

# World-Class Ambitions, Weak Standards

## An Excerpt from The State of State Science Standards 2012

Since Sputnik shot into orbit in 1957, Americans have considered science education to be vital to our national security and economic competitiveness. The impact of the Soviet satellite launch on American science classrooms was almost immediate. Shirley Malcom, a leader in the field of science education (and presently head of education programs for the American Association for the Advancement of Science), was a young student in Alabama at the time. She described the swift and palpable shift in the way science was taught:<sup>1</sup>

We stopped having throwaway science and started having real science.... All of a sudden everybody was talking about it, and science was above the fold in the newspaper, and my teachers went to institutes and really got us all engaged. It was just a time of incredible intensity and attention to science.

The impact on public opinion was just as

**The State of State Science Standards 2012, published by the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, is available at [www.edexcellence.net/publications/the-state-of-state-science-standards-2012.html](http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/the-state-of-state-science-standards-2012.html).**



profound—and national concern over the quality of American science, and science education, has continued for the past half century. According to a 2011 survey, 74 percent of Americans think STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) education is “very important.” Only 2 percent say it’s “not too important.”<sup>2</sup>

Yet this strong conviction has not translated into strong science achievement. The 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) found barely one-third of fourth-graders in the United States at or above the “proficient” level in science, with those proportions slipping to 30 percent in eighth grade and a woeful 21 percent in twelfth grade.<sup>3</sup>

Why is this? How can it be that, for more than five decades, Americans have voiced so much concern about science education yet made so little progress in delivering it? There are, of course, multiple explanations, starting with the blunt fact that few states and communities have taken concrete action to build world-class science programs into their primary and secondary schools. Without such programs in place to deliver the goods, our Sputnik-induced anxieties remain fully justified some 55 years later.

A solid science education program begins by clearly establishing what well-educated youngsters need to learn about this multifaceted domain of human knowledge.

Here, the first crucial step is setting clear academic standards for the schools—standards that not only articulate the critical science content students need to learn, but that also properly sequence and prioritize that content. In the light of such standards, teachers at each grade level can clearly see where they should focus their time and attention to ensure that their pupils are on track toward college and career readiness. That doesn’t mean it will happen, of course. As we at the Thomas B. Fordham Institute have repeatedly noted, standards alone cannot drive outstanding achievement. But they are a necessary starting point. They are the score for conductors, musicians, instrument makers, and more. They are the foundation upon which rigorous curricula and instructional materials and assessments are built. They are the template for preparing science teachers for our classrooms.

Fordham has a long-standing interest in science standards and a history of reviewing them with care and rigor. We published our first analysis of state science standards in 1998 and a follow-up review in 2005. Unfortunately, the findings from both evaluations were not good. In 1998, just 36 states had even set standards for science, and only 13 of those earned grades from our reviewers in the A or B range. By 2005, though every state except Iowa had

## Undermining Evolution

### Where State Standards Go Wrong

According to The State of State Science Standards 2012, four problems were found frequently among the mediocre to poor standards: undermining evolution, including vague standards, failing to integrate inquiry skills with content, and avoiding mathematical formulae and equations. To complement the main article’s study of how high school biology teachers approach evolution (see page 12), the following is an updated version of the report’s discussion of how evolution is undermined.

—EDITORS

“Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution.” So wrote famed biologist Theodosius Dobzhansky in 1973.<sup>1</sup> And so it is today. Yet controversy continues to envelop the teaching of evolution in American schools. One wonders, indeed, how much progress we’ve made in this realm since the Scopes trial in 1925. Six years ago, our science reviewers noted:<sup>2</sup>

The attack on evolution is unabated [since 2000], and Darwin’s critics have evolved a more subtle, more dangerous approach. A decade ago, the anti-evolution movement ... argued vigorously

for explicit teaching of the evidence for intelligent design....

The claim now is that evidence against “Darwinism” exists, that curriculum-makers should include it as an exercise in critical thinking, and that “freedom of speech” or “fairness” requires that they do so. The hidden agenda is to introduce doubt—any possible doubt—about evolution at the critical early stage of introduction to the relevant science.

While many states are handling evolution better today than in the past, anti-evolution pressures continue to threaten state science standards. In April 2012, for example, Tennessee passed a law that enables teachers to bring anti-evolution materials into the classroom without being challenged by administrators. This law is similar to the Science Education Act passed in June 2008 in Louisiana, which is ostensibly an “academic freedoms act” meant to give teachers and students legal cover to debate the merits and veracity of scientific theories. In practice, such measures push a pro-creationist agenda—and give cover to those looking to teach intelligent design creationism. Though both acts are freestanding statutes with no

articulated K–12 science standards, the results were equally disheartening: just 19 earned honors grades, and the overall average was barely a C.

This, our third review, provides analyses of the K–12 science standards currently in place in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, as well as the framework that undergirds the NAEP science assessment. The results of this rigorous analysis paint a fresh—but still bleak—picture. A majority of the states’ standards remain mediocre to awful. In fact, the average grade across all

assessment framework. And seven states earn grades in the B range. But this also means that just 13 jurisdictions—barely 25 percent, and fewer than in 2005—earn a B or better for setting appropriately clear, rigorous, and specific standards.

Of course, as one of our reviewers noted in 1998:

When it comes to academic standards ... even a “B” ought not be deemed satisfactory. In a properly organized education system, standards drive

academic achievement. Several states with exemplary science standards still aren’t serious about setting high proficiency bars on their assessments. Others don’t hold students (or their teachers) properly accountable for learning (or successfully imparting) important content. And still others haven’t provided (or directed teachers to) the curricular and instructional resources that teachers need to drive achievement. But, while standards alone won’t drive achievement, they are an important place to start.

Of the 44 jurisdictions that have revised, replaced, or created their science standards since our 2005 analysis, 11 have shown some improvement, and some of that improvement has been dramatic. Kansas, for example, moved from an F to a B, and Arkansas moved from a D to a B. The District of Columbia rose from a mediocre C in our last analysis to a best-in-class A this time.

By contrast, 16 states managed to make their standards worse since 2005. In fact, five of them—Colorado, New Jersey, North Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia—dropped from Bs to Ds.

Note, however, that our criteria have changed since 2005. Therefore, changes in a state’s grade could be due to changes in the quality of the standards, changes in our criteria, or both.\* On balance, the combination of improvements and worsenings had little impact on our national average. □

*(Endnotes on page 40)*

\*For more information on our grading metric, see Appendix A of the report.

## A majority of the states’ science standards remain mediocre to awful. In fact, the average grade across all states is a low C.

states is—once again—a thoroughly undistinguished C. (In fact, it’s a low C.) In 27 jurisdictions, the science standards earn a D or below. Yet this very weakness in what states expect of their schools, teachers, and students in science suggests that a purposeful focus on improving—or replacing—today’s standards could be a key part of a comprehensive effort to boost science performance.

Two jurisdictions—California and the District of Columbia—have standards strong enough to earn straight As from our reviewers. Four other states—Indiana, Massachusetts, South Carolina, and Virginia—earn A-minuses, as does the NAEP

everything else. If they are only “pretty good,” then “pretty good” is the best the system is apt to produce by way of student learning. No state should be satisfied with such a result. Hence, no state should be satisfied with less than world-class standards in a core academic subject such as science.

States looking to improve their standards, however, need not start from scratch. They can look to places like California and the District of Columbia, and also to the NAEP assessment framework, for models of excellence.

Let us repeat that even the finest of standards alone will never yield outstanding

direct link to the states’ academic standards, they do damage by allowing for the introduction of creationist teaching supplements—thereby affecting classroom instruction.<sup>3</sup>

Tennessee and Louisiana are not the only states that have tried to undermine the teaching of evolution through legislation. In 2011 alone, anti-evolution bills were introduced in seven state legislatures.<sup>4</sup>

Of course, most anti-evolution efforts are aimed more directly at the standards themselves. And these tactics are far more subtle than they once were. Missouri, for example, has asterisked all “controversial” evolution content in the standards and relegated it to a voluntary curriculum that will not be assessed. (Sadly, this marks a step back from that state’s coverage of evolution in 2005.) Tennessee includes evolution only in an elective high school course (not the basic high school biology course). And Maryland includes evolution content in its standards but explicitly excludes crucial points from its state assessment.

Other states have undermined the teaching of evolution by singling it out as somehow not quite as “scientific” as other concepts of similar breadth. A common technique—used to a greater or lesser extent by Colorado, Missouri, Montana, and West Virginia—is to direct students to study its “strengths and weaknesses.”

Far too often, important evolution content is included, but minimally. Some states mention evolution just once in their standards and never revisit it. Others—including Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, and Nebraska—unnecessarily delay it until high school.

Even some of the nation’s best standards subtly undermine the teaching of evolution. In California, for example, students are told to “understand science, not necessarily [to] accept everything taught.” In New York, students learn that “according to many scientists, biological evolution occurs through natural selection.” (This is not according to “many” but, in fact, all true scientists.)

Finally, conspicuously missing from the vast majority of states’ standards is mention of human evolution—implying that elements of biological evolution don’t pertain to human life. This marks a subtle but important victory for creationists: even states with thorough and appropriate coverage of evolution (e.g., Massachusetts, Utah, and Washington) shy away from linking the controversial term with ourselves. Only four states—Florida, New Hampshire, Iowa, and Rhode Island—openly embrace human evolution in their current science standards. (Pennsylvania, which referenced human evolution in its previous standards, has omitted it from the more recent version.) □

*(Endnotes on page 40)*

## Evolving Controversy

(Continued from page 23)

- George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism 1870–1925* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982); Robert D. Woodberry and Christian S. Smith, "Fundamentalism et al.: Conservative Protestants in America," *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1998): 25–56; and Michael Ruse, *The Evolution-Creation Struggle* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).
- Ruse, *The Evolution-Creation Struggle*; and Michael Lienesch, *In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).
- William Jennings Bryan, *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan* (Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company, 1925), 535, 539, 543.
- Berkman and Plutzer, *Evolution, Creationism, and the Battle*.
- See Ronald L. Numbers, *The Creationists: From Scientific Creationism to Intelligent Design*, expanded ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Clyde Wilcox, "Fundamentalists and Politics: An Analysis of the Effects of Differing Operational Definitions," *Journal of Politics* 48, no. 4 (1986): 1041–1051.
- Berkman and Plutzer, *Evolution, Creationism, and the Battle*.
- Eugenie C. Scott, "The Evolution of Creationism: The Struggle for the Schools," *Natural History* 103, no. 10 (1994): 12–13.
- For an accessible explanation of this, see Francisco Ayala, *Darwin's Gift to Science and Religion* (Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press, 2007), 59–61.
- Eugenie C. Scott, *Evolution vs. Creationism: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).
- For details, see Berkman and Plutzer, *Evolution, Creationism, and the Battle*.
- Henry M. Morris, "The Scientific Case Against Evolution: A Summary Part 1," *Impact* #330 (December 2000): ii.
- Michael B. Berkman and Eric Plutzer, "Local Autonomy versus State Constraints: Balancing Evolution and Creationism in U.S. High Schools," *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 41, no. 4 (October 2011): 610–635.
- Nicholas J. Matzke and Paul R. Gross, "Analyzing Critical Analysis: The Fallback Antievolutionist Strategy," in *Not in Our Classrooms: Why Intelligent Design Is Wrong for Our Schools*, ed. Eugenie C. Scott and Glenn Branch (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006), 28–56.
- Michael B. Berkman and Eric Plutzer, "Defeating Creationism in the Courtroom, But Not in the Classroom," *Science* 331, no. 6016 (2011): 404–405.
- Berkman and Plutzer, *Evolution, Creationism, and the Battle*; and Berkman and Plutzer, "Defeating Creationism in the Courtroom."
- Michael L. Rutledge and Melissa A. Warden, "Evolutionary Theory, the Nature of Science & High School Biology Teachers: Critical Relationships," *American Biology Teacher* 62, no. 1 (2000): 29.
- Berkman and Plutzer, *Evolution, Creationism, and the Battle*.
- Michael L. Rutledge and Melissa A. Mitchell, "High School Biology Teachers' Knowledge Structure, Acceptance & Teaching of Evolution," *American Biology Teacher* 64, no. 1 (2002): 21–28.
- Joyce A. Griffith and Sarah K. Brem, "Teaching Evolutionary Biology: Pressures, Stress, and Coping," *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 41, no. 8 (2004): 791–809.
- Dan Goldhaber, "The Mystery of Good Teaching: Surveying the Evidence on Student Achievement and Teachers' Characteristics," *Education Next* 2, no. 1 (Spring 2002).
- Glenn Branch, Eugenie C. Scott, and Joshua Rosenau, "Dispatches from the Evolution Wars: Shifting Tactics and Expanding Battlefields," *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics* 11 (2010): 332.
- Ella L. Ingram and Craig E. Nelson, "Relationship between Achievement and Students' Acceptance of Evolution or Creation in an Upper-Level Evolution Course," *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 43, no. 1 (January 2006): 18.

## Weak Standards

(Continued from page 19)

### Endnotes

- Cornelia Dean, "When Science Suddenly Mattered, in Space and in Class," *New York Times*, September 25, 2007.
- Research!America, *Your Congress—Your Health: National Public Opinion Poll* (Alexandria, VA: Research!America, March 2011).
- National Center for Education Statistics, *The Nation's Report Card: Science 2009; National Assessment of Educational Progress at Grades 4, 8, and 12* (Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, January 2011).

## Undermining Evolution

(Continued from page 19)

### Endnotes

- Theodosius Dobzhansky, "Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution," *The American Biology Teacher* 35 (1973): 125–129.
- Paul R. Gross, *The State of State Science Standards 2005* (Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute, December 2005), 7.
- For details on Tennessee's new law, see <http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx?BillNumber=HB0368>; for details on Louisiana's law, see "Bulletin 741—Louisiana Handbook for School Administrators," published by the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, at [www.doa.louisiana.gov/osr/lac/28v115/28v115.doc](http://www.doa.louisiana.gov/osr/lac/28v115/28v115.doc). Section 2304 stipulates how the Science Education Act is to be administered by school administrators and teachers at the parish and local levels.
- "Antievolution Legislation Scorecard," National Center for Science Education, April 8, 2011, [www.ncse.com/evolution/antievolution-legislation-scorecard](http://www.ncse.com/evolution/antievolution-legislation-scorecard).

## Labor's Untold Story

(Continued from page 37)

- See Joseph Moreau, *Schoolbook Nation: Conflicts over American History Textbooks from the Civil War to the Present* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2003).
- During the strike, corporate and police brutality against the strikers led Michigan Governor Frank Murphy to send in the National Guard, not to attack strikers or to evict them from the GM plant they had occupied (ways in which the National Guard was often used against strikers), but rather to protect them, both from the police, who used tear gas against the strikers, and from corporate strikebreakers.
- Moreau, *Schoolbook Nation*, 245.
- Elizabeth A. Fones-Wolf, *Selling Free Enterprise: The Business Assault on Labor and Liberalism, 1945–60* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994).
- For example, Jon Bekken's 1994 analysis of journalism curricula found unions to be neglected or unrepresented. See Jon Bekken, "The Portrayal of Labor in Reporting Textbooks: Critical Absences, Hostile Voices" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Atlanta, GA, August 10–13, 1994), [www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED375414.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED375414.pdf).
- Robert Shaffer, "Where Are the Organized Public Employees? The Absence of Public Employee Unionism from U.S. History Textbooks, and Why It Matters," *Labor History* 43, no. 3 (2002): 315.
- See Appleyby et al., *The American Vision*, 435; and Lapsansky-Werner et al., *United States History*, 558.
- See Danzer et al., *The Americans*, 708–709.
- From the proclamation, printed in the *Boston Evening Transcript*, February 18, 1834. See also, Thomas Dublin, "Women, Work, and Protest in the Early Lowell Mills: The Oppressing Hand of Avarice Would Enslave Us," *Labor History* 16 (1975): 99–116, [www.invention.smithsonian.org/centerpieces/whole\\_cloth/u2ei/u2materials/dublin.html](http://www.invention.smithsonian.org/centerpieces/whole_cloth/u2ei/u2materials/dublin.html). As Dublin notes, "At several points in the proclamation the women drew on their Yankee heritage. Connecting their turn-out with the efforts of their 'Patriotic Ancestors' to secure independence from England, they interpreted the

wage cuts as an effort to 'enslave' them—to deprive them of the independent status as 'daughters of freemen.'" Dublin points out that this proclamation (and, we believe, many of the group's other writings) makes clear that the women saw their right to band together to fight for better pay and working conditions as a natural outgrowth of the rights defended by their ancestors in the American Revolution and enshrined in the Constitution.

- Danzer et al., *The Americans*, 705.
- See David Madland, Karla Walter, and Nick Bunker, *Unions Make the Middle Class: Without Unions, the Middle Class Withers* (Washington, DC: Center for American Progress, April 2011).
- Appleyby et al., *The American Vision*, 864; and Danzer et al., *The Americans*, 911.
- Ayers et al., *American Anthem*, 703.
- For examples, see the international labor activism website LabourStart at [www.laborstart.org](http://www.laborstart.org).
- For a chart of union membership rates historically, in the United States and several other countries, see Gerald Friedman, "Labor Unions in the United States," *EH.Net Encyclopedia of Economic and Business History*, ed. Robert Whaples, March 16, 2008, [www.eh.net/encyclopedia/article/friedman.unions.us](http://www.eh.net/encyclopedia/article/friedman.unions.us).

## Distorting the Record

(Continued from page 35)

- For more on Bayard Rustin's life and the new award-winning documentary *Brother Outsider: The Life of Bayard Rustin*, see [www.rustin.org](http://www.rustin.org).
- For an analysis of civil rights unionism and the forces that shaped it, see Michael Honey, "A Dream Deferred," *The Nation*, May 3, 2004. Honey, a professor at the University of Washington, writes: "It is crucial to remember that *Brown* was as much the product as the precipitator of mass movements. Yes, the decision resulted from the incredibly hard-working and astute battle led by Charles Houston, Thurgood Marshall and others in the NAACP. But it also resulted from mass movements and a vast shift in status among poor and working-class African-Americans, millions of whom moved out of rural areas and into cities and mass-production industries in the 1930s and '40s. They created an expanding membership base for the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), the NAACP and an American left that challenged segregation at every level. Domestic workers, sharecroppers, day laborers, factory workers and other poor people, especially the women among them, organized economic boycotts, picket lines, marches, sit-ins, strikes, church and community groups, unions, consumer cooperatives and mass meetings. Their role as workers, soldiers and activists in the fight against white supremacy at home and fascism abroad created vast social changes that set the stage for *Brown*. As one example, in the Deep South city of Memphis, African-Americans, who had been organizing unions since after the Civil War, provided the main support that made the rise of the CIO possible, at a time when supporting a union could cost one's life. The purge of the interracial left from the CIO during the cold war undermined civil rights unionism, yet a number of black industrial unionists continued to challenge white supremacy in the 1950s and '60s. Union wages also made it more possible to send children to college, and some of those students led sit-ins and demonstrations against Jim Crow."
- For a more detailed account of the UAW's history in supporting civil rights, see "UAW History," United Auto Workers, [www.uaw.org/page/uaw-history](http://www.uaw.org/page/uaw-history).
- Kevin Boyle, *The UAW and the Heyday of American Liberalism, 1945–1968* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 176.
- For more on the Teamsters' support of civil rights, see "Teamsters and Civil Rights," International Brotherhood of Teamsters, [www.teamster.org/history/teamster-history/civil-rights](http://www.teamster.org/history/teamster-history/civil-rights). See also [www.teamster.org/content/teamsters-honor-black-history-month](http://www.teamster.org/content/teamsters-honor-black-history-month).
- See "This Day in History," International Brotherhood of Teamsters, [www.teamstermagazine.com/day-history](http://www.teamstermagazine.com/day-history).
- An all-white jury acquitted the men accused in Viola Liuzzo's slaying. For more on Liuzzo, see "Civil Rights Martyr Viola Liuzzo," International Brotherhood of Teamsters, March 11, 2010, [www.teamster.org/content/civil-rights-martyr-viola-liuzzo](http://www.teamster.org/content/civil-rights-martyr-viola-liuzzo).
- Peter B. Levy, *The New Left and Labor in the 1960s* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 17.
- James M. Washington, ed., *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 202–203.
- See "Major Features of the Civil Rights Act of 1964" on the CongressLink website, available at [www.congresslink.org/print\\_basics\\_histmats\\_civilrights64text.htm](http://www.congresslink.org/print_basics_histmats_civilrights64text.htm).