to:

• develop a sense of inquiry;
• see that mathematics makes sense and is logical and enjoyable;
• have a repertoire of ways to solve problems;
• understand that mathematics is more than memorizing rules and procedures;
• believe that they have the power to do mathematics.

The curriculum that supports these outcomes will create self-directed learners who reason logically and effectively employ problem-solving strategies. The integration of calculators, computers, courseware, and manipulative materials into daily mathematics instruction is essential to a successful program. The outcomes envision a curriculum balanced between staying on course towards a goal and allowing for inquiry into areas yet to be imagined.

Physical Development and Health

Physical and mental health are interdependent. Students must be given the opportunity to develop into healthy individuals physically, mentally, emotionally, and socially. Students must be provided information so that they will take positive actions about their own health and fitness and continue to do so throughout their lives.

Students must understand and adjust to scientific changes affecting living habits and understand the value of healthful living. All students can attain these outcomes in programs which provide the necessary cognitive, affective, and physical skills and emphasize their functional applications at successive levels of maturity.

Social Sciences

The social sciences Learning Outcomes encompass the integrated subjects of history, geography, political science, civics, economics, and sociology. Instruction includes using language, literature, the fine arts, and the sciences to enhance students' knowledge and appreciation of different cultures, times, and places.

The focus of the social sciences is to enable students to become responsible citizens, productive workers, and informed consumers. The outcomes reinforce higher order thinking, such as analysis, decision making, evaluation, and application both to other disciplines and to daily living.

The social sciences outcomes recognize the importance of social history and multicultural perspectives in addition to political history to understanding our society and world. Social sciences instruction should convey information about diverse cultures and perspectives, movements, and events, with particular consideration of those which have been historically omitted from or misrepresented in standard curricula.
WHAT LEARNING OUTCOMES MEAN FOR TEACHING, LEARNING, AND ASSESSING

Higher standards for all students demand new ways of thinking about instruction. The roles and responsibilities of both teacher and learner will change. The Learning Outcomes require, for example, that students think mathematically and scientifically and that they demonstrate high levels of understanding and skill. The outcomes emphasize independence of thought; they require learning by doing. Students will be placed in the role of active learner; the teacher assumes the role of facilitator of students’ learning.

Teaching must be based on best practices and current research on how the mind works and how children learn. This research shows that:

- Learning is the negotiation of meaning.
- Knowledge is actively constructed by individuals, not passively received from the environment.
- Learning is a social process.
- Learning takes place when learners connect new knowledge to their lives and experiences.
- The ability to apply a concept to a new situation shows understanding of that concept.

The above findings are shown in a variety of teaching and learning approaches, such as Socratic discussion, hands-on problem-based learning, interdisciplinary learning, reciprocal teaching, and cooperative learning. Choice among these strategies, in addition to lecture and direct instruction, should be governed by the needs of the students and the demands of the academic discipline.

Assessment must change to align with the Learning Outcomes and include performance-based demonstrations of achievement as well as standardized tests in order to provide students with relevant and informative measurements of their work. Portfolios, exhibitions, and projects are examples of performance-based assessments that will provide evidence of students’ learning.

Student-centered teaching and learning require a rethinking of the structures that support instruction. Collaborative teamwork incorporating interdisciplinary and/or thematic teaching; learning outside of schools; the use of mixed-age grouping; organization of faculty and students in smaller units or into schools-within-schools; and flexibility in use of time and space can all contribute to higher student achievement when used appropriately.

CHART ORGANIZATION

The Learning Outcomes are organized in six areas of learning, or subjects, and at benchmark levels: grades four, eight, and eleven. The six subjects are color coded with symbols to highlight connections across them. These symbols are not meant to be limiting, but to encourage the exploration of connections.
DEFINING THE AREAS OF LEARNING

Biological and Physical Sciences

Students must be scientifically literate in order to become productive, responsible, and effective citizens. A science program should provide students with more than knowledge of the laws of nature. It must also nurture their curiosity, foster their creativity, and develop their ability to solve problems.

Science is learned best when students do science. Well-equipped science classrooms, staffed by enthusiastic and prepared teachers, will be arenas for exploration and experimentation, where students can hypothesize, measure, probe, touch, and draw conclusions.

Students will learn about the structure of matter, energy and its transformation, change and variation, and the cellular and molecular basis of life. Through the scientific process, students will learn the importance of observing accurately, reporting precisely, and reasoning logically.

Fine Arts

The fine arts Learning Outcomes encompass four arts disciplines: visual arts, music, dance, and drama. The fine arts are universal communicators that are multicultural, multigenerational, and multiethnic. Properly taught, they promote higher order thinking, self-discipline, motivation, teamwork, and self-esteem.

The fine arts outcomes include four major conceptual areas in which students will be able to:

- perceive and analyze artworks;
- create and perform the arts;
- understand the historical and cultural place and value of the arts;
- encounter the arts aesthetically.

The fine arts outcomes represent the fundamental knowledge, skills, and experiences that are expected for all Chicago students in all arts disciplines. Students who wish to pursue a specific art in order to achieve greater proficiency than is articulated by these statements should be provided with such opportunities.

Language Arts

Proficiency in language arts is essential for student growth and success in all content areas. Listening, speaking, reading, writing, and language should not be taught as isolated subjects made up of discrete skills, but rather as integrated learning strategies which cross all subjects. Language arts instruction should coach students to use what they already know to learn new things; select the best strategies for learning; and interpret oral, written, and visual communication.

Literature offers insight into history and cultures and allows students to understand diverse perspectives. The Learning Outcomes assume that dialects, home languages, and sign language are respected means of communication in appropriate situations.
CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING OUTCOMES
Social Sciences - State Goals for Learning

- Students will be able to
- understand and analyze comparative political and economic systems, with an emphasis on the political and economic systems of the United States.
- understand and analyze events, trends, personalities, and movements shaping the history of the world, the United States, and Illinois.
- demonstrate a knowledge of the basic concepts of the social sciences and how these help to interpret human behavior.
- demonstrate a knowledge of world geography with emphasis on that of the United States.
- apply the skills and knowledge gained in the social sciences to decision-making in life situations.

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING OUTCOMES
Social Sciences - Grade 4

- Demonstrate a basic understanding of the structure and function of local, state, and federal governments.
- Examine the similarities and differences of world communities.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the sequential nature of events in local and national history.
- Explain the influence of individuals and groups, differing by gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and culture, and their impact on United States society.
- Recognize how the utilization of natural and human resources affects the quality of life.
- Demonstrate an understanding of how family and community affect daily living and personal choices.
- Use maps, globes, and other geographic tools and technology to identify the major physical and cultural features of the earth.
- Examine the influence of technology and mass communication in our daily lives.
- Determine how current events impact our daily lives.
- Recognize that individual and group behavior entails responsibilities as well as rights.
- Demonstrate the ability to make informed choices to meet wants and needs.
- Include a knowledge of the world of work and the workers who supply our basic needs.

- **Biological & Physical Sciences**
- **Language Arts**
- **Physical Development and Health**
- **Fine Arts**
- **Mathematics**
- **Social Sciences**
CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING OUTCOMES
Social Sciences - Grade 8

- Apply an effective citizenry the democratic principles found in the documents, laws, customs, and traditions of our government.
- Use the tools of historical research, including primary documents, written and oral records, and technology.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the interdependence and interrelationships of the world community economically, politically, and culturally.
- Exhibit an understanding of how historical events influence the development of the political, economic, and cultural institutions of the United States and the world.
- Demonstrate a global consciousness concerning the issues of civil rights and human dignity.
- Understand how the availability and utilization of resources affect the foreign policy of nations.
- Analyze and explain the influence of historical factors that influence human behavior and decision-making available support resources.
- Analyze global patterns of the earth's physical features, political divisions, economic ties, and cultural diffusion, using geographic data.
- Analyze the advancements in war communications and technology influence our social, economic, and political choices individually and collectively.
- Explore how contemporary issues influence public policy.
- Analyze the processes in the United States that enable individuals and groups to participate in government and to develop and expand their political consciousness.
- Demonstrate an understanding of methods and problems of the global economy in order to make responsible economic decisions.
- Demonstrate an awareness of the scope of career choices and the education, skills, and talents needed to be a successful member of the work force.

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING OUTCOMES
Social Sciences - Grade 11

- Analyze primary source documents, laws, customs, and traditions that gave rise to the development of our democratic form of government.
- Compare the structure of our local, state, and federal governments with other governmental systems.
- Exhibit an understanding of the chronology and significance of the major historical, political, social, and economic events contributing to the development and growth of the United States.
- Understand that people in the United States, differing by race, ethnicity, gender, religion, and culture, have contributed to and influenced their own and global society.
- Recognize how the allocation of resources affects the attitudes and behavior of people at the national and international levels.
- Recognize the various factors that influence human development and behavior.
- Use data, maps, and other geographic tools to create, compare, and contrast geographic collections.
- Demonstrate an understanding of how cultural and topographic affect the way people live.
- Analyze and explain the influence of mass communication and technology on society's values, beliefs, and behaviors.
- Analyze how contemporary issues influence public policy and the civic responsibility of an individual to be aware of them.
- Exhibit an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of a citizen and the processes of political and judicial institutions.
- Demonstrate an understanding of economic principles as an informed consumer.
- Recognize the preparation needed for the world of work.

- Biological & Physical Sciences
- Language Arts
- Mathematics
- Physical Development and Health
- Social Sciences
- Fine Arts
EXPECTING MORE
Higher Standards for Chicago's Students

Chicago Academic Standards & Frameworks

K-12 Social Science
GRADE SEVEN

CFS

1. Investigate various careers to identify what skills are necessary and what preparation is required for an entry-level position.

CAS F. Compare and contrast ways in which goods and services are produced and distributed in various economic systems (traditional, market, and command).

CFS

1. Identify the circular flow of the economy and give examples of its segments (e.g., savings, investment, and international trade) and how they interact.
2. Describe the role of economic specialization and private markets.

STATE GOAL 16: UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE EVENTS, TRENDS, INDIVIDUALS, AND MOVEMENTS SHAPING THE HISTORY OF ILLINOIS, THE UNITED STATES, AND OTHER NATIONS.

CAS A. Identify patterns of historical succession and duration and apply them to explain historical continuity and change.

CFS

1. Investigate and analyze significant issues in the early history of the American experience (e.g., the expression of religious freedom in the English colonies, conflicts over European colonial claims in North America, and events leading to the American Revolution) and explain how they serve as a basis for understanding subsequent issues in United States history (e.g., separation of church and state, property rights, and principles of individual freedom).

CAS B. Identify, compare and contrast the roles and cultural, economic, and political contributions of historical and contemporary individuals and groups in the Americas.

CFS

1. Analyze how Native Americans, Europeans, and Africans interacted in shaping the history of the Western Hemisphere.

CAS C. Identify and use the tools and processes of social science inquiry (e.g., providing and validating evidence, searching for causality, using varied sources, and analyzing various interpretations) to reconstruct and understand past and present events.

CFS

1. Investigate and explain various theories concerning the European discovery of the Western Hemisphere using traditional written sources.

CAS D. Identify, review, and compare key developments in the history of urban centers in the Midwest, and the nations.

Expecting More: Higher Standards for Chicago’s Students (1997)
HIGH SCHOOL AMERICAN HISTORY

CAS D. Analyze the forces that have shaped the economic system of the United States (e.g., mercantilism, capitalism, labor movements).

CFS

1. Analyze basic economic issues that have been major political issues in the history of the United States (e.g., tariffs, free trade, central banking system, the gold standard).
2. Analyze the United States market economy through time (e.g., using indicators such as labor, capital, and natural resources; interaction of supply and demand; role of private ownership, profits; relationships of households, firms, and government; savings, investments and capital; labor/management relationships).
3. Explain the importance of research, technology, invention, and entrepreneurship to the United States economy.
4. Analyze contributions of individuals (e.g., business and political leaders, scientists, scholars, reformers) to the development of modern economic eras in the United States.

CAS E. Analyze and describe the basic concepts of United States fiscal and monetary policies and their influence on the economy and public policies (e.g., labor, health care, interstate commerce, international trade policies) providing public goods and services and promoting economic growth.

CFS

1. Identify and explain the different forms and rationale for various kinds of taxes, tariffs, and sanctions used by governments, specifically those of Illinois and the United States.
2. Analyze the economic interdependence of Illinois, the United States, and the world market.
3. Describe the role of the Federal Reserve System and the impact of monetary policy (e.g., reserve ratios, discount rates, open market operations) on the money supply and interest rates.
4. Analyze the impact of the federal budget, especially federal deficits, on the economy.

CAS F. Analyze the economic role of the family and other economic units in various world cultures.

CFS

1. Describe the changing role of the family with respect to slavery, immigration, and refugees, with an emphasis on the United States.

STATE GOAL 16: UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE EVENTS, TRENDS, INDIVIDUALS, AND MOVEMENTS SHAPING THE HISTORY OF ILLINOIS, THE UNITED STATES, AND OTHER NATIONS.
Title: ILLINOIS LEARNING STANDARDS
Section: 601.1
Board Report: 03-0924-PO02
Date Adopted: September 24, 2003

Policy:


PURPOSE:
The purpose of this policy is to implement the Illinois Learning Standards ("ILS"), a set of rigorous academic standards in the curricular areas of language arts, mathematics, science, social science, foreign languages, the fine arts, physical education and health, as the guide for curriculum and instruction in the Chicago Public Schools ("CPS"). This policy is designed to ensure that all CPS students are educated in a consistent manner with regard to curriculum and instruction. This policy also is designed to ensure that all students have equal access to appropriate curriculum, which is assessed in alignment with ILS, so that CPS achieves its foremost priority of continuing to improve student achievement.

ISSUES:
Current thinking in the field of education, which is reflected in legislation such as the No Child Left Behind Act, supports the premise that education and training are most effective when clear standards are set for student achievement. Children learn best when clearly understandable learning expectations are established for them, and they are given varied opportunities to demonstrate their levels of mastery and achievement.

POLICY TEXT:
In order to realize the goal of continuing to promote systemwide improvement in student achievement, CPS will align the goals of its education plan, "Every child, Every School," with the ILS. Implementing the ILS allows CPS to develop new capacity at the classroom, school, and district levels to ensure that all students are provided superior instructional programs and supportive classroom environments that will allow them to meet challenging academic standards and develop high learning aspirations. In a decentralized school system, the central administration’s role will be to provide strong leadership, an infrastructure of support, and strong systems of accountability.

To support the systemwide implementation of standards-based instruction, as set forth by ILS, the Office of Standards-Based Instruction will design training sessions for all CPS curriculum offices, the Area Instruction Officers, instructional facilitators, specialists and coaches, principals, and teachers who are responsible for establishing and sustaining the CPS community of learners.

A copy of the Illinois Learning Standards is available on the Illinois State Board of Education website and at CPS Office of Standards-Based Instruction.

Amends/Rescinds: Rescinds 97-0528-PO2
Cross References:
Legal References:
Overview of the Course

The study of United States history allows secondary students to better understand the people, ideas, and forces that have shaped and impacted this country and its place in an ever-increasing interdependent global society. Looking back on the achievements, shortcomings, significant events, and conflicts in this country’s past, students will develop a greater appreciation for their place in a culturally diverse society that continually strives toward democratic ideals. An understanding of history empowers individuals to claim their rights, balance their own interests with those of the community, and participate effectively within their system of government.

This United States History course provides a vehicle to explore what it means to be an American by studying the people and events that shaped United States history, from the pre-Colonial Period (1400 A.D.) to the present. Students will become adept at expressing and interpreting information and ideas, recognizing and investigating problems, formulating and proposing solutions that are supported by reason and evidence, learning and contributing productively as individuals and members of groups, and recognizing and applying connections of important information and ideas. Students will learn specific concepts and skills, and form a fundamental understanding of United States history and how that history connects with the rest of the world.

Historical understanding is more than memorization of dates, events, and names. Historical inquiry provides a systematic way of approaching questions about the past and the present. A successful history course integrates approaches from other social sciences such as economics, geography, political science, and sociology. It teaches students how to ask critical questions about the past, and helps them seek their own answers. It also develops students’ literacy, analytical thinking, and communication skills through the study of primary and secondary sources and the sharing of interpretations with peers and teachers.

The formation of critical questions is essential for students to deepen both their ability to make historical connections and to comprehend the relevance and application of history in their own lives. For example, when studying inventions and technology, a teacher may pose the question, How has technology impacted your life and connected you to the global community in which you live? When investigating the Civil Rights Movement, a teacher may choose to have students explain how the legacy of civil rights affects their life, or describe how their rights compare to the rights of groups of people in other countries.
No single history course can cover every aspect of the past; therefore, teachers must focus instruction on the events, people, organizations, and concepts that best convey the growth of this nation. Focusing on fewer topics, but going into greater depth with a rich collection of primary and secondary resources, will encourage students to develop their own questions and answers about the past. Teachers may also develop project and inquiry-based approaches to instruction and assessment that allow students to work closely with a particular historical topic.

This course is aligned to the Illinois State Goals 14 through 18 and the Illinois Learning Standards for Social Science. The Goals, Standards, Benchmarks, Performance Descriptors, and Assessment Framework Statements ensure that students have been presented with essential content and concepts that will allow them to demonstrate mastery. Illinois Learning Standards are aligned with important topics and themes (including state mandates: Public Law 195, the African-American Experience, the Labor Movement, the Women’s Movement, and the Holocaust) which serve as instructional targets that bring focus to classroom assessments. Infusion of applied learning skills such as solving problems, communicating, using technology, working collaboratively, and making connections are threaded throughout the Goals, Standards, and Benchmarks.

Central Concepts and Habits of Mind
The Main Foci of this Course Expressed as General Skills and Concepts

I. To enable the student to recognize the chronological nature of history.
   A. Identify time structure in historical narratives.
   B. Interpret data presented in timelines, graphics, and text.

II. To enable the student to think historically.
   A. Paraphrase the literal meaning of a historical passage.
   B. Identify the central question(s) addressed in historical narrative(s).
   C. Give evidence to support historical perspectives.
   D. Draw upon data in maps, graphs, charts, and political cartoons.

III. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and interpretation.
   A. Compare and contrast differing sets of ideas, values, personalities, behaviors, and institutions.
   B. Consider multiple perspectives.
   C. Analyze cause-and-effect relationships.
   D. Compare competing historical narratives.
   E. Draw conclusions about the influences of the past.

IV. To enable the student to conduct historical research.
   A. Formulate historical questions.
   B. Retrieve historical data.
   C. Question historical data.

V. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and decision-making.
A. Identify issues and problems in the past.
B. Examine evidence contributing to a historical event, relate it to a present-day event, and decide on a course of action.
C. Evaluate the implementation and outcome of a decision.

**Major Curriculum Structure**

The United States History course is the second of three required courses in the social science sequence. This one-credit course consists of a chronological survey of the major themes and eras of United States history from its early beginnings to the present.

Classroom formative and summative assessments are used to monitor student progress; they must have academic rigor and also must be aligned to the Illinois State Goals, Illinois Learning Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Descriptors. Classroom assessments include products of student work such as written reports (i.e., essays, social science prompts), research projects, speeches, performances, debates, and portfolios, as well as forced-choice tests. A social science rubric, designed by either the teacher or the Illinois State Board of Education will be used.

The following outline delineates a sample of memorable events that could be used to drive the curriculum.

United States History

I. Semester I - First Quarter
   A. Early history in the Americas to 1620
      1. Voyages of Columbus
      2. Iroquois Confederacy
      3. Introduction of slavery
   B. Colonial history and settlement to 1763
      1. Fundamental Orders of Connecticut (1639)
      2. William Penn receives charter for Pennsylvania (1681)
   C. The American Revolution and Early National Period to 1820s
      1. Declaration of Independence
      2. Articles of Confederation
      3. United States Constitution

II. Semester I - Second Quarter
   A. National Expansion from 1801 to 1861
      1. Louisiana Purchase
      2. War of 1812
      3. Missouri Compromise
      4. Trail of Tears
   B. The Civil War and Reconstruction from 1850 to 1877
      1. Abraham Lincoln’s election
      2. Civil Rights Act (1866)

III. Semester II - Third Quarter
    A. Development of the Industrial United States from 1865 to 1914
1. Alexander Graham Bell patents the telephone (1876)
2. Pullman strike (1894)
3. Impact and contributions of Immigration

B. The Emergence of the United States as a World Power and WWI from 1890 to 1920
   1. Spanish-American War (1898)
   2. Panama Canal opens (1914)

C. Prosperity, Depression, the New Deal and World War II from 1920 to 1945
   1. Harlem Renaissance
   2. U.S. stock market crash
   3. The Holocaust

IV. Semester II - Fourth Quarter
   A. Post-World War II and the Cold War from 1945 to 1959
      1. Marshall Plan
      2. Establishment of NATO
   B. Contemporary United States from 1960 to the present
      1. Civil Rights Movement
      2. Women’s Rights Movement
      3. Vietnam War
      4. 9/11

Best Practice Instructional Themes

Some aspects of instruction that are particular to this course are listed below.

- The United States History course should involve students in independent inquiry and cooperative learning to build lifelong learning skills and behaviors.
- The United States History course should involve students in reading, writing, observing, discussing, and debating to encourage active participation in learning.
- The students need the autonomy to select their own United States history topics for in-depth study. Good teaching involves showing the students how to make intelligent choices and helping students chart their own course of study from topics provided.
- United States History should challenge students’ thinking. This requires teachers to generate questions that invite discussion and promote student engagement.
- In order to make United States History meaningful to the student, the student must be actively involved not only in the classroom, but also in the wider community. This involves creating links of content to preexisting knowledge and beliefs.
- This United States History course must incorporate a rich understanding of the many ethnic groups and cultures in our country.
Instruction in United States History must reflect the importance of students’ ability to process the information given in order to become responsible citizens.

**Literacy in United States History**

Students must be able to demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of United States history (political, economic, social, geographic, and cultural), including an awareness of unity and diversity in American society. Students must also have knowledge and understanding of representative institutions (e.g., Congress, Electoral College) in order to determine and explain how those institutions have shaped and been shaped by different groups. Additionally, students must be able to demonstrate their understanding of the relationship(s) between the U.S. and other parts of the world.

In order to accomplish these objectives, students must become critical readers with opportunities to apply district-wide reading strategies, i.e., *Read, Think, and Write in response to text* as an integral component within this course. Students must have the ability to read, interpret, compare and contrast, think critically, and analyze information. Students must also be given opportunities to respond authentically to a variety of texts such as historical narratives, documents, reference materials, and both primary and secondary sources. The utilization of materials analyzing the interpretation of data from graphics such as maps, political cartoons, timelines, charts, diagrams, and other visuals will assist students in making historical connections. This minds-on approach requires that students interpret the provided information with personalized experiences, draw conclusions, make generalizations, and respond to issues presented orally and in writing to facilitate real-life applications of the social sciences.
Overview of the Course

The study of United States history allows secondary students to better understand the people, ideas, and forces that have shaped and impacted this country and its place in an ever-increasing interdependent global society. Looking back on the achievements, shortcomings, significant events, and conflicts in this country’s past, students will develop a greater appreciation for their place in a culturally diverse society that continually strives toward democratic ideals. An understanding of history empowers individuals to claim their rights, balance their own interests with those of the community, and participate effectively within their system of government.

This United States History course provides a vehicle to explore what it means to be an American by studying the people and events that shaped United States history, from the pre-Colonial Period (1400 A.D.) to the end of the 19th century with the emergence of the United States as a world power. By dividing the expanse of United States history into two courses, instruction can focus with a greater depth and detail of the memorable events in these eras. Students will become adept at expressing and interpreting information and ideas, recognizing and investigating problems, formulating and proposing solutions that are supported by reason and evidence, learning and contributing productively as individuals and members of groups, and recognizing and applying connections of important information and ideas. Students will learn specific concepts and skills, and form a fundamental understanding of United States history and how that history connects with the rest of the world.

Historical understanding is more than memorization of dates, events, and names. Historical inquiry provides a systematic way of approaching questions about the past and the present. A successful history course integrates approaches from other social sciences such as economics, geography, political science, and sociology. It teaches students how to ask critical questions about the past, and helps them seek their own answers. It also develops students’ literacy, analytical thinking, and communication skills through the study of primary and secondary sources and the sharing of interpretations with peers and teachers.

The formation of critical questions is essential for students to deepen both their ability to make historical connections and to comprehend the relevance and application of history in their own lives. For example, when studying inventions and technology, a teacher may pose the question, How has technology impacted your life and connected you to the global community in which you live? When investigating the Industrial Revolution and
the evolution of the labor movement, a teacher may choose to have students explain how
the legacy of workers’ rights affects their families or future career aspirations, or describe
how the rights of American laborers compare to the rights of workers in other countries.

No single history course can cover every aspect of the past; therefore, teachers must focus
instruction on the events, people, organizations, and concepts that best convey the growth
of this nation. Focusing on fewer topics, but going into greater depth with a rich
collection of primary and secondary resources, will encourage students to develop their
own questions and answers about the past. Teachers may also develop project and
inquiry-based approaches to instruction and assessment that allow students to work
closely with a particular historical topic.

This course is aligned to the Illinois State Goals 14 through 18 and the Illinois Learning
Standards for Social Science. The Goals, Standards, Benchmarks, Performance
Descriptors, and Assessment Framework Statements ensure that students have been
presented with essential content and concepts that will allow them to demonstrate
mastery. Illinois Learning Standards are aligned with important topics and themes
(including state mandates: Public Law 195, the African–American Experience, the Labor
Movement and Women’s Movement) which serve as instructional targets that bring focus
to classroom assessments. Infusion of applied learning skills such as solving problems,
communicating, using technology, working collaboratively, and making connections are
threaded throughout the Goals, Standards, and Benchmarks.

Central Concepts and Habits of Mind

The Main Foci of this Course Expressed as General Skills and Concepts

I. To enable the student to recognize the chronological nature of history.
   A. Identify time structure in historical narratives.
   B. Interpret data presented in timelines, graphics, and text.

II. To enable the student to think historically.
   A. Paraphrase the literal meaning of a historical passage.
   B. Identify the central question(s) addressed in historical narrative(s).
   C. Give evidence to support historical perspectives.
   D. Draw upon data in maps, graphs, charts, and political cartoons.

III. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and interpretation.
   A. Compare and contrast differing sets of ideas, values, personalities,
      behaviors, and institutions.
   B. Consider multiple perspectives.
   C. Analyze cause-and-effect relationships.
   D. Compare competing historical narratives.
   E. Draw conclusions about the influences of the past.

IV. To enable the student to conduct historical research.
   A. Formulate historical questions.
B. Retrieve historical data.
C. Question historical data.
V. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and decision-making.
   A. Identify issues and problems in the past.
   B. Examine evidence contributing to a historical event, relate it to a present-day event, and decide on a course of action.
   C. Evaluate the implementation and outcome of a decision.

Major Curriculum Structure

The United States History course is the second of three required courses in the social science sequence. This one-credit course consists of a chronological survey of the major themes and eras of United States history from its early beginnings to the present.

Classroom formative and summative assessments are used to monitor student progress; they must have academic rigor and also must be aligned to the Illinois State Goals, Illinois Learning Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Descriptors. Classroom assessments include products of student work such as written reports (i.e., essays, social science prompts), research projects, speeches, performances, debates, and portfolios, as well as forced-choice tests. A social science rubric, designed by either the teacher or the Illinois State Board of Education will be used.

The following outline delineates a sample of memorable events that could be used to drive the curriculum.

United States History

V. Semester I - First Quarter
   A. Early history in the Americas to 1620
      1. Voyages of Columbus
      2. Iroquois Confederacy
      3. Introduction of slavery
   B. Colonial history and settlement to 1763
      1. Fundamental Orders of Connecticut (1639)
      2. William Penn receives charter for Pennsylvania (1681)
   C. The American Revolution and Early National Period to 1820s
      1. Declaration of Independence
      2. Articles of Confederation
      3. United States Constitution

VI. Semester I - Second Quarter
   A. National Expansion from 1801 to 1861
      1. Louisiana Purchase
      2. War of 1812
      3. Missouri Compromise
4. Trail of Tears
B. The Civil War and Reconstruction from 1850 to 1877
   1. Abraham Lincoln’s election
   2. Civil Rights Act (1866)

VII. Semester II - Third Quarter
A. Development of the Industrial United States from 1865 to 1914
   1. Alexander Graham Bell patents the telephone (1876)
   2. Pullman strike (1894)
   3. Impact and contributions of Immigration
B. The Emergence of the United states as a World Power and WWI from 1890 to 1920
   1. Spanish-American War (1898)
   2. Panama Canal opens (1914)

C. Prosperity, Depression, the New Deal and World War II from 1920 to 1945
   1. Harlem Renaissance
   2. U.S. stock market crash
   3. The Holocaust

VIII. Semester II - Fourth Quarter
A. Post-World War II and the Cold War from 1945 to 1959
   1. Marshall Plan
   2. Establishment of NATO
B. Contemporary United States from 1960 to the present
   1. Civil Rights Movement
   2. Women’s Rights Movement
   3. Vietnam War
   4. 9/11

Best Practice Instructional Themes
Some aspects of instruction that are particular to this course are listed below.

- The United States History course should involve students in independent inquiry and cooperative learning to build lifelong learning skills and behaviors.
- The United States History course should involve students in reading, writing, observing, discussing, and debating to encourage active participation in learning.
- The students need the autonomy to select their own United States history topics for in-depth study. Good teaching involves showing the students how to make intelligent choices and helping students chart their own course of study from topics provided.
- United States History should challenge students’ thinking. This requires teachers to generate questions that invite discussion and promote student engagement.
In order to make United States History meaningful to the student, the student must be actively involved not only in the classroom, but also in the wider community. This involves creating links of content to preexisting knowledge and beliefs.

This United States History course must incorporate a rich understanding of the many ethnic groups and cultures in our country.

Instruction in United States History must reflect the importance of students’ ability to process the information given in order to become responsible citizens.

**Literacy in United States History**
Students must be able to demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of United States history (political, economic, social, geographic, and cultural), including an awareness of unity and diversity in American society. Students must also have knowledge and understanding of representative institutions (e.g., Congress, Electoral College) in order to determine and explain how those institutions have shaped and been shaped by different groups. Additionally, students must be able to demonstrate their understanding of the relationship(s) between the U.S. and other parts of the world.

In order to accomplish these objectives, students must become critical readers with opportunities to apply district-wide reading strategies, i.e., *Read, Think, and Write in response to text* as an integral component within this course. Students must have the ability to read, interpret, compare and contrast, think critically, and analyze information. Students must also be given opportunities to respond authentically to a variety of texts such as historical narratives, documents, reference materials, and both primary and secondary sources. The utilization of materials analyzing the interpretation of data from graphics such as maps, political cartoons, timelines, charts, diagrams, and other visuals will assist students in making historical connections. This minds-on approach requires that students interpret the provided information with personalized experiences, draw conclusions, make generalizations, and respond to issues presented orally and in writing to facilitate real-life applications of the social sciences.
Overview of the Course

The study of United States history allows secondary students to better understand the people, ideas, and forces that have shaped and impacted this country and its place in an ever-increasing interdependent global society. Looking back on the achievements, shortcomings, significant events, and conflicts in this country’s past, students will develop a greater appreciation for their place in a culturally diverse society that continually strives toward democratic ideals. An understanding of history empowers individuals to claim their rights, balance their own interests with those of the community, and participate effectively within their system of government.

This United States History II course provides a vehicle to explore what it means to be an American by studying the people and events that shaped United States history, from the beginning of the twentieth century with the domestic social transformations and globally with the emergence of the United States as a world power to the present. Students will become adept at expressing and interpreting information and ideas, recognizing and investigating problems, formulating and proposing solutions that are supported by reason and evidence, learning and contributing productively as individuals and members of groups, and recognizing and applying connections of important information and ideas. Students will learn specific concepts and skills, and form a fundamental understanding of United States history and how that history connects with the rest of the world.

Historical understanding is more than memorization of dates, events, and names. Historical inquiry provides a systematic way of approaching questions about the past and the present. A successful history course integrates approaches from other social sciences such as economics, geography, political science, and sociology. It teaches students how to ask critical questions about the past, and helps them seek their own answers. It also develops students’ literacy, analytical thinking, and communication skills through the study of primary and secondary sources and the sharing of interpretations with peers and teachers.

The formation of critical questions is essential for students to deepen both their ability to make historical connections and to comprehend the relevance and application of history in their own lives. For example, when studying inventions and technology, a teacher may pose the question, How has technology impacted your life and connected you to the global community in which you live? When investigating the Civil Rights Movement, a teacher may choose to have students explain how the legacy of civil rights affects their
life, or describe how their rights compare to the rights of groups of people in other countries.

No single history course can cover every aspect of the past; therefore, teachers must focus instruction on the events, people, organizations, and concepts that best convey the growth of this nation. Focusing on fewer topics, but going into greater depth with a rich collection of primary and secondary resources, will encourage students to develop their own questions and answers about the past. Teachers may also develop project and inquiry-based approaches to instruction and assessment that allow students to work closely with a particular historical topic.

This course is aligned to Illinois State Goals 14 through 18 and the Illinois Learning Standards for Social Science. The Goals, Standards, Benchmarks, Performance Descriptors, and Assessment Framework Statements ensure that students have been presented with essential content and concepts that will allow them to demonstrate mastery. Illinois Learning Standards are aligned with important topics and themes (including state mandates: Public Law 195, the African-American Experience, the Labor Movement, the Women’s Movement, and the Holocaust) which serve as instructional targets that bring focus to classroom assessments. Infusion of applied learning skills such as solving problems, communicating, using technology, working collaboratively, and making connections are threaded throughout the Goals, Standards, and Benchmarks.

Central Concepts and Habits of Mind

The Main Foci of this Course Expressed as General Skills and Concepts

I. To enable the student to recognize the chronological nature of history.
   A. Identify time structure in historical narratives.
   B. Interpret data presented in timelines, graphics, and text.

II. To enable the student to think historically.
   A. Paraphrase the literal meaning of a historical passage.
   B. Identify the central question(s) addressed in historical narrative(s).
   C. Give evidence to support historical perspectives.
   D. Draw upon data in maps, graphs, charts, and political cartoons.

III. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and interpretation.
    A. Compare and contrast differing sets of ideas, values, personalities, behaviors, and institutions.
    B. Consider multiple perspectives.
    C. Analyze cause-and-effect relationships.
    D. Compare competing historical narratives.
    E. Draw conclusions about the influences of the past.

IV. To enable the student to conduct historical research.
    A. Formulate historical questions.
    B. Retrieve historical data.
C. Question historical data.
V. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and decision-making.
   A. Identify issues and problems in the past.
   B. Examine evidence contributing to a historical event, relate it to a present-day event, and decide on a course of action.
   C. Evaluate the implementation and outcome of a decision.

Major Curriculum Structure

The United States History II course is the third of three required courses in the social science sequence. This one-credit course consists of a chronological survey of the major themes and eras of United States history from the beginning of the twentieth century to the present. It is suggested that United States History I be taken prior to for both a content and chronological foundation to segue to the United States History II course.

Classroom formative and summative assessments are used to monitor student progress; they must have academic rigor and also must be aligned to the Illinois State Goals, Illinois Learning Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Descriptors. Classroom assessments include products of student work such as written reports (i.e., essays, social science prompts), research projects, speeches, performances, debates, and portfolios, as well as forced-choice tests. A social science rubric, designed by either the teacher or the Illinois State Board of Education, will be used.

The following outline delineates a sample of memorable events that could be used to drive the curriculum.

United States History II

IX. Semester I - First Quarter
   A. The Emergence of the United States as a World Power and WWI from 1890 to 1920
      1. Panama Canal opens (1914)
      2. Fourteen Points (1918)
      3. Treaty of Versailles (1919)
   B. Reforms and Social Influences
      1. Progressivism
      2. Niagara Movement (1905)
   3. Jane Addams and Hull House
   C. The Impact of Prosperity and Depression
X. The Russian Revolution (1917)
   1. Harlem Renaissance
   2. U.S. stock market crash (1929)
   3. The Dust Bowl
4. New Deal Programs

XI. Semester II – Second Quarter
A. World War II to 1945
   1. The Holocaust
   2. The GI Bill of Rights (1944)
   3. Hiroshima and Nagasaki
B. Post-World War II and the Cold War from 1945 to 1959
   1. The Iron Curtain
   2. Establishment of NATO (1949)
   3. The Korean War (1950)
   4. McCarthyism
C. The Impact of Social Issues
   2. Salk Vaccine (1954)
   3. Influence of Sputnik (1957)
   4. Television, Technology, and the Media

XII. Semester II - Third Quarter
A. Movements and Challenges
   1. Nixon-Kennedy Debates
   2. March on Washington (1963)
   3. Vietnam War
   4. Women’s Movement
B. Domestic Policies
   1. Environmentalism
   2. Growth of Immigration
   3. Reaganomics
C. International Unrest and Policies
   1. Tiananmen Square (1989)

XIII. Breakup of Soviet Union (1990)
XIV. Persian Gulf War (1990)
   1. NAFTA and World Trade

XV. Semester II - Fourth Quarter
A. Challenges for Democracy
   1. Election of 2000
   2. September 11, 2001
B. Contemporary Global Issues
   1. War in Kosovo
   2. European Union
   3. Middle East Policies
Best Practice Instructional Themes

Some aspects of instruction that are particular to this course are listed on the following page:

- The United States History II course should involve students in independent inquiry and cooperative learning to build lifelong learning skills and behaviors.
- The United States History II course should involve students in reading, writing, observing, discussing, and debating to encourage active participation in learning.
- The students need the autonomy to select their own United States history topics for in-depth study. Good teaching involves showing the students how to make intelligent choices and helping students chart their own course of study from topics provided.
- United States History II should challenge students’ thinking. This requires teachers to generate questions that invite discussion and promote student engagement.
- In order to make United States History II meaningful to the student, the student must be actively involved not only in the classroom, but also in the wider community. This involves creating links of content to preexisting knowledge and beliefs.
- This United States History II course must incorporate a rich understanding of the many ethnic groups and cultures in our country.
- Instruction in United States History II must reflect the importance of students’ ability to process the information given in order to become responsible citizens.

Literacy in United States History II

Students must be able to demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of United States history (political, economic, social, geographic, and cultural), including an awareness of unity and diversity in American society. Students must also have knowledge and understanding of representative institutions (e.g., Congress, Electoral College) in order to determine and explain how those institutions have shaped and been shaped by different groups. Additionally, students must be able to demonstrate their understanding of the relationship(s) between the U.S. and other parts of the world.

In order to accomplish these objectives, students must become critical readers with opportunities to apply district-wide reading strategies, i.e., Read, Think, and Write in response to text, as an integral component within this course. Students must have the ability to read, interpret, compare and contrast, think critically, and analyze information. Students must also be given opportunities to respond authentically to a variety of texts such as historical narratives, documents, reference materials, and both primary and secondary sources. The utilization of materials analyzing the interpretation of data from graphics such as maps, political cartoons, timelines, charts, diagrams, and other visuals will assist students in making historical connections. This minds-on approach requires that students interpret the provided information with personalized experiences, draw conclusions, make generalizations, and respond to issues presented orally and in writing to facilitate real-life applications of the social sciences.
Overview of the Course

The study of contemporary United States history allows secondary students to better understand the people, ideas, and forces that have shaped and impacted this country and its place in an ever-increasing interdependent global society. Looking back on both the achievements, shortcomings, significant events, and conflicts in this country’s past and analyzing current developments, students will gain a greater appreciation for their place in a culturally diverse society that continually strives toward democratic ideals. An understanding of history empowers individuals to claim their rights, balance their own interests with those of the community, and participate effectively within their system of government. The unique instructional focus of a course in contemporary history provides a bridge to the relevancy and the immediacy of the world in which our students live. It is imperative that students are enabled to make real-world connections, whether globally to the daily media portrayal of domestic and international events or locally to their community issues.

This Contemporary American History course provides a vehicle to explore what it means to be an American by studying the people and events that shaped recent United States history, from 1945 and the Cold War to the present. Students will become adept at expressing and interpreting information and ideas, recognizing and investigating problems, formulating and proposing solutions that are supported by reason and evidence, learning and contributing productively as individuals and members of groups, and recognizing and applying connections of important information and ideas. Students will learn specific concepts and skills, and form a fundamental understanding of contemporary United States history and how that history connects with the rest of the world, including diplomacy, trade and international relations.

Historical understanding is more than memorization of dates, events, and names. Historical inquiry provides a systematic way of approaching questions about the past and the present. A successful history course integrates approaches from other social sciences such as economics, geography, political science, and sociology. It teaches students how to ask critical questions about the past, and helps them seek their own answers. It also develops students’ literacy, analytical thinking, and communication skills through the study of primary and secondary sources and the sharing of interpretations with peers and teachers.
The formation of critical questions is essential for students to deepen both their ability to make historical connections and to comprehend the relevance and application of history in their own lives. For example, when studying inventions and technology, a teacher may pose the question, *How has technology impacted your life and connected you to the global community in which you live?* When investigating the Civil Rights Movement, a teacher may choose to have students explain how the legacy of civil rights affects their life, or describe how their rights compare to the rights of groups of people in other countries. Contemporary American history is replete with current issues, events, and relationships that can trigger discussions and research for students to compare, contrast, connect, synthesize, and extrapolate to make historical connections.

No single history course can cover *every* aspect of the past; therefore, teachers must focus instruction on the events, people, organizations, and concepts that best convey the growth of this nation. Focusing on fewer topics, but going into greater depth with a rich collection of primary and secondary resources, will encourage students to develop their own questions and answers about the past. Teachers may also develop project and inquiry-based approaches to instruction and assessment that allow students to work closely with a particular historical topic.

This course is aligned to Illinois State Goals 14 through 18 and the Illinois Learning Standards for Social Science. The Goals, Standards, Benchmarks, Performance Descriptors, and Assessment Framework Statements ensure that students have been presented with essential content and concepts that will allow them to demonstrate mastery. Illinois Learning Standards are aligned with important topics and themes (including state mandates: Public Law 195, the African-American Experience, the Labor Movement, the Women’s Movement and the aftermath of the Holocaust) which serve as instructional targets that bring focus to classroom assessments. Infusion of applied learning skills such as solving problems, communicating, using technology, working collaboratively, and making connections are threaded throughout the Goals, Standards, and Benchmarks.

**Central Concepts and Habits of Mind**

The Main Foci of this Course Expressed as General Skills and Concepts

I. To enable the student to recognize the chronological nature of history.
   A. Identify time structure in historical narratives.
   B. Interpret data presented in timelines, graphics, and text.

II. To enable the student to think historically.
   A. Paraphrase the literal meaning of a historical passage.
   B. Identify the central question(s) addressed in historical narrative(s).
   C. Give evidence to support historical perspectives.
   D. Draw upon data in maps, graphs, charts, and political cartoons.

III. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and interpretation.
A. Compare and contrast differing sets of ideas, values, personalities, behaviors, and institutions.
B. Consider multiple perspectives.
C. Analyze cause-and-effect relationships.
D. Compare competing historical narratives.
E. Draw conclusions about the influences of the past.

IV. To enable the student to conduct historical research.
A. Formulate historical questions.
B. Retrieve historical data.
C. Question historical data.

V. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and decision-making.
A. Identify issues and problems in the past.
B. Examine evidence contributing to a historical event, relate it to a present-day event, and decide on a course of action.
C. Evaluate the implementation and outcome of a decision.

Major Curriculum Structure

The Contemporary American History course should follow a foundational survey course in United States history as part of the social science sequence. This one-credit course consists of a chronological survey of the major themes and eras of United States history from the end of World War II to the present. The utilization and analyses of current events should be a central core to this course for students to cultivate and execute critical thinking skills.

Classroom formative and summative assessments are used to monitor student progress; they must have academic rigor and also must be aligned to the Illinois State Goals, Illinois Learning Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Descriptors. Classroom assessments include products of student work such as written reports (i.e., essays, social science prompts), research projects, speeches, performances, debates, and portfolios, as well as forced-choice tests. A social science rubric, designed by either the teacher or the Illinois State Board of Education, will be used.

The following outline delineates a sample of memorable events that could be used to drive the curriculum.

**Contemporary American History**

XVI. Semester I - First Quarter
A. The Aftermath of WWII and Origins of the Cold War
   1. The Iron Curtain
   2. The Truman Doctrine (1947)
   3. The Marshall Plan (1948)
   4. McCarthyism
B. International Relations
   1. Establishment of NATO (1949)
   2. The Korean War (1950)
   3. Suez Crisis (1956)
   4. The Eisenhower Doctrine (1957)

C. The Impact of Social Issues
XVII. Brown v. Board of Education (1954)
   1. Rise of Suburbia
   2. The Influence of Sputnik (1957)

XVIII. Semester I - Second Quarter
A. Movements and Challenges
   1. Cuban Missile Crisis (1962)
   2. March on Washington (1963)
   3. Vietnam War
   4. Women’s Rights
B. Domestic Influences
   1. Environmentalism
   2. Growth of Immigration

XIX. Semester II - Third Quarter
A. Conflicts and Compromises
   1. Détente and SALT
   2. Watergate (1973)
   3. Camp David Accords (1978)
B. Legacies of the 1980’s
   1. Reaganomics
   2. Perestroika politics
C. International Unrest and Policies
   1. Tiananmen Square (1989)
   2. Break-up of Soviet Union (1990)
   3. Persian Gulf War (1990)

XX. Semester II - Fourth Quarter
A. Reforms and Global Interdependency
   1. Family and Medical Leave Act (1993)
   2. NAFTA and World Trade
B. Challenges for Democracy
   1. War in Kosovo
   2. Election of 2000
   3. September 11, 2001
C. Contemporary Global Issues
   1. The European Union
   2. Middle East Policies
**Best Practice Instructional Themes**

Some aspects of instruction that are particular to this course are listed below.

- The Contemporary American History course should involve students in independent inquiry and cooperative learning to build lifelong learning skills and behaviors.
- The Contemporary American History course should involve students in reading, writing, observing, discussing, and debating to encourage active participation in learning.
- The students need the autonomy to select their own contemporary United States history topics for in-depth study. Good teaching involves showing the students how to make intelligent choices and helping students chart their own course of study from topics provided.
- Contemporary American History should challenge students’ thinking. This requires teachers to generate questions that invite discussion and promote student engagement.
- In order to make Contemporary American History meaningful to the student, the student must be actively involved not only in the classroom, but also in the wider community. This involves creating links of content to pre-existing knowledge and beliefs.
- This Contemporary American History course must incorporate a rich understanding of the many ethnic groups and cultures in our country.
- Instruction in Contemporary American History must reflect the importance of students’ ability to process the information given in order to become responsible citizens.

**Literacy in Contemporary American History**

Students must be able to demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of contemporary United States history (political, economic, social, geographic, and cultural), including an awareness of unity and diversity in American society. Students must also have knowledge and understanding of representative institutions (e.g., Congress, Electoral College) in order to determine and explain how those institutions have shaped and been shaped by different groups. Additionally, students must be able to demonstrate their understanding of the relationship(s) between the U.S. and other parts of the world.

In order to accomplish these objectives, students must become critical readers with opportunities to apply district-wide reading strategies, i.e., *Read, Think, and Write in response to text* as an integral component within this course. Students must have the ability to read, interpret, compare and contrast, think critically, and analyze information. Students must also be given opportunities to respond authentically to a variety of texts such as historical narratives, documents, reference materials, and both primary and secondary sources. The utilization of materials analyzing the interpretation of data from graphics (such as maps, political cartoons, timelines, charts, diagrams, and other visuals)
will assist students in making historical connections. This minds-on approach requires that students interpret the provided information with personalized experiences, draw conclusions, make generalizations, and respond to issues presented orally and in writing to facilitate real-life applications of the social sciences.
Overview of the Course

The introductory social studies course of World Studies allows secondary students to better comprehend the people, ideas, and forces that have shaped world history and analyze the elements of culture that influence the global society in which they live. Looking back on the achievements, shortcomings, significant events, and conflicts in various cultures, students will develop a greater appreciation for not only the common elements of a culture, but also for the unique contributions that various cultures have had shaping the world. An understanding of history empowers individuals to claim their rights, balance their own interests with those of the community, and participate effectively within their system of government in addition to deepening an understanding of the human experience.

This World Studies course provides a vehicle to explore various belief systems, historical events, geographic regions, societies and civilizations. Students will become adept at expressing and interpreting information and ideas, recognizing and investigating problems, formulating and proposing solutions that are supported by reason and evidence, learning and contributing productively as individuals and members of groups, and recognizing and applying connections of important information and ideas. Students can be enabled to become global citizens by learning specific concepts and skills, and forming a fundamental understanding of world history and how that history connects them with the rest of the world. World history encompasses not only the lives of the extraordinary, but also the ordinary and those that have been involved in historical conflicts and how they resolved them. Understanding the encounters of the past and making parallels to the present will enable students to analyze the exchange of ideas, beliefs, and resources, among people over time.

Historical understanding is more than memorization of dates, events, and names. Historical inquiry provides a systematic way of approaching questions about the past and the present. A successful history course integrates approaches from other social sciences such as economics, geography, political science, and sociology. It teaches students how to ask critical questions about the past, and helps them seek their own answers. It also develops students’ literacy, analytical thinking, and communication skills through the study of primary and secondary sources and the sharing of interpretations with peers and teachers.

The formation of critical questions is essential for students to deepen both their ability to make historical connections and to comprehend the relevance and application of history in their own lives. For example, when studying inventions and technology, a teacher may
pose the question, *How has technology impacted your life and connected you to the global community in which you live?* When investigating the human rights movement, a teacher may choose to have students explain how the legacy of human rights affects their life, or describe how their rights compare to the rights of groups of people in other countries.

No single history course can cover *every* aspect of the past; therefore, teachers must focus instruction on the events, people, organizations, and concepts that best drive history. Focusing on fewer topics, but going into greater depth with a rich collection of primary and secondary resources, will encourage students to develop their own questions and answers about the past. Teachers may also develop project and inquiry-based approaches to instruction and assessment that allow students to work closely with a particular historical topic.

This course is aligned to Illinois State Goals 14 through 18 and the Illinois Learning Standards for Social Science. The Goals, Standards, Benchmarks, Performance Descriptors, and Assessment Framework Statements ensure that students have been presented with essential content and concepts that will allow them to demonstrate mastery. Illinois Learning Standards are aligned with important topics and themes (including the state mandate of the Holocaust, Labor Movement, and Women’s Movement) which serve as instructional targets that bring focus to classroom assessments. Infusion of applied learning skills such as solving problems, communicating, using technology, working collaboratively, and making connections are threaded throughout the Goals, Standards, and Benchmarks.

**Central Concepts and Habits of Mind**

The Main Foci of this Course Expressed as General Skills and Concepts

I. To enable the student to recognize the chronological nature of history.
   A. Identify time structure in historical narratives.
   B. Interpret data presented in timelines, graphics, and text.

II. To enable the student to think historically.
   A. Paraphrase the literal meaning of a historical passage.
   B. Identify the central question(s) addressed in historical narrative(s).
   C. Give evidence to support historical perspectives.
   D. Draw upon data in maps, graphs, charts, and political cartoons.

III. To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and interpretation.
   A. Compare and contrast differing sets of ideas, values, personalities, behaviors, and institutions.
   B. Consider multiple perspectives.
   C. Analyze cause-and-effect relationships.
   D. Compare competing historical narratives.
   E. Draw conclusions about the influences of the past.
IV. To enable the student to conduct historical research.
   A. Formulate historical questions.
   B. Retrieve historical data.
   C. Question historical data.
V.   To enable the student to engage in historical analysis and decision-making.
   A. Identify issues and problems in the past.
   B. Examine evidence contributing to a historical event, relate it to a present-day event, and decide on a course of action.
   C. Evaluate the implementation and outcome of a decision.

Major Curriculum Structure

The World Studies course is the first of three required courses in the social science sequence. This one-credit course consists of a chronological survey of the major themes and eras of world history from its early beginnings to the present with an emphasis on history, geography, economics, social systems, and political science. World Studies will be a rudimentary course to build skills for further study of other social science courses and enable students to understand the role of the United States in global affairs.

Classroom formative and summative assessments are used to monitor student progress; they must have academic rigor and also must be aligned to the Illinois State Goals, Illinois Learning Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Descriptors. Classroom assessments include products of student work such as written reports (i.e., essays, social science prompts), research projects, speeches, performances, debates, and portfolios, as well as forced-choice tests. A social science rubric, designed by either the teacher or the Illinois State Board of Education will be used.

The following outline of chronological descriptors suggested by the Illinois State Board of Education is enhanced with samples of memorable events that could be used to drive the curriculum.

World Studies

XXI.  Semester I - First Quarter
(Review of Social Science skills and concepts e.g., elements of culture, map skills, commerce)
   A. Prehistory to 2000 B.C.E.
      1. Human origins in Africa
      2. Bronze Age
      3. Sumerian Cuneiform
   B. Early civilizations, non-Western empires, and tropical civilizations
      1. Code of Hammurabi
      2. Phoenician Trader
C. The rise of pastoral peoples to 1000 B.C.E.
   1. Indus Valley Culture
   2. Mesopotamia

XXII. Semester I – Second Quarter

A. Classical civilizations from 1000 B.C.E. to 500 C.E.
   1. Confucian Ideas
   2. Persian Wars
B. Fragmentation and interaction of civilizations from 500 to 1100 C.E.
   1. Disappearance of the Mayan civilization
   2. The Crusades
C. Centralization of power in different regions from 1000 to 1500 C.E.
   1. Spanish marriage of Isabel and Ferdinand
   2. Feudalism

XXIII. Semester II - Third Quarter

A. Early modern world from 1450 to 1800
   1. Voyages of Columbus
   2. The Reformation
B. Global unrest, change and revolution from 1750 to 1850
   1. Venezuelan independence from Spain
   2. Bismarck unites Germany
   3. Opium War in China
C. Global encounters and imperialism and their effects form 1850 to 1914
   1. The Berlin Conference
   2. Assassination of Archduke Ferdinand

XXIV. Semester II - Fourth Quarter

A. The twentieth century to 1945
   1. Russian Revolution
   2. The Holocaust
B. The contemporary world from 1945 to the present
   1. Apartheid resistance movement
   2. Dissolution of the Soviet Union
   3. September 11, 2001
Best Practice Instructional Themes

Some aspects of instruction that are particular to this course are listed below.

- The World Studies course should involve students in independent inquiry and cooperative learning to build lifelong learning skills and behaviors.
- The World Studies course should involve students in reading, writing, observing, discussing, and debating to encourage active participation in learning.
- The students need the autonomy to select their own World Studies history topics for in-depth study. Good teaching involves showing the students how to make intelligent choices and helping students chart their own course of study from topics provided.
- World Studies should challenge students’ thinking. This requires teachers to generate questions that invite discussion and promote student engagement.
- In order to make World Studies meaningful to the student, the student must be actively involved not only in the classroom, but also in the wider community. This involves creating links of content to preexisting knowledge and beliefs.
- This World Studies course must incorporate a rich understanding of the many ethnic groups and cultures in our country.
- Instruction in World Studies must reflect the importance of students’ ability to process the information given in order to become responsible citizens.

Literacy in World Studies

Students must be able to demonstrate a basic knowledge and understanding of world history (political, economic, social, geographic, and cultural), including an awareness of unity and diversity in the world they live. Students must also have knowledge and understanding of representative institutions (e.g., government, education, laws) in order to determine and explain how those institutions have shaped and been shaped by different groups. Additionally, students must be able to demonstrate their understanding of the relationship(s) between the United States and other parts of the world.

In order to accomplish these objectives, students must become critical readers with opportunities to apply district-wide reading strategies, i.e., Read, Think, and Write in response to text as an integral component within this course. Students must have the ability to read, interpret, compare and contrast, think critically, and analyze information. Students must also be given opportunities to respond authentically to a variety of texts such as historical narratives, documents, reference materials, and both primary and secondary sources. The utilization of materials analyzing the interpretation of data from graphics such as maps, political cartoons, timelines, charts, diagrams, and other visuals will assist students in making historical connections. This minds-on approach requires that students interpret the provided information with personalized experiences, draw conclusions, make generalizations, and respond to issues presented orally and in writing to facilitate real-life applications of the social sciences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics / Concepts/ Big Ideas</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
<th>Performance Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early history in the Americas to 1620</td>
<td>14A. Understand and explain basic principles of the United States government.</td>
<td>14.F.4a Determine the historical events and processes that brought about changes in United States political ideas and traditions (e.g., the New Deal, Civil War).</td>
<td>Describe significant historical events and processes that brought about changes in the political ideas and traditions of the United States (e.g., Civil War, the New Deal). Analyze the evolution of a particular political tradition that still influences modern political discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early history in the Americas to 1620</td>
<td>15A. Apply the skills of historical analysis and interpretation.</td>
<td>16.A.4a Analyze and report historical events to determine cause-and-effect relationships.</td>
<td>Explain why significant historical events have multiple causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.A.4b Compare competing historical interpretations of an event.</td>
<td>Compare the narrative in a work of historical fiction with the narrative of the same event in a work by an historian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explain the reasons why historians working in different periods can arrive at different conclusions of the same event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defend an interpretation of a significant person or event using a variety of primary and secondary sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Course Quarterly Planning Map

**Course Title:** Contemporary American History  
**Content Area:** Social Science  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics / Concepts/Big Ideas</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
<th>Performance Descriptors</th>
<th>Assessment Framework Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Aftermath of World War II, The Origins of the Cold War, International Relations, and the Impact of Social Issues—1945-1959 | 14 A. Understand and explain basic principles of the United States government | 14.A.4 Analyze how local, state and national governments serve the purposes for which they were created.  
14.A.5 Analyze ways in which federalism protects individual rights and promotes the common good and how at times has made it possible for states to protect and deny rights for certain groups. | - Describe how changing interpretations of the powers and limitations of our Constitution have affected rights and responsibilities of groups and individuals.  
- Evaluate the relationship that can exist between local, state, and national governments concerning majority rule and minority rights.  
- Analyze the fundamental principles of our political system that often come into conflict (e.g., rule of law, liberty and equality, individual rights and the common good, separation of powers, majority rule and minority rights).  
- Evaluate how fundamental political principles (e.g., separation of powers, checks and balances, individual rights, and federalism) led to the development of democratic government in the United States and Illinois.  
- Analyze significant U.S. Supreme Court decisions that address equal protection and due process issues. | 14.11.01 Identify the significance of key Supreme Court decisions and how varying interpretations of the Constitution have defined, limited or expanded individual rights, as well as addressed the Constitutional principles of separation of powers and checks and balances, including... Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka,  
14.11.02 Distinguish between enumerated and implied powers in the U.S. and Illinois Constitutions.  
14.11.03 Understand the tensions within the U.S. constitutional democracy (e.g., majority role/individual rights; state/national authority; civil disobedience/rule of law; freedom of press/right to a fair trial; religion/government). Analyze the rights contained in the Bill of Rights and explain the process through which amendments are added to the Constitution.  
14.11.05 Identify the “continuity and change” of the U.S. Constitution over time, and why one depends upon the other.  
14.11.06 Analyze the development of federal civil rights and voting rights, in terms of: key court cases and ballot initiatives: Plessy v. Ferguson, Brown v. Board of Education; key leaders: Thurgood Marshall...  
14.11.07 Understand the growth of the United States government since the New Deal and explain how it has affected the political process over time. |
APPENDIX D

CONGRESSIONAL CRISIS IN HISTORY: A STATEMENT
NCSS JOINT POSITION STATEMENT ON NCLB
NCSS RESOLUTIONS ON SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION
NCSS ADVOCACY LETTER TO SENATOR OBAMA
Crisis in History: A Statement

Editor's Note: Earlier this summer NCHE Trustee Theodore K. Rabb of Princeton University was asked, by a bipartisan group of U.S. Senators concerned about the state of history instruction in our schools, to draft a statement about the need for further action beyond the Teaching American History Grant Program that has been passed by Congress in recent years and the American History Achievement Act that is pending before the Senate. What follows is that statement, which he drafted together with NCHE Trustee Byron Hollinshed of American Historical Publications. In accordance with the Senators' wishes, it has been circulated to distinguished roster of public figures, historians, leaders of historical organizations, Pulitzer Prize winners, and educators who have endorsed its goals. That list of signatories is appended to the statement, but its impact would be greatly enhanced if, as we hope, a large number of members of NCHE will be willing to add their names to the list. To indicate your support of the Statement, please go to the NCHE website <www.nche.net>. Click on the "Crisis in History" link and follow the directions. Co-signers will be adding their names as individuals with their affiliations only as identification."

Whereas, to quote Senator Lamar Alexander, "American history is our children's worst subject";

Whereas, to quote the 1988 report of the Bradley Commission on History in the Schools:

"History belongs in the school programs of all students, regardless of the academic standing and preparation... because it provides the only avenue we have to reach an understanding of ourselves and of our society.

Without such understanding, the two foremost aims of American education will not be achieved — the preparation of all our people for private lives of personal integrity and fulfillment, and their preparation for public life as democratic citizens";

Whereas, to address this problem and this need, two major shortcomings of America's educational system—

(a) the inadequate time given to history instruction, especially in the early grades; and

(b) the inadequate training in content demanded of teachers of history;

—require urgent attention;

We, the undersigned, many of us members of the National Council for History Education (the sole nation-wide membership organization devoted to the improvement of the teaching of history in our schools), submit this statement on the CRISIS IN HISTORY in order to promote the improvement of history education by taking the following steps:

1. Given the emphasis on Reading in the No Child Left Behind legislation, we recommend the adoption of guidelines to ensure that the texts used to teach reading include a substantial proportion of biographies and other works of history;

(continued on page 7)
Crisis in History: A Statement (continued from page 1)

2. Given the excellent History curricula that have been adopted in a number of States, we recommend that, as an amendment to the No Child Left Behind legislation, States and localities (the determiners of educational policy) be encouraged to adopt substantial requirements for the teaching of history in the first eight grades; and

3. Given the success of the Teaching American History Initiative and Senate Bill 2721, the American History Achievement Act, in improving the preparation of teachers of history, we recommend:

(i) that both these programs be expanded;
(ii) that funds be provided for all States to offer such programs; and
(iii) that funds be provided for all Schools of Education to offer intensive preparation in the content of History as part of the education of teachers of history.

Signed by:
Edward L. Ayers, Professor of History & Dean, Arts & Sciences, University of Virginia
Bernard Bailyn, Professor Emeritus of History, Harvard University, Pulitzer Prize Winner, Former President, AHA
Douglas Brinkley, Director, Eisenhower Center, University of New Orleans
Spencer R. Crew, Executive Director, National Underground RR Freedom Center, Former Director, National Museum of American History, Chair, NCHS Board of Trustees
The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton, Former US Senator From Missouri
Sharon Flack, Coordinator of Social Studies, West Virginia Dept. of Education
Eric Foner, Professor of History, Columbia University, Former President, OAH & AHA
John Hope Franklin, Professor Emeritus of History, Duke University, Former President, OAH & AHA
Vartan Gregorian, President, The Carnegie Corporation of New York
Victor Hanson, Senior Fellow, The Hoover Institute, Stanford University
Byron Hollinshead, President & CEO, American Historical Publications, Former Chair, National History Day

Akira Iriye, Professor of History, Harvard University, Former President, AHA
Kenneth T. Jackson, Professor of History, Columbia University, Former OAH President & NCHS Chair
David Kennedy, Professor of History, Stanford University, Pulitzer Prize Winner
Linda Kerber, Professor of History, University of Iowa, Former President, OAH
Henry Kierman, Incoming Chair, NCHS
Cynthia M. Koch, Hyde Park, NY
William E. Leuchtenburg, Professor Emeritus of History, University of North Carolina, Former President, OAH & AHA
David McCullough, West Tisbury, MA, Pulitzer Prize Winner
Mary Beth Norton, Professor of History, Cornell University
Georgia Nugent, President, Kenyon College
Nell Irvin Painter, Professor of History, Princeton University
Theodore K. Rabb, Professor of History, Princeton University, Former Chair, NCHS
Diane Ravitch, Professor of Education, New York University
Elaine W. Reed, Executive Director, NCHS
Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Professor of History Emeritus, CUNY, Pulitzer Prize Winner, Former President, AHA
Sam Wineburg, Professor of Education, Stanford University
Gordon Wood, Professor of History, Brown University, Pulitzer Prize Winner.

AHA = American Historical Association; NCHS = National Council for History Education; OAH = Organization of American Historians.

To become a co-signer of this statement, visit the NCHS website: <www.nchs.net>.
Joint Organizational Statement on the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act

The undersigned education, civil rights, religious, children’s, disability, civic and labor organizations are committed to the No Child Left Behind Act’s objectives of strong academic achievement for all children and closing the achievement gap. We believe that the federal government has a critical role to play in attaining these goals. We endorse the use of an accountability system that helps ensure all children, including children of color, from low-income families, with disabilities, and of limited English proficiency, are prepared to be successful, participating members of our democracy.

While we all have different positions on various aspects of the law, based on concerns raised during the implementation of NCLB, we believe the following significant, constructive corrections are among those necessary to make the Act fair and effective. Among these concerns are: over-emphasizing standardized testing, narrowing curriculum and instruction to focus on test preparation rather than richer academic learning; over-identifying schools in need of improvement; using sanctions that do not help improve schools; inappropriately excluding low-scoring children in order to boost test results; and inadequate funding. Overall, the law’s emphasis needs to shift from applying sanctions for failing to raise test scores to holding states and localities accountable for making the systemic changes that improve student achievement.

continued on next page
RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN NCLB

Progress Measurement
1. Replace the law’s arbitrary proficiency targets with ambitious achievement targets based on rates of success actually achieved by the most effective public schools.

2. Allow states to measure progress by using students’ growth in achievement as well as their performance in relation to pre-determined levels of academic proficiency.

3. Ensure that states and school districts regularly report to the government and the public their progress in implementing systemic changes to enhance educator, family, and community capacity to improve student learning.

4. Provide a comprehensive picture of students’ and schools’ performance by moving from an overwhelming reliance on standardized tests to using multiple indicators of student achievement in addition to these tests.

5. Fund research and development of more effective accountability systems that better meet the goal of high academic achievement for all children.

Assessments
6. Help states develop assessment systems that include district and school-based measures in order to provide better, more timely information about student learning.

7. Strengthen enforcement of NCLB provisions requiring that assessments must:
   - Be aligned with state content and achievement standards;
   - Be used for purposes for which they are valid and reliable;
   - Be consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical standards;
   - Be of adequate technical quality for each purpose required under the Act;
   - Provide multiple, up-to-date measures of student performance including measures that assess higher order thinking skills and understanding; and
   - Provide useful diagnostic information to improve teaching and learning.

8. Decrease the testing burden on states, schools and districts by allowing states to assess students annually in selected grades in elementary, middle schools, and high schools.

Building Capacity
9. Ensure changes in teacher and administrator preparation and continuing professional development that research evidence and experience indicate improve educational quality and student achievement.

10. Enhance state and local capacity to effectively implement the comprehensive changes required to increase the knowledge and skills of administrators, teachers, families, and communities to support high student achievement.

Sanctions
11. Ensure that improvement plans are allowed sufficient time to take hold before applying sanctions; sanctions should not be applied if they undermine existing effective reform efforts.

12. Replace sanctions that do not have a consistent record of success with interventions that enable schools to make changes that result in improved student achievement.

Funding
13. Raise authorized levels of NCLB funding to cover a substantial percentage of the costs that states and districts will incur to carry out these recommendations, and fully fund the law at those levels without reducing expenditures on other education programs.

14. Fully fund Title I to ensure that 100 percent of eligible children are served.

We, the undersigned, will work for the adoption of these recommendations as central structural changes needed to NCLB at the same time that we advance our individual organization’s proposals.

The most current list of signers, which includes NCSS, can be seen at the FairTest website www.fairtest.org/joint%20statement %2007-%2008.html. Signers as of July 4, 2007 are shown on the next page.
Working Group of Social Studies Discipline Organizations Joint Statement on NCLB

1. Subpart 1—Basic Program
   Requirements, sec. 11111. State plans, (b)(1)(C)
   Add “the core social studies disciplines—civics/government, economics, geography, and history” to this academic standards provision.

2. Subpart 1—Basic Program
   Requirements, sec. 11111. Academic Assessments (b)(3)(A)
   Add “the core social studies disciplines—civics/government, economics, geography, and history” to the requirements for assessments and accountability.

3. Title II professional development
   fund requirements include alignment with state standards and assessments.
   Adding “the core social studies disciplines—civics/government, economics, geography, and history” to these provisions would allow for equity in funding for these content areas.

Working Group of Social Studies Discipline Organizations

American Historical Association, Teaching Division
Center for Civic Education
Constitutional Rights Foundation
Constitutional Rights Foundation/Chicago
JA Worldwide™

National Council on Economic Education
National Council for the Social Studies
National Geographic Society
National History Day
Organization of American Historians
World History Association

Social Studies and the Young Learner, Volume 20, No. 1 (September 2007) pp. 31-33
October 8, 2008

Senator Barack Obama
Obama for America
P.O. Box 8102
Chicago, IL 60680

Dear Senator Obama:

As you and Senator McCain compete for the highest office in the land and share your views and plans for US policies home and abroad over the next four years, the importance of a strong and accountable public education system cannot be understated. As you know, training and retaining a quality teaching workforce, addressing the dropout crisis that plagues public high schools, giving young people crucial 21st Century Skills that facilitate success in the workplace and college, addressing the persistent achievement gap and maintaining a strong higher education system are crucial to an effective citizenry and healthy economy.

On behalf of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) and its more than 25,000 members, we would like to share our views and priorities on a number of issues that will be considered by the next Administration. As you and your prospective Secretary of Education work with lawmakers on Capitol Hill to consider policies that affect K-12 schools and classrooms, we ask you to consider these views.

NCSS defines social studies as “the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence.” The mission of the Council is to provide leadership, service and support for all social studies educators. During this presidential election year, we are reminded how important it is that citizens know their civic responsibilities. It is important that federal investments validate the role of social studies in exposing young people to civic engagement, economics and financial literacy, global awareness, historical reasoning and other subjects that yield increasingly crucial 21st Century skills.

As you know, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is a law that has had an enormous impact on public education throughout the nation and has brought vital focus to the need to define school wide academic success as success for every child. NCSS wholeheartedly endorses this goal, but believes the law can be both strengthened and improved. NCSS is concerned that social studies is getting short shrift in the classroom as teachers and administrators focus almost exclusively on achievement test results in math and reading. If American students are to succeed in the global market place of the 21st Century, it is the teaching of social studies, science and other core disciplines that will serve as the means to stimulate interest in academics and prepare students for their roles as citizens.
The Center on Education Policy (CEP) released a report in 2007 that asserts that since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, 44% of districts surveyed have reduced time for social studies. That percentage leapt to 51% in districts with “failing schools.” Denying students the opportunity to build social studies vocabulary and background knowledge lowers reading comprehension and ironically increases the achievement gap. This is clearly an unintended consequence of NCLB and one that deserves the attention of policy makers.

Powerful social studies teaching begins with a clear understanding of the subject’s unique purposes and goals. Social studies is a discipline that facilitates the teaching of a number of subjects and arms young people with the knowledge and skills they need to be effective and responsible citizens. An emphasis on reading knowledge alone ignores the value of important content and analysis. Rigorous and relevant social studies curriculum can—and does—teach reading skills while imparting important knowledge and skills. The same is true in mathematics. Economics, financial literacy, geography and other disciplines have mathematics lessons and content imbedded in their teaching. NCSS firmly believes that by incorporating a social studies curriculum into the school day, the reading and math skills of the students will actually be enhanced.

Finally, as social studies educators strive to give young people the skills and knowledge they need to become effective citizens, it is crucial they have access to quality professional development to meet the demands of the ever-changing classroom. There are a number of federal programs that assist districts, administrators and principals in their efforts to support their classroom teachers. We ask you to adequately fund these initiatives, including the Teaching American History grant program, National History Day, Civic Education, Excellence in Economic Education, Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants and NCLB Improving Teacher Quality State Grants. Adequate federal funding for existing programs and innovative new ideas can and do help tens of thousands of students and teachers to gain important skills and experiences, ultimately producing responsible citizens.

No matter who takes up residence in the White House in January, he and his staff will face challenges, and we look forward to working with the team as it faces appropriations battles, considers the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act and addresses important issues that affect classrooms, teachers, administrators, parents and students.

Thank you for your attention to these views. As the campaign continues, if we can provide you with any additional information, please contact NCSS Executive Director Susan Griffin at 301.581.1800 or sgriffin@ncss.org.

Sincerely,

Susan Griffin
Executive Director

Michael Yell
President

National Council for the Social Studies
8333 Sixteenth Street, Suite 206 | Silver Spring, Maryland 20910 | 301.588.1800 | Fax 301.588.2602 | www.socialstudies.org

Facilitating Social Studies Creating Effective Citizens
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