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The long-standing debate regarding the appropriateness of the Common Core State Standards for the Kindergarten learners has appeared to reach its settlement, through the severe criticism of such policies by an avalanche of education experts. The standards, which often apply across the Grade 3 learners have acquired a new tag for lacking developmental appropriateness since most of the provisions of this system have proven either irrelevant or have little to no significant contribution to the addition of knowledge among the learners from Kindergarten across the Grade 3 studies. According to various teams of experts defending the early years of educational development for the students, there are a set of justifiable reasons that help both the teachers and the parents in understanding the extent of the inappropriateness of the Common Core Standards (CCSS) (Hiebert & Mesmer, 2013).

One of the bases for the inappropriateness of the CCSS for the kindergarten through 3rd-grade learners is the fact that most of the provisions of the system lack a logical premise on any well-researched concepts on child development with particular reference to how the learning process occurs in juniors at such stages. Instead of comprehensive research to establish the nature of the learning process among the juniors, Pearson (2013) adds that the developers based their arguments on a backward trend of what happens to high school graduates. The implication is that the CCSS is a product of assumptions and individual imaginations, which may lack a universal point of application to the junior learners.

Some of the inappropriate consequences of the provisions and requirements for the CCSS among the junior students involve courses that demand that the children list discrete skills and facts, which have proven to be incompatible with the overall way in which such children can think, as well as develop. Furthermore, there have been frequent cases in which the system has required that junior learners acquire particular facts, most of which they have not been ready to capture (Pearson, 2013). More particularly, the CCSS’s method of instruction has had its basis on the teacher-led and didactic methodology, other than the most appropriate experimental and play-based teaching for junior scholars. Consequently, it is possible to state that the CCSS standards of teaching kindergarten through grade 3 learners have been a fertile ground through which rot learning occurs, and illiteracy may thrive.

According to Applebee (2013), there is a dangerous assumption that occurs while using the CCSS method in teaching kindergarten through grade 3 learners. It assumes that all children have similar development capacities, and can learn the various skills taught at the same rate. However, there is sufficient evidence from different studies in child development process, including cognitive and developmental psychology, medicine, and education, as well as neuroscience, which points to a common fact that different children have differing development rates (Williamson, Fitzgerald & Stenner, 2013). The implication that they have different rates at which each can learn and absorb similar concepts. The CCSS standards are not only irrelevant to most of the children especially those with different learning capabilities but also inappropriate for overall learning processes.

Since it is no longer a debate on whether the use of CCSS standards is appropriate, but a final stand on its inappropriateness is established, it is important to develop policies which aim at utmost benefits of the learning experience. Kindergarten children, through grade 3 often learn under a particular set of conditions, including both indoor and outdoor activities, direct experiences as well as play. New policies should allow adequate room for the teachers to facilitate individual learner development.

**Action Plan Module 5**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **Action**  (Training, Investigation, Pilot Study, Interviews, etc.) | **Time**  **Frame** | **Stakeholders** | **Evaluation**  (Formative, Summative, etc.) |
| Introduction of Play -based Activities | Interview kindergarten teachers to determine existing time allocation for play-based learning, compared to fact-based teaching  This would in strategizing for more time allocation, based on the available teaching time | 2-3 months  This time would be sufficient to obtain the representative views of kindergarten teachers from various states | * Education Experts such as professors * Kindergarten teachers * Kindergarten pupils’ parents * Kindergarten school management boards * Both State and Federal departments of education | Formative evaluation of how kindergarten pupils to determine their early math development and learning  Education experts, in close consultation with the teachers to carry out the evaluation |
| To prepare all students to be college and career ready | Training of pupils to develop focused minds, getting ready with relevant skills for college and future careers | Throughout the period of study before college or beginning any career of choice | * Education Experts such as professors * Kindergarten teachers * Kindergarten pupils’ parents * Kindergarten school management boards * Both State and Federal departments of education | Summative Evaluation  Determining the overall suitability of a candidate to enter college or begin a career in a chosen field  Evaluation be carried out by education experts such as professors |
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