

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013



EXEMPLARY SCIENCE STANDARDS

# How Does Your State Compare?

Edited by Kathleen Porter-Magee, Brandon Wright, and Laurel Horn

Introduction by Chester E. Finn, Jr. and Kathleen Porter-Magee

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

# Contents

Introduction.....	3	Nebraska.....	64
Alabama.....	7	Nevada.....	67
Alaska.....	10	New Hampshire.....	70
Arizona.....	13	New Jersey.....	73
Colorado.....	16	New Mexico.....	76
Connecticut.....	19	North Carolina.....	79
Delaware.....	22	North Dakota.....	82
Florida.....	25	Oklahoma.....	85
Georgia.....	28	Oregon.....	88
Hawaii.....	31	Pennsylvania.....	91
Idaho.....	34	Rhode Island.....	94
Illinois.....	37	South Dakota.....	97
Iowa.....	40	Tennessee.....	100
Kentucky.....	43	Texas.....	103
Maine.....	46	Vermont.....	106
Michigan.....	49	Washington.....	109
Minnesota.....	52	West Virginia.....	112
Mississippi.....	55	Wisconsin.....	115
Missouri.....	58	Wyoming.....	118
Montana.....	61		

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Introduction

by Chester E. Finn, Jr. and Kathleen Porter-Magee

The final version of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) was released in April. As we did for the two public drafts that preceded it, we asked our team of science experts<sup>1</sup> to evaluate these ambitious new standards, using substantially the same criteria that they used to judge each state’s K–12 science standards a year earlier.<sup>2</sup> Those criteria focus on two categories: the content and rigor of the science material covered and the clarity and specificity of the expectations themselves. After careful consideration of the NGSS, weighing both their strengths and their shortcomings, our judgment was that the NGSS deserve a grade of C. (That review was released on June 13, 2013, and you can find its full text online at <http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/final-evaluation-of-NGSS.html>.)

### Orientation

The final NGSS was the culmination of more than a year of work that began with release of a “Framework for K–12 Science Education” by the National Research Council. The Framework was the first phase in an effort to do for science what the Common Core State Standards initiative did for English and math: to define the knowledge and skills that all students should master across grades K–12 to be prepared for college and beyond.

At the time of the Framework’s release, we asked the eminent biologist Paul Gross, a veteran Fordham reviewer, to evaluate and grade it using the criteria that were used to judge states’ K–12 science standards (and that we would eventually use to judge the NGSS). Dr. Gross found that the Framework outlined much of the content needed to inform a rigorous K–12 science curriculum, that it was appropriately rigorous, and that the content progressed thoughtfully and deliberately through the grades.

But as Dr. Gross explained in his review, the Framework was not itself a set of academic standards for teachers, schools, textbook authors, curriculum directors and assessment developers. Rather, it was an outline designed to inform the development of clear and unambiguous standards that could drive curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Nor was it perfect, even as an outline. While it included much essential content, that content was confusingly presented and difficult to navigate. Furthermore, “process” skills were given undue prominence.

Sadly, our science-review team subsequently found that those flaws traveled from the Framework to the final NGSS, which themselves are confusingly presented and prioritize science processes over the critical content that students would need to master them.

### Thinking Ahead

On the positive side, the U.S. today contains a few excellent examples of strong K–12 science standards. When our 2012 ratings of state standards are compared with NGSS, we find thirteen jurisdictions whose standards were “clearly superior” (including two, Maryland and Kansas, that have already adopted the NGSS). That also means, of course, that thirty-eight states have standards whose quality is either roughly equivalent or inferior to the NGSS. (As of late July, 2013, three of those states—Rhode Island, Vermont, and Kentucky—have also opted to replace their previous standards with the NGSS.)

Would schools and children in those thirty-eight jurisdictions be better off if their states substituted NGSS for their present science standards? Would educators? Would university and job entrants? The state’s economy? Perhaps. But those jurisdictions

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

might do better still to look to the thirteen other states whose existing standards are clearer and more rigorous than the NGSS. There they might find better blueprints for upgrading academic expectations in this critical subject.<sup>3</sup>

We're also mindful that there are inevitable trade-offs when swapping one set of standards for another. Accordingly, we owe it to educators and state-level decision makers to provide more information by which they can compare the strengths and shortcomings of their current science standards with those of NGSS and with some of very best state standards that exist today. In the pages that follow, we offer concise, side-by-side comparisons of three sets of state standards that were rated most highly by our reviewers—those belonging to the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, and South Carolina—as well as the NGSS, along with the standards of each state whose standards (according to our review) are “clearly inferior” to the NGSS or “too close to call.” That adds up to thirty-eight states. (We do not provide such comparisons for the thirteen states with “clearly superior” science standards—save for the three that we highlight.)

These concise comparisons are necessarily limited and cannot answer every question that a state education leader may have regarding the many elements of each set of standards, nor do we attempt to say whether state leaders *should* embrace the NGSS or opt for something else (or keep what they have). Such decisions are properly the work of educators and policymakers in every state. Our intent here is simply to offer a general comparison that may help to inform such deliberations. For those seeking further information, we encourage you to review both our comprehensive evaluation of every state's standards in [State of State Science Standards 2012](#) and our extensive review of the NGSS (found [here](#)).<sup>4</sup>

Finally, as state leaders determine whether the NGSS offer the basis they seek to drive curriculum, planning, instruction, and assessment for the improved science education that everyone agrees is sorely needed across most of the United States, let us repeat the caution we noted in our evaluation of the NGSS themselves:

*Most states already have full plates of education reforms that are plenty challenging to implement, often including the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and math. Before undertaking any major change in their handling of science education, state leaders would be wise to consider whether they have the capacity to accomplish this in the near term, too. We caution against adopting any new standards until and unless the education system can be serious about putting them into operation across a vast enterprise that stretches from curriculum and textbooks to assessment and accountability regimes, from teacher preparation to graduation expectations, and much more. Absent thorough and effective implementation, even the finest of standards are but a hollow promise.*

In the end, our purpose is neither to praise nor to bury the NGSS. They are what they are, and we have no expectation that their authors will alter them. We do note, however, for states considering their adoption, that (as with computer programs that need “patches” in order to work properly) carefully supplementing the content and limiting the “practices” of NGSS could yield significant improvements.<sup>5</sup> We've long known and said that science education in America needs a radical upgrade. Too many state standards lack both clarity and essential content, and too few students are graduating from high school with the scientific knowledge and capacity to apply it that they will need for advanced work in college and careers, particularly in STEM fields. Those who developed the NGSS earnestly seek to improve American K–12 science education. So do we.

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Acknowledgments

Support for this review was provided by our sister organization, the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

We are grateful to Kathleen Porter-Magee for her work in putting these comparisons together, as well as to Brandon Wright and Laurel Horn, who provided writing and research assistance. Matt Richmond managed production, Pamela Tatz copyedited the document, and Alton Creative designed the layout.

## How to Read These Comparisons

In this report, we compare the K–12 science standards for states whose expectations were either “too close to call” or “clearly inferior to” those of the NGSS with the expectations set by three of the top-performing states, as well as with the Next Generation Science Standards themselves.

Comparisons are presented side-by-side in the form of brief descriptions of the quality of the standards, including salient strengths and weaknesses. We cover five areas: treatment of scientific inquiry and practices; physical science (including physics and chemistry); life science; earth and space science; and clarity and specificity.<sup>6</sup>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Endnotes

1. Our evaluation of the NGSS was led by Dr. Paul Gross. He was aided by six domain experts: Douglas Buttrey (engineering), Ursula Goodenough (life sciences), Noretta Koertge (philosophy of science), Lawrence Lerner (physical science, physics, and chemistry), Martha Schwartz (earth and space science), and Richard Schwartz (physical science, physics, and chemistry). You can read more about our team of experts in the Appendix of our NGSS evaluation here: <http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/final-evaluation-of-NGSS.html>.
2. You can find a full description of our methods, criteria, and grading metrics here: <http://www.edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2012/2012-State-of-State-Science-Standards/2012-State-Science-Standards-AppendixA.pdf>.
3. In addition to states with strong standards, our reviewers found much merit in, and gave high marks to, the science-assessment frameworks that undergird the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). They were less admiring of the PISA science framework. You can find all three of those reviews at [standards.educationgadfly.net](http://standards.educationgadfly.net).
4. You can find the full text of the Next Generation Science Standards here: <http://nextgenscience.org/next-generation-science-standards>. And you can view our evaluation of the K–12 science standards for the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, and South Carolina, along with links to the standards themselves, in our *State of State Science Standards in 2012* report.
5. To our knowledge, no organization has understanding of such amplification and supplementation, but it is surely worth considering.
6. You can find a full description of our methods, criteria, and grading metrics here: <http://www.edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2012/2012-State-of-State-Science-Standards/2012-State-Science-Standards-AppendixA.pdf>.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Alabama
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Coverage of critical content and concepts is often haphazard, incomplete, puzzling, and at times incorrect. Large swaths of important information are missing, and what is present often receives cursory treatment. Equally problematic, some expectations are far too challenging for the specified grade level—particularly considering the lack of adequate development that pervades the standards.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>While the standards rightly explain that "process and application skills" should be "embedded throughout the content areas and applied through the use of inquiry," the expectations provide virtually no guidance about how educators might link essential content with practices.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Alabama’s physical science standards suffer from lack of appropriate sequencing, vagueness, and insufficient depth of coverage. The high school chemistry and physics standards lack appropriate sequencing and omit critical prerequisite skills and concepts entirely.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Life science content is generally well covered across all grades, with one critical exception: Evolution, which should be an essential element of the genetics content, is all but absent.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The K–12 earth and space science standards touch on many important concepts. Unfortunately, much critical context and necessary explanation is missing.</p>



## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Some of Alabama’s standards are presented clearly, particularly those for life science. However, the content, provided in list form, is generally skimpy and lacks the detail needed to guide instruction. Furthermore, careless writing abounds, resulting in some standards that are simply wrong.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Alaska
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>At twenty-seven pages, Alaska's science standards are awfully thin. Between what is missing and what is shortchanged, it is hard to consider this document a set of real K-12 academic standards. Indeed, the state makes no provision for high school biology, chemistry, or physics, leaving an enormous body of essential content completely untouched.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Four of Alaska's seven strands address scientific inquiry and methodology. All but the last suffer from an overeagerness to give voice to "different ways of thinking" rather than to outline specific content that students should master. Incoherence abounds, and there is scant evidence that students have been given the opportunity to acquire the scientific background they need to provide the foundation for the described process and inquiry skills.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The flaws in Alaska’s treatment of physical science are impressive. For example, a reader would search in vain for such critical terms as acids and bases, atomic number and atomic mass, formulas, chemical equations, and isotopes. This category is also is rife with outright errors. As noted above, the state makes no provision for high school chemistry, or physics (or biology).</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Across all grades, the Alaska standards contain little useful content in biology—less than is conveyed in most states’ middle school standards alone. But for a couple of partial bright spots (physiology and evolution, to an extent), life-science standards also suffer from mountainous errors and sweeping generalities.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The Alaska standards for earth and space science are woefully inadequate. They provide no understanding or appreciation of nature, with the exception of a mention of the aurora. The coverage of most topics is superficial or nonexistent.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

While the Alaska standards are generally clearly written and easy to follow, the lack of specificity makes them virtually useless. Nothing short of scrapping this document and starting from scratch could result in a useful basis for curriculum writing, test preparation, and textbook writing.

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Arizona
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Arizona's science standards are generally weak on content and plagued by disorganization and a frustrating lack of cohesion. Coverage of critical high school content is spotty and unsystematic. The standards read more like a set of scrambled chapter titles from a textbook than a comprehensive set of academic standards.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Arizona's standards addressing inquiry and scientific practices are reasonably strong: Both processes and history of science receive explicit mention. Unfortunately, Arizona places far too much emphasis on practices, which inappropriately prioritizes practices over essential content.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards for K–8 have occasional flashes of competence but are also marred by serious shortcomings. The “concepts” under which the standards are grouped are often poorly conceived, and the standards grouped beneath each concept often defy explanation. K–8 Chemistry content is relegated to fifth and eighth grades. And high school chemistry and physics are distressingly inadequate, with all of chemistry being covered in eleven vague sentences.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>What material is presented in Arizona’s life-science standards is clear and progresses adequately through the grades. Unfortunately, there are holes in the content, leaving Arizona teachers with a weak skeleton upon which to build a rigorous life-science curriculum.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The Arizona standards document addresses (or at least skims over) a great deal of earth and space content but needs to be fleshed out with more specific content and detail.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Arizona standards frequently lack specificity, usually consisting of little more than broad lists of topics without proper sequencing or development. Their organization and presentation are a mess.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Colorado
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Colorado's standards are a confused and misguided presentation of content. The material presented suffers from a serious lack of clarity, depth, and sufficient content. The standards also have a frustrating tendency to string together numerous properties without explanation.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>This area stands out as the only one that is well covered. Inquiry and process-skills material is interwoven with disciplinary content, making the link between content and practices clear.</p>



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards are generally weak, with a few bright spots in the early grades. Chemistry is presented unsystematically and confusingly throughout the grades. There seems to be no material for high school physics or chemistry. And too many standards are plagued by infelicities and errors.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>What aspects of life science will be covered in Colorado classrooms is a mystery. One searches the document in vain for any mention of many basic terms, and the level of difficulty of the material presented varies wildly.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>These standards simply lack content. The term “crust” appears exactly once, in sixth grade; the rock cycle appears once, in third grade. And sadly, these examples are the rule, rather than the exception, making the standards for earth and space science woefully inadequate.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Colorado standards are as confusing as they are devoid of critical content. The writing is also repetitious and awkward—and at times ungrammatical. And these blunders are set against a totality that suffers from a serious lack of clarity, depth, and sufficient content.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Connecticut
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Connecticut science standards are generally well written, though they include a number of scientific errors or badly phrased statements. In addition, a significant amount of important material is missing entirely.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>These are the weakest of the Connecticut standards. They inadequately explain a number of complex skills and provide little guidance for what the ambiguously worded standards actually require.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Much of this content is covered with adequate depth and rigor. In addition, the grade-level expectations often helpfully build upon the standards provided in the curriculum framework. Other times, however, the standards introduce errors or are too vague, confusing, or disorganized. And several major physics topics are missing entirely.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Life-science content is often adequate. There are, however, a number of problems: A few key topics are missing entirely (e.g., genetics). There are inconsistencies where students are expected to know a topic with inadequate background. And too much of the content is vague, superficial, or incomplete.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Earth-science standards are broad but inconsistent, with a mix of rigorous and inadequate standards. Some topics are spottily covered (e.g., plate tectonics) or not covered at all (e.g., fossils). Still others are too advanced for the assigned grade level.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Connecticut standards are generally clear and well written, and content is usually logically organized and presented. In some places, however, the document is vague, speaking around the necessary content instead of addressing it head on.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Delaware
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Delaware science standards are generally robust, detailed, and thoughtful, and they present critical information clearly, with a minimum of jargon. Unfortunately, not all subjects are equally well covered; the document is uneven and its organization is difficult to navigate.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The scientific-inquiry and methodology standards are generally well written, and they increase in rigor and complexity from grade span to grade span. In addition, the standards deal admirably with the practicalities of the laboratory experience, demanding attention be paid to precision and accuracy. Unfortunately, while the standards mention linking the process standards to the body of scientific knowledge, there are content gaps that would sometimes make it difficult for students to associate the results of their investigations with historical science knowledge as the standards demand.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Through ninth grade, the physical-science standards are generally detailed, though the division of content among the standards is odd. The high school standards, however, suffer from three serious problems: First, physics and chemistry are not treated as independent courses. Second, too many standards are overly broad, asking either too much or too little of students. Third, while some standards ask the unattainable, others arbitrarily hold students back from learning grade-appropriate content.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science material is concise and accurate, and it contains all the important concepts and facts that a high school graduate should learn. Evolution is also treated thoroughly and accurately.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The presentation of important earth- and space-science material is generally excellent. Some important topics are glossed over, however, or omitted entirely (e.g., plate tectonics).</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Most of the standards are clearly written and free from distracting jargon. In addition, the state clearly labels the indicators that will be assessed and indicates which of those assessed standards is most important. Unfortunately, the organization and presentation of the content is often confusing.



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Florida
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Florida's standards evoke a split personality. The document starts out well at the primary level, but in the higher grades, it weakens into poor organization, ambiguous statements, and basic errors. Taken as a whole, the standards do not provide a solid foundation for a rigorous K-12 science curriculum.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Scientific inquiry and science practices are addressed competently but uninspiringly in the standards. Too often the benchmarks are vague and offer little guidance about how the ideas might be articulated in the classroom.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>In too many areas, the physical-science standards get off on the wrong foot thanks to confusing or even erroneous “Big Ideas.” The standards are also plagued by internal inconsistencies and much content lacks rigor (i.e., the content of many benchmarks is easier than it should be). The treatment of chemistry is also weak throughout.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The K–8 life-science coverage is generally strong. Evolution is treated straightforwardly and in good detail. (Indeed, strong coverage of evolution continues through high school, where the standards even mention human evolution, a rarity in state science standards.) Unfortunately, at the high school level, coverage of essential life-science content is inconsistent.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Florida’s treatment of earth and space science is fairly broad, but the coverage can be uneven and somewhat lacking in the detail necessary to insure proper depth of treatment. Once again, the early grades fare better than high school.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The standards’ poor organization leads—perhaps inevitably—to detailed statements that are isolated and confused. Sometimes the standards even veer into the incomprehensible.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Georgia
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Georgia standards are extraordinarily uneven. Content ranges from excellent (life science) to pretty bad (physics and chemistry). Unfortunately, the good moments are the exception. In too many instances, the material is sloppily presented, unfocused, and/or poorly supported.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>This content contains good, clear statements on process.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards are decidedly mixed. Some content is covered with depth and rigor (e.g., grade one magnetism and grade four optics); many, however, fail to outline sufficiently the content that students need to learn. The physics course division of major concepts is illogical (e.g., kinetics without dynamics), and the chemistry standards are glaringly incomplete.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The presentation of life-science material is quite good, biology coverage is sound and generally complete, and evolution is covered very well in grades six through eight. Unfortunately, this does not carry over into high school, where key concepts, like DNA, are missing.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The earth- and space-science standards are reasonably ambitious and complete. In grades K–8, however, there are some weaknesses, including inadequate coverage of some critical topics (e.g., plate tectonics). Also, some critical content is missing throughout.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

While the Georgia standards document is generally straightforward and easy to navigate, clarity and specificity of the expectations themselves are inconsistent. Some standards are accurate and concise; too many, however, are incomplete, confusing, and illogical.



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Hawaii
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Hawaii science standards are a case study in half-loaves and inconsistencies. At times, the K-8 standards are reasonably rigorous and thorough. But the high school material is woefully inadequate, including only rare islands of content floating in a sea of omission, confusion, and inaccuracy.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The scientific-inquiry and methodology standards are explained through two sub-strands of the scientific process strand: scientific investigation and nature of science. The benchmarks found therein are problematic for two reasons. First, many are so brief that they fail to delineate the content that students must learn. Second, there is little progression of content or rigor from grade to grade.</p>



# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science content is generally strong in the early grades; in later grades, however, the standards fail to include requisite content. The discussion of energy in the high school physics standards is fraught with problems, including nonsensical expectations and thematic leaps. By contrast, the high school chemistry standards are generally clear, thorough, and appropriately rigorous.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Life science receives middling treatment. In the early grades, the content is thin and averse to specifics. There are also misconceptions, howlers, and scientific errors (e.g., Sickle-cell and cystic fibrosis are cited as examples of chromosomal mutations, but in fact, they are single-gene mutations).</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Hawaii’s earth- and space-science content is particularly thin and underdeveloped, with just a few brighter spots. Unfortunately, Hawaii’s science standards also make little use of the unique and interesting natural history of the islands themselves.</p>



## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The clarity of the science content in the Hawaii standards is eroded by poor grade-by-grade development and weak presentation. And typos and sloppy writing abound.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Idaho
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Idaho science standards contain precious little science. What little appears tends to be couched in broad generalities that fail to delineate what, precisely, students should know and be able to do. Generally speaking, the quality of the scientific content starts poorly in the primary grades and declines thereafter.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Idaho makes the unfortunate sacrifice of utility on the altar of brevity and vagueness, substituting wisps of fluff for meaningful content. Broad generalities abound, and the scientific-inquiry and practices standards contain no actual content.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>There are some bright spots in the Idaho physical-science standards, but these are the exception. Too often, lofty goals are untethered to details. The high school chemistry standards address roughly half of our evaluation criteria. And the presented content lacks necessary rigor or clarity. Adding confusion, the standards do not include distinct high school physics standards. To the extent that essential physics content is covered, it is included under the heading of physical science.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science content is woefully inadequate (e.g., evolution). High school biology receives an especially hasty sweep-over and suffers from inaccurate, nonsensical statements.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>If the Idaho standards have any strong points, they’re to be found in earth and space science, which contains a few examples of thoughtfulness. Unfortunately, even here many important subjects are simply ignored or glossed over (e.g., galaxies and plate tectonics).</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Idaho science standards are as poorly organized as they are vague and repetitious. Especially perplexing, some of the standards—particularly in biology—veer suddenly from the excessively vague into the highly specific, with jarring effect. The document is useless for all the purposes for which K–12 academic standards are intended.

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Illinois
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Illinois science standards fail to provide the guidance necessary to ensure that students are college and career ready. Wild disorganization, poor writing, and illogical sequencing—compounded by critical content gaps and omissions—leave these standards significantly short of acceptable.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The expectations for scientific inquiry and practices are the high-water mark in the Illinois science standards. Here, expectations are clear and well articulated, and they thoroughly outline what is expected of students and teachers. Further, process expectations are explicitly linked to content areas of the standards. Indeed, apart from the overuse of the term "brainstorming" as a desirable skill, there is nothing to find fault with here.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The treatment of physical science is a disaster throughout. In the earlier grades, the biggest problems involve a frustrating reliance on overly broad expectations. In the later grades, logical structure falls apart with equally troubling consequences. There’s seemingly no separate section on high school physics. The high school chemistry content is marginally better than physics but still inadequate.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Life-science content is reasonably well covered. The assessment frameworks for grades four, seven, and eleven provide an excellent sequence pertaining to biochemistry, (molecular) genetics, and (molecular) cell biology that other states would do well to emulate. Unfortunately, there is a curious absence of anything, at any grade level, on organ systems or physiology (muscles, nerves, digestion, etc.).</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>With a very small number of exceptions, the earth-and space-science standards are too broad to offer much guidance. While some useful content can be found in the assessment framework, the standards themselves fail to outline the essential content students need to learn.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Between overly broad statements and frequent head-scratching rambles, the Illinois standards lack clarity and specificity. Their quality also varies significantly. The damage, however, is not total: The content statements included in the related assessment framework are frequently quite good.



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Iowa
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>In the Iowa standards, the paucity of detail and many moments of obscurity in the text make it difficult and, at times, impossible to know precisely what is to be taught. Sloppy organization, vagueness, and lack of detail: This baleful trio characterizes the Iowa standards across all disciplines and grade levels.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The scientific-inquiry and methodology standards constitute a single page that is functionally useless, providing no guidance or grade articulation.</p>



# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The all-too-frequent errors that mar the document are particularly acute in the physical sciences. For example, there are glaring errors concerning nuclear forces, gas solubility, and molecular polarity. Mistakes abound throughout physical science, physics, and chemistry.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Life-science content is virtually nonexistent up to high school level, where the coverage is generally sound. Even in high school, however, many of the expectations are obscure or difficult to perform.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>There are a few bright spots in Iowa’s coverage of earth and space science, but these are eclipsed by numerous examples of topics that are mentioned but not described or explained in satisfactory detail.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Poor organization, vagueness, and lack of detail underlie the Iowa science standards. On the plus side, the use of English is good, and the document even contains the occasional “wow” moment. But the “essential concepts and/or skills” are too broad, and too often, students are to be asked unanswerable questions or given challenging tasks.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Kentucky
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Kentucky science standards are lamentable less for their flaws—though there are plenty—than for their failed potential. A scaffold exists for what might have been an effective set of standards. But the documents are so short on details—including critical content—that the standards fail to provide the backbone for a rigorous K-12 science curriculum.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The science-process standards are scattered across various "big ideas," making it difficult to track what, specifically, students should master at each grade level. Several important topics are vaguely introduced, then not revisited for several grades, if at all.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The K–8 physical-science standards are missing much essential content. What little content exists is poorly developed and does not progress well through the grades. At the secondary level, there is nothing in the entire document that could provide the foundation for a course in high school physics or chemistry.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The earlier grades provide poor preparation for high school work, but there is some good material at the high school level. Some of the vagueness that permeates the lower grades does, however, persist. And the standards seem allergic to the word “evolution.”</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The standards for earth and space science are severely flawed. Important content is entirely missing (e.g., plate tectonics). There are but occasional glimmers of substantive content (such as coverage of the age of the earth and solar system in eighth grade).</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Lack of specificity and general ambiguity are a persistent problem for the Kentucky standards. Long passages of vague statements are sometimes punctuated by excessively detailed bits that students cannot possibly address. And too many ideas are alluded to, glanced at, approached obliquely, or mentioned vaguely.



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Maine
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Maine's science and technology standards, and their performance indicators, are admirably concise—even terse. Unfortunately, that succinctness too often devolves into shallowness. These standards simply do not provide enough instances of concrete content upon which to base a curriculum.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Nearly two-thirds of the Maine standards are devoted to the process of science in its broadest sense—only about 40 percent of the material deals with traditional content. Not only does this inappropriately prioritize science process over content, but the process standards themselves are often inadequate. At times, standards in later grades are virtually the same as standards in earlier grades, and in other places, standards are glaringly incomplete.</p>



# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>While these standards are not significantly marred by errors or confusions, that is largely because they contain very little content. Perhaps worst of all, the standards omit high school chemistry and physics entirely.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>These standards make a laudable attempt to include important topics like evolution, but simplification and compression result in language that is potentially misleading or simply incomprehensible.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The earth and space sciences are lumped together with the physical sciences, and accordingly, this important content domain gets short shrift. Some cogent, specific entries detail important content that students should learn, but there is not enough of this to overcome the overall vagueness.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Maine standards lack clarity and specificity. Content is buried beneath a confusing web of strands and sub-strands. Important content from different areas of science is mingled together, and too many standards are virtually meaningless because of their ambiguity.



# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Michigan
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The quality of Michigan's science standards varies greatly. Some disciplines are strong, even excellent (notably chemistry), while others are weak, even disastrous (notably physics). Of particular concern is that much content that is prerequisite for high school content is missing entirely from the K-8 standards.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The Michigan standards for scientific inquiry and methodology are vague to the point of near uselessness. While they include the usual process skills that students are expected to master in most states, they rarely link these abstract goals to the content that students would need to learn in order to demonstrate mastery, nor is there much consistency or development of content from grade to grade.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The development of physical science is often chaotic and illogical. Standards appear as a mixed bag of loosely related concepts, some of them poorly or incorrectly stated. The order of materials is scattered and the depth fluctuates wildly. The treatment of physics is a confused mess. Many standards are so broad as to be instructionally meaningless. Fortunately, the high school chemistry standards are generally well written and cover most critical content.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Through seventh grade, much important life-science content is either absent altogether or glossed over (e.g., the inconsistent and incomplete treatment of evolution). Happily, the high school standards are far better, containing excellent content that is systematically and explicitly laid out.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The Michigan earth- and space-science standards start out weakly; much critical content is omitted in grades K–7. At the high school level, however, the standards are spectacular in breadth and depth and are often beautifully written.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Michigan standards are occasionally clear and specific, but much material is too garbled, poorly written, or illogically developed to drive a coherent science curriculum. This suggests a failure to subject the document to a final, unified edit by able and experienced persons.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Minnesota
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Minnesota's standards are uneven. The treatment of life science and of earth and space science is excellent, but that of physical science is inadequate. Many of the problems stem from a failure to develop grade-appropriate expectations and to build on them over time. As a result, although examples of rigorous content abound, they often seem out of place or unachievable.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>These standards are generally thorough, but some are vague to the point of meaninglessness. There is also a fascination with local traditions, and the tendency to blur the distinction between scientific and traditional wisdom is not helpful to students' development of a clear understanding of science.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards are barely passable. While some important content is covered, much is missing or slighted. The high school physics standards are marred by illogical organization. Later-grade expectations do not follow earlier-grade standards. The high school chemistry standards are marginally stronger, but these are still too uneven.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Important life-science content is presented minimally, particularly at the K–8 level, but the flow and logic convey an understanding of the concepts rather than coming across as a list of topics to check off. The high school expectations are particularly thorough and rigorous, and they cover many outside-the-usual topics.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Minnesota’s earth and space science standards are reasonably comprehensive. But a few things are missing, some important content is handled too late, and other topics are too rigorous.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

For the most part, the presentation of Minnesota’s standards is clear. But specificity sometimes suffers, and the standards tend to use needlessly obscure language.

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Mississippi
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Mississippi's science standards are a mixed bag. Some are poorly written and some topics are disorganized, while other areas are reasonably strong and thorough. Brevity often deprives the material of depth, making it difficult to imagine that a coherent, effective curriculum might emerge from these expectations.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Brevity is both a blessing and a curse for inquiry standards. Whereas many states devote too much of their science standards to process, here many standards are so compact that they fail to outline the specific content and skills that students need to learn.</p>



## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards are poorly presented. The state often throws several unrelated matters into a single confusingly written or scrambled sentence. The high school physics course, however, is quite strong. Though the whole is covered in about three pages, its content is systematic, logical, and lucid. Most of the essential high school chemistry content is similarly present. Unfortunately, that content is often presented in a haphazard and disorganized way.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Problems of sequence and rigor persist across topics and grade levels in life science, and students are often asked to learn content that is simply inappropriate for their grade level. One marginally bright spot is the standards’ treatment of evolution, which is extensive, although scattered.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The earth- and space-science content varies, being richly ambitious in places and sketchy in others. The standards include much important content, but the presentation is often confusing.</p>



## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

### Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Mississippi science standards’ disorganization makes it difficult to track the progression of content and rigor from grade to grade. In several places, expectations boil down to jarring episodes of boosterism of local agencies and businesses. Confused and/or confusing writing is common.



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Missouri
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Missouri's standards present a mixed picture, varying in quality from quite good (for K-8 life science) to essentially useless (for high school physics). Most material lies between these extremes. The best of the Missouri standards typically appears in the earlier grades. As grade levels rise, the content becomes increasingly prone to error.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The Missouri standards offer a number of refreshing observations. Throughout, there is a good dose of realism about the scientific process and the social and historical aspects of the scientific enterprise. Process material builds up gradually, appropriately, and logically across grades.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>K–8 physical science is generally strong. There are some scientific errors, however, and the number of these errors increases as grade levels rise. The high school physics standards, however, often ask little more than the standards for Kindergarten through eighth grade. And far too many of the high school chemistry indicators ask for too little of students.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Though not perfect, the life-science standards are the best by far. There is a substantial amount of good material in eighth grade, including strong coverage of heredity and cells. High school content is strong, with one significant exception: the evolution material that might be considered controversial is categorized as being subject to local assessment and is thus exempt from wider examination at the state level.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Overall, the earth- and space-science standards are well written, logical, and free from obvious error; many topics are addressed with sufficient depth and rigor. But a few items of important content—e.g., the Big Bang—are missing or underdeveloped.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Missouri standards are, for the most part, clearly written. Unfortunately, when they stumble, we find confusing hodgepodes as well as wide variance in specificity.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Montana
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Montana documents are permeated with vague if high-sounding generalities of little use in setting up a course of study. Although bits of well-developed content appear, these suffer from poor or nonexistent follow up and an overall failure to build on knowledge through the advancing grades.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Across all grade levels and bands, the standards addressing scientific inquiry and methodology are vacuous. Much of the content is simplistic, banal, and, at times, poorly written. Like a number of other states, Montana also tries to integrate the experiences of its indigenous peoples into its science standards. And as is too often the case, it never becomes clear how this integration is supposed to aid or develop student understanding of the process and content of science.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Some essential physical-science content is covered thoroughly and at the appropriate level of rigor. Unfortunately, omissions and errors are also widespread. Prerequisite content needed for high school chemistry is inadequate. There is no specific coverage of high school physics or chemistry. And there is much throwing around of high-sounding phrases that are so general as to be useless.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>At times, life-science content is adequate, but too much is lacking or missing entirely. For instance, Montana tiptoes around evolution and entirely fails to mention physiology.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The coverage of earth science is poor, and what standards are included are vague to the point of meaninglessness.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

### Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Montana’s science standards are as poorly written as they are ambiguous. Typos and misspellings are rampant. Many statements are garbled. Sentences run on, seemingly at their own will. The order of presentation is inconsistent and at times illogical. There is vagueness throughout.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Nebraska
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Nebraska's science standards are inadequate in nearly every way. They lack sufficient depth and breadth at every grade span, and critically important areas receive woefully thin attention—or are completely absent.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The scientific-inquiry and methodology standards are essentially useless. Scanning the standards across grades, it is difficult to detect meaningful changes or a development of content. Expectations are presented without adequate explanation or background instruction, leaving teachers with no indication of what, specifically, students should know.</p>



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science coverage is reasonably strong in the early grades, but it suffers from a serious drop in quality in high school. One might even say that the content and rigor of the standards collapse completely in grades 9–12 where, among other problems, there are no separate standards for high school chemistry or physics.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science standards are vapid and lifeless. There is only a moment of substance (in the Sample Curriculum treatment of cellular composition of organisms). Also, the word “evolution” is missing entirely before high school, and its coverage in grades 9–12 is woefully inadequate.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>While some important earth and space science content is included in K–8, serious gaps exist. Also, there is virtually no earth-and space-science content at the high school level.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Nebraska standards are usually clear—they do, for instance, generally avoid garbled language. Unfortunately, that’s because the standards themselves lack the specificity needed to delineate what students should know and be able to do.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Nevada
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Nevada's science standards suffer from the twin flaws of not offering enough content and bungling what little information they do provide. None of the content areas are well covered, and strengths are difficult to find.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The material on scientific inquiry and methodology is rife with platitudes but provides no guidance on what students should know or be able to do. Critical concepts that are essential to understanding what science involves—such as theory or hypothesis—are missing altogether.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Nothing in the documents is appropriate to a high school physics course, nor is any distinction made between a ninth-grade physical-science course and a higher-level physics or chemistry course.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science offerings are vaguely presented and scanty in content. The words “gene” and “chromosome” are never used, and there is no mention of photosynthesis or any other metabolism. In addition, the standards are fraught with errors, and the treatment of evolution is mixed at best.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Though concise and containing few errors, the earth- and space-science standards too often lack the specificity and rigor they need to meaningfully guide teaching and learning.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Nevada standards are mired in confusion and will do little to aid curriculum builders or teachers. There is often no clear relation between the standard and related “achievement indicators” or between one indicator and the next, making it nearly impossible for a teacher to discern what, specifically, he should be teaching at each grade level.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	New Hampshire
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The New Hampshire science standards are ambitious but undisciplined. The lower grades are generally strong, but the quality declines as the grade level rises. Some topics—life science, in particular—are covered thoughtfully, thoroughly, and with appropriate rigor. Other topics, however, are missing critical content and/or the level of rigor is inappropriate for the grade level.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Too much space is devoted to science-process skills, including inquiry and methodology, which inappropriately prioritizes process over content. Worse, the standards themselves are generally vacuous statements that provide little guidance about what students should learn about scientific inquiry, methodology, or history (e.g., "ways of knowing" and "supernatural forces and viewpoints").</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science concepts introduced in grades K–4 are thoughtful, clearly and correctly expressed, and appropriately suited to their grade levels. Starting in grades 5–6, however, the standards document exhibits illogical ordering, inadequate development, and sloppy writing. Worse, many standards contain inaccuracies. There is no coverage of high school physics or chemistry.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science standards are well conceived and progress with clear, broad, and challenging content developing appropriately from the elementary grades through high school. In addition, the standards clearly prioritize evolution. A weak point for the life-science standards is the inclusion of benchmarks that are too broad to be useful.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Earth and space science receives uneven attention. Much is good. Unfortunately, a considerable amount of important content is missing entirely—for instance, the solar system as part of a galaxy, volcanism, the greenhouse effect, air pressure, and the distinction between climate and weather.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Except in the life sciences, clarity is often missing from New Hampshire’s science standards, where vague expectations make it difficult to divine what the document intends to convey. In many cases, the standards merely present a series of goals with little guidance as to how to articulate them in the classroom.



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

Fordham Grade	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	New Jersey
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>While still problematic, New Jersey's science standards are far stronger in grades K-8 than high school, where no grade-appropriate content can be found.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are virtually useless. Nowhere in the text does the word "hypothesis" (or any of its cognates) appear. Instead, students are asked to "pose theories." The content and skills also fail to progress from grade to grade.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Physical science is the high-water mark for New Jersey’s standards, but that’s not saying much, as the coverage of important content is severely uneven. The standards do address some critical content clearly and with sufficient depth and rigor, but the related “classroom examples” are poorly written and confusing. New Jersey has no standards for high school physics or chemistry.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The New Jersey life-science standards sacrifice content for process. As a consequence, general concepts are presented with a good logical flow, but few details are provided. The one saving grace in the life sciences is the high school treatment of evolution, which is comprehensive.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The New Jersey earth- and space-science standards cover a good deal of critical content. Unfortunately, as in other disciplines, this coverage is frequently superficial.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

While the standards are clearly organized and presented, the expectations are often empty or jargon-filled. Many standards contain virtually no content; it’s impossible to determine what students should know or be able to do. Furthermore, standards are frequently repeated from grade to grade, offering no clear progression of content or rigor.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	New Mexico
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The New Mexico standards are a mixed bag. The life-science standards are outstanding, covering all the necessary content with adequate depth and rigor. In other areas, however, the standards fall far short, omitting or poorly covering critical content.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The scientific-inquiry and methodology standards are generally thorough, clear, and grade appropriate. However, the associated grade-band benchmarks, which are meant to add clarity and specificity, are too vague and rarely make meaningful distinctions in content or rigor across grade bands.</p>

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Coverage of essential physical-science content is reasonably thorough, if sometimes superficial, in the elementary grades. Unfortunately, the high school standards fail to include critical physics and chemistry content. Furthermore, the standards assiduously avoid the essential math content that is necessary, particularly in the upper grades.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>New Mexico’s life-science standards are generally clear, rigorous, and thorough. Information contained in the standards is also pointedly accurate.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The earth- and space-science standards cover much essential content at an appropriate level of depth and with few errors. The coverage of space science is a little stronger than that for solid earth material, such as rocks and minerals, plate tectonics, and earthquakes.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The New Mexico standards are clear, but they are not specific enough to drive curriculum, instruction, and assessment. As a result, critical details are missing and too much content is merely listed without any indication of depth or complexity.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	North Carolina
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The North Carolina standards are crippled by their overemphasis on generality at the expense of concrete examples. And with so few details, the occasional gross error and confusing statement stands out even more starkly.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The standards offer little guidance as to how one might incorporate inquiry in the classroom. What exists is a paragraph offering bromides but little on how concepts such as theory, hypothesis, and law are to be introduced or integrated with the content.</p>



# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards are reasonably thorough and rigorous in the early grades, but they become disorganized, illogically sequenced, and riddled with misconceptions and mistakes as the grades progress. In addition, the standards often include content that is inappropriate for grade-level material. Most of the essential content is missing from the high school physics and chemistry standards.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science standards are brief and lack significant content coverage. Evolution is not introduced until grade eight and excludes vital topics (e.g., natural selection and variation). High school biology also suffers from some glaring omissions (e.g., organ systems and physiology).</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Earth science, astronomy, and environmental science are presented as a single subject, and too much content is crammed into the limited space of the individual standards.</p>



## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Although reasonably well ordered and written in grammatical prose, the standards are far too vague to guide curriculum, instruction, or assessment development.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	North Dakota
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>North Dakota's science standards contain essentially nothing of scientific or pedagogical utility.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are plagued by vagueness and a lack of guidance for teachers seeking to achieve the benchmark expectations in the classroom. The expectations lack depth and clarity necessary to guide instruction.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Throughout the physical-science sections, about three-quarters of the major subjects that should be covered are missing—and what is included is incredibly weak.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>There is too little content here even to offer a careful summary of how the state measures up in this category.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Again, not enough content is provided in this domain of science to support a useful summary of how the state measures up.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

What little language is included in the North Dakota state standards is clear, though so much is missing that commentary about this category, too, is essentially pointless.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Oklahoma
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>While there are a few exceptions, Oklahoma's science standards are generally rife with errors, critical omissions, and below-grade-level expectations across all disciplines.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>With small exceptions, the inquiry standards for Kindergarten through eighth grade are presented logically, and their content and rigor progress well from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, the process strands tend to be too vague to be useful and well below grade-level expectations.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards are replete with errors. Besides incorrect information, many standards expect that students know terminology and content that was not previously required. The standards for chemistry and physics suffer from confounding broadness and the omission of critical content.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>A significant amount of necessary content is missing from the life-science standards (e.g., evolution is essentially absent). The content that is provided is often slipshod and weakly covered.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Coverage of important earth- and space-science content is extremely thin. Astronomy, for example, is missing entirely. There is no high school earth- and space-science material; there are only standards for a course in environmental science.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

Oklahoma’s standards move at a painfully slow pace, repeating much content and often changing only a word or two as the standards progress from grade to grade. Few standards are appropriately specific, and those that do attempt specificity often inject error.

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Oregon
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Oregon standards that address the three core content areas—physical science, life science, and earth and space science—consist of three pages, one for each content area. This means that a single page covers the totality of what Oregon students are expected to learn about each discipline in thirteen years of schooling.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>While the standards document proclaims that they are essential, no attempt is made to connect the process standards with content, nor is there any real progression of content or rigor from grade to grade.</p>



# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Oregon provides no standards for high school physics or chemistry courses. There is some meager treatment of physical science, but even those standards omit many important topics, including moles, balancing equations and stoichiometric calculations, gases, solutions, acids/bases/redox, mixtures, and equilibrium.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science standards are handicapped by sweeping generalities, particularly in the earlier grades.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>Once again, solid content is notable only for its absence in this subject area. The lack of critical content is understandable when all of cosmology, solar-system history, and planetary astronomy is telescoped into a single sentence.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

To say that the Oregon’s standards are vague would be a ridiculous understatement. What little content is present in the standards is at times unintelligible.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Pennsylvania
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>In the early grades, Pennsylvania's standards occasionally deserve high marks for coverage of essential content and rigor. By high school, however, the material is disorganized and lacks meaningful content.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The Pennsylvania inquiry standards include no link to real content, give no indication of just how inquiry should be embedded in the curriculum, and are functionally useless. Process expectations are presented as a series of scant bullet points on a single page, organized into four grade bands (K-4, 5-7, 8-10, 11-12).</p>

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards suffer from two main problems. First, the expectations too often change very little from year to year, resulting in little progression of content or rigor as the grades advance. Second, some topics jump around from year to year, making it difficult to track the scope and sequence of content through the grades. High school–physics expectations are disordered, and chemistry content is often too broad to be useful—or is missing entirely.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science standards are woefully inadequate. While some important content is included, there is no clear progression of content or rigor through the grades. Too many expectations are nonsensical or so broad as to be essentially meaningless. In high school, except for biology, which is reasonably well covered, the rigor is simply inadequate.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don't match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The K–8 earth- and space-science standards include some critical content. Unfortunately, lack of specificity often masks the intended scope, making it difficult for teachers to determine how deep the standards should go. The high school standards are even worse, and there is no designated earth-science course, without which it's unclear how such material would be presented to students.</p>
<p><b>Clarity and Specificity</b></p>	<p>The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of "examples" (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.</p>	<p>The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.</p>	<p>The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.</p>	<p>The Pennsylvania standards suffer from two significant problems. First, the presentation of the high school content is wildly confusing. Physics, chemistry, and biology material appears scattered across three courses of the same names and across the tenth- and twelfth-grade expectations. Second, many standards are written so broadly that teachers are left with little that could meaningfully guide curriculum and instruction.</p>

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Rhode Island
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Rhode Island's science standards are poorly developed across grade levels, riddled with errors, serious gaps, and omissions of important content. They offer little in the way of scientific substance, leaving much assumed and unsaid. Worse, what they do emphasize is often misguided.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Rhode Island embeds process standards within its content expectations. While this effort is laudable, the expectations themselves are too vague to be helpful. Much of the guidance presented in the standards is too list-like, without enough meat to guide effective instruction.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science standards lack logical organization, arranging topics under subheadings that would do better to be treated separately. In addition, major concepts of physics are either omitted or glossed over. At the high school level, separate physics and chemistry course content is not provided.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life sciences are a bright spot in the Rhode Island standards. Despite the brevity of the standards document, the grade-span expectations for life science generally cover important content with sufficient depth and rigor. Rhode Island is also one of the few states to deal directly with human evolution.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The earth- and space-science standards prefer broad statements to finer detail and, as a result, offer little content. Worse, the content that is present is not particularly thorough or well thought out. There are a few bright spots, particularly in space science and in the treatment of earth’s plates in the elementary and middle school grades.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Rhode Island standards are as vague as they are devoid of content. Too many fail to include the detail necessary to guide rigorous curricula and instruction. In other cases, the standards are too general to meaningfully drive curriculum or instruction.



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	South Dakota
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>South Dakota's standards are included in an extensive publication that has many words but remarkably little scientific content. So much critical content is missing in every discipline that the gaps outnumber the useful material.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>South Dakota's "nature of science" standards offer a meager recipe, consisting of bulleted lists of supporting skills. Virtually no useful content is included, and the omissions are justified by a statement that assures that science content is "constantly changing and emerging."</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>South Dakota’s K–8 physical-science standards touch on most necessary content, but there are errors, gaps, or omissions in virtually every expectation. The high school standards include a general physical-science section that seems to include basic concepts of both chemistry and physics and that is appropriate to a ninth-grade physical science course. Beyond this, however, the content is very thin.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Life-science coverage is better than some other disciplines in the early grades, but gets thinner with each advancing grade level. At the high school level, critical content is haphazardly mentioned in concentrated statements randomly cobbled into the standards.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The earth- and space-science standards are generally vague and include serious gaps and omissions. For instance, the following topics are missing entirely: the history of the universe and solar system, stellar evolution, absolute and relative dating techniques, plate tectonics (though there is brief treatment of some of its consequences), volcanism, and any detail about the processes underlying climate and weather.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The South Dakota standards take 200 pages to say virtually nothing of substance. The standards are overly broad and vague, and the supplementary material that is meant to clarify expectations rarely adds value.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Tennessee
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Tennessee science standards are missing critical content across all disciplines, sometimes egregiously. While the expectations are clearly written, they are too broad to lend themselves to implementation.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Scientific-inquiry standards are so vague and formulaic that they fail to adduce the content that students would need to conduct successful inquiry investigations.</p>

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The physical-science program is academically weak throughout grades K–8. The standards are frequently vague, they omit critical content, and there is much repetition within and between grades. Coverage of important topics is marred by incomprehensible statements and scrambling of logical sequences. This worsens in the higher grades, culminating in an exceptionally weak handling of high school physics where important content is omitted, unimportant topics are stressed, and the logical order is unruly or even completely inverted.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The life-science standards include poor and repetitive treatment of evolution from Kindergarten through eighth grade. In fifth grade and beyond, the standards simply repeat concepts previously covered, using different words but with no increase in depth or rigor.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don't match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The coverage of earth and space science in K–8 is reasonably thorough. Earth science and geology are separate courses, and the treatment of geology in particular has many positive aspects. Although the rigor of many standards is far too low for the grade level, some topics are treated with admirable depth and rigor.</p>
<p><b>Clarity and Specificity</b></p>	<p>The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.</p>	<p>The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.</p>	<p>The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.</p>	<p>The Tennessee standards amount to a sort of linguistic bluff: a well-written document that says very little of substance. Too often, the absence of small details derails an entire statement.</p>



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Texas
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The Texas science standards present areas of strength—including a particularly well-done sequence for earth and space science. There are, however, nontrivial weaknesses, including a tendency across nearly all disciplines to diminish the value of critical content with vague statements and, somewhat less often, the presence of material that's well below grade level.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The scientific-inquiry and methodology standards are clear, practical, and grade appropriate, and the content builds well from grade to grade.</p>





# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>The quality of both the physical-science and chemistry standards varies dramatically from highly rigorous and grade appropriate to frustratingly general. Adding further confusion, physical-science content is arbitrarily spread across two categories, making it difficult to track the scope and sequence of related material. In chemistry, there is commendable coverage of several important topics that many other state standards ignore, but several critical topics are missing entirely.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The Texas life-science standards are woefully imbalanced, with poorly developed material in the early grades and strong, sometimes excellent, content in the upper levels. In spite of the Texas Board of Education’s erratic approach to evolution, the state’s current high school biology standards handle the subject straightforwardly.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>With a few exceptions, the material for earth and space science is generally strong, appearing at appropriate grade levels and with sufficient depth and rigor.</p>



## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The chief problem with the Texas standards is the lack of a red pencil. There are many clear and specific standards, but these are weakened by wordy and repetitious language. The standards are sometimes confusing and frustratingly vague. And their organization is confusing, with related expectations scattered across various strands and sub-strands, making it difficult to track the scope and sequence of important content.



EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Vermont
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Vermont's science standards are horribly inconsistent. Although some disciplines contain reasonably rigorous material—life science in particular—other areas omit critical content, fail to develop important ideas, and include surprising errors.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>Within the scientific-inquiry strand, the expectations for students are appropriate and clearly stated, and important terms are highlighted. The standards are weakened, however, by missing examples and sample items.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>In general, coverage of physics and physical science is weak across all grade levels, plagued by serious gaps and omissions, along with inaccurate information. For the conventional high school course in physics or chemistry, the standards offer nothing suitable.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>While life science suffers from some errors and omissions, overall, the content and flow of the life-science standards is solid.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The earth- and space-science standards are mixed. Occasional examples of detailed critical content appear, but serious gaps persist. While there is an attempt to build on content from grade to grade, sometimes the addition at each step is little more than trivial.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Vermont documents are marred by many typos and much tangled phraseology, and often the grade-to-grade development is inadequate. In addition, logical and pedagogical inconsistencies abound in the ordering and presentation of information.

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Washington
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>In some areas—notably life science—the Washington standards content is clearly presented, thorough, and free from errors. By contrast, other disciplines suffer from glaring omissions of important content.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>While there are some areas where the process standards are too broad to usefully guide planning and instruction, the Washington expectations are generally clear and grade-appropriate and the content progresses well through the grades.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>In general, the physical-science standards are succinctly and correctly stated, in proper logical order. The high school physical-science material is excellent at a relatively low level. Unfortunately, there are no higher-level standards that could inform a rigorous high school physics course, and major gaps in chemistry content exist as well.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>By far the strongest of the Washington standards are those for life science, which are thorough, well explained, and grade appropriate, with particular strength in their coverage of physiology through grade eight and evolution across all grades.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The earth- and space-science standards are mixed. Some topics are covered quite well (e.g., solar system and earth’s layers), while others demonstrate strength in the elementary grades but are lacking in the higher grades (e.g., plate tectonics). The standards are also impaired by oversimplification and errors (e.g., weathering).</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation and organization of the Washington standards are generally top-notch and contain statements that express critical content in crystal-clear prose. Unfortunately, an excellent set of standards is kneecapped by a glossary that contains numerous errors and offers limited and confusing information.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	West Virginia
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The West Virginia science standards are a confusing hodgepodge. The mediocre treatment at the K-8 level descends into a bewilderment of ill-defined and overlapping courses at the high school level. Worse, the standards' rigor is wildly inconsistent, both within and across grades.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The West Virginia inquiry standards attempt to present process goals as measurable outcomes, leading to some poorly worded and bizarre standards. Moreover, the standards give no indication as to how these expectations are meant to increase in rigor from grade to grade.</p>



# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>West Virginia’s physical-science standards are rarely grade appropriate, oscillating between asking too much and too little of students. Many statements are disorganized and carelessly written—or patently wrong. Content in the traditional physics course is marred by serious gaps and omissions. In fact, “Conceptual Physics”—a remedial physics course outlined in the standards—does a marginally better job of covering the most important material than the traditional course. In chemistry, content doesn’t build coherently from grade to grade, and important topics often included in an introductory chemistry course are relegated to a remedial “Conceptual Chemistry” course.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>Throughout the life-science standards, much text is devoted to useless descriptors of progress and inquiry, leaving the treatment of content marginal at best. Middle school offers little guidance about what should be taught. In addition, evolutionary concepts prove hard to find in grades K–8 and their treatment in high school introduces creationist rhetoric.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don't match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>The inconsistency of rigor that plagues the West Virginia standards is evident in the earth- and space-science standards, as well. In addition, the performance indicators, which are meant to elucidate standards, are often just tangentially related to the standards that they're meant to clarify.</p>
<p><b>Clarity and Specificity</b></p>	<p>The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of "examples" (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.</p>	<p>The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.</p>	<p>The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.</p>	<p>West Virginia's learning objectives are repetitive and disjointed. Far too much content is repeated nearly verbatim across grade levels. Worse, the standards themselves show a lack of flow and integration across grade levels. Finally, the content itself is not organized by discipline, theme, or any other apparent structure.</p>

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Wisconsin
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>Wisconsin's science standards—unchanged since 1998—are simply worthless. True standards are provided for just three grades, yet the content provided for those grades is almost nonexistent.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The standards for inquiry and methodology are devoid of any real substance and do not indicate what skills are intended for mastery.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>There is not enough content offered in these standards to render a worthwhile summary of how the state measures up in this category.</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>There is not enough content offered in these standards to render a worthwhile summary of how the state measures up in this category.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>There is not enough content offered in these standards to render a worthwhile summary of how the state measures up in this category.</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

## Clarity and Specificity

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The Wisconsin science standards are as lacking in clarity as they are in content.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

	States with Excellent Standards			NGSS	Wyoming
	District of Columbia	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
<b>Fordham Grade</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>The D.C. science standards are generally clear and rigorous, with content that progresses appropriately through the grades. Virtually all of the essential K-12 science content is covered effectively and succinctly, proving that standards don't have to sacrifice coverage and depth when pursuing concision.</p>	<p>The Massachusetts science standards are easy to read and to use. Across disciplines, their quality and depth is strong. Particularly at the high school level, the standards are clear and comprehensive. There are a few minor content omissions, but no major gaps or errors.</p>	<p>South Carolina's science standards are rigorous, clear and succinct, and they outline the essential K-12 content that students need to learn. Content coverage is generally thorough, and concepts develop in logical progression over the advancing grades.</p>	<p>The NGSS fall short of excellence in several ways, including: overemphasis on practices over essential content; omission of much essential content; failure to integrate mathematics content that is essential to science learning; and use of "assessment boundaries" that put arbitrary ceilings on the content that will be assessed (and therefore taught) at each grade.</p>	<p>The writers of the Wyoming science standards failed to articulate the critical science content that K-12 students should learn. In no discipline does more than a smattering of such content appear. The few items that are included follow no logical pattern and lack necessary context.</p>
<b>Scientific Inquiry and Practices</b>	<p>The scientific inquiry and methodology standards are presented as a separate strand that, while not explicitly tied to content, is generally clear and appropriately rigorous.</p>	<p>Process standards are straightforward and well integrated with content. Mathematical problem-solving is stressed along with investigation and experimentation. Also emphasized is the need for students to communicate effectively about their work in science, both orally and in writing.</p>	<p>The inquiry standards are clear and thorough. South Carolina presents inquiry standards and practices two ways. First, there is a separate "inquiry" strand included for every grade level. Additionally, each performance expectation (i.e. standard) includes multiple "indicators" that clarify both the content that students need as well as what they're meant to do with it—i.e., the "practices." Critical process standards are directly integrated with content, making the link between the two unambiguous. This integration helps to ensure that skills are taught within the context of the knowledge that students need in order to master them.</p>	<p>Good science consists of doing as well as knowing, of practices as well as content and concept. But integrating practices and content in K-12 standards requires a careful balance that NGSS fails to strike. Instead, they confer primacy on practices and pay too little attention to the knowledge base that makes those practices feasible and worthwhile. Indeed, the authors have integrated a scientific "practice" into every performance expectation, too often in ways that are forced, ill-conceived, and/or detract from the essential content that students need in order to think critically and engage in scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The scientific-inquiry and methodology standards are vague and omit nearly all of the essential content that students should learn. Worse, some critical concepts that should be introduced are missing entirely. For instance, with two exceptions, the word "theory" is absent from the standards, along with the words "hypothesis" and "law."</p>

# EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

<p><b>Physical Science (Including Physics and Chemistry)</b></p>	<p>The physical science standards are clear, appropriate, and thorough. Content systematically builds from grade to grade. Students can acquire a thorough background, preparing them well for high-school-level courses. In addition, the high school physics and chemistry coverage is excellent. The one drawback is occasional inclusion of “examples” that are meant to clarify standards but are often silly.</p>	<p>Although generally solid, the physical science standards for pre-Kindergarten through eighth grade suffer from omission or short-changing of several important topics. The high school physics standards, however, are systematic, logical, and pedagogically sound, and high school chemistry is handled with refreshing depth and specificity</p>	<p>Virtually all of the essential physical science, physics and chemistry content is included and clearly progresses from grade to grade. At the high school level, however, while essential content is included, the expectations would occasionally benefit from greater specificity.</p>	<p>NGSS physical science coverage is mediocre throughout grades K–5 and declines rapidly in middle school, and still further at the high school level. Overall, the physical science standards fail to lay the foundation for advanced study in high school and beyond, and there is so little advanced content that it would be impossible to derive a high school physics or chemistry course from the content included in the NGSS.</p>	<p>Most essential content for K–8 physical-science standards is entirely absent. Even basic topics, such as molecules and mixtures, are absent. The standards for high school physics and chemistry are no better, featuring unbearable brevity and delay of critical content (e.g., atoms, electrons, and the periodic table are not mentioned until eleventh grade).</p>
<p><b>Life Science</b></p>	<p>The life science standards are thorough, well developed, and appropriately rigorous. They could easily serve as a model for other states.</p>	<p>Virtually all critical life science content is included and well developed in the MA standards. The coverage of evolution in grades six through eight, in particular, is both appropriate and good. High school biology content is also clear, concise, and comprehensive.</p>	<p>While coverage of evolution at the middle school level is occasionally evasive, the grades K-8 life science standards are otherwise reasonably strong. The standards for high school biology are excellent, and the treatment of evolution at this level is excellent.</p>	<p>Life science is generally solid in elementary school, but grows thin by middle and high school. Too much important content is represented only by mention or allusion within “omnibus” standards that refer to large bodies of content for which either necessary precedent in lower grades or needed detail is missing.</p>	<p>The Wyoming life-science standards begin in grades 5–8, with a distinct (if subtle) creationist tone. As for other core elements of the life sciences, the standards have nothing to say about the essential requirements of living things, of respiration and photosynthesis, or of the entire field of physiology.</p>
<p><b>Earth and Space Science</b></p>	<p>Coverage of earth and space sciences is excellent across all grade levels. Occasionally, however, the presentation of the content is marred by examples that don’t match the rigor of the material.</p>	<p>Earth and space science is covered comprehensively, and only occasional omissions mar these otherwise strong standards.</p>	<p>With the exception of a few minor errors and overly broad standards, the South Carolina earth and space science standards and related support materials present most of the essential K-12 earth and space science content.</p>	<p>The NGSS earth and space science standards are ambitious in their scope. Unfortunately, too many standards become long laundry lists of topics, even as essential prerequisite knowledge that needs to be mastered is assumed but never specifically required or mentioned.</p>	<p>All of earth- and space-science content comprises thirty-one lines, resembling more a rapid-fire list of topics than a set of standards. The material therein is broad and vague and provides no more than “study-the-encyclopedia” guidance.</p>

## EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01 AM EST, AUGUST 20, 2013

**Clarity and Specificity**

The D.C. science standards are clear, succinct, and specific. The one minor drawback is the inclusion of “examples” (instructional activities that can help students master particular concepts) that are sometimes weak and occasionally absurd, particularly in high school.

The Massachusetts standards are clearly presented and easy to navigate. Occasionally, additional detail would help clarify what is actually expected of students.

The South Carolina standards are presented clearly and are nicely linked to support documents, which add significant value by providing specific details and clarifying what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

The presentation of the NGSS is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. In addition, too many individual performance expectations are vague and poorly worded, with broad references to concepts that lack specific guidance about what, precisely, students should know and be able to do.

For the Wyoming standards, an absence of words conveys the absence of information. The whole standards document is little more than a vocabulary list that contains terms but no definitions. When definitions are included, they are vapid and poorly written.