4th Grade Math

Operations with Whole Numbers	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
84	82.35%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
18	17.65%

If my child understands the basics, why does she have to spend so much time explaining?

Improvements in the educational process should not make things more difficult. My son has ADHD and he can not comprehend what this is even talking about. As a 33 year old adult I myself have trouble comprehending this. I am a college graduate and learned math the old fashioned way. This way is so confusing and difficult to even understand the instructions.

These standards require students to understand math conceptually. I appreciate that it requires teachers to have students work through the concepts, not teach only algorithms. In the past students could meet the standards without comprehending what they were doing. This led to serious gaps in their learning that did not become apparent until later grades. These standards need to remain as-is. They are appropriate as written.

This is not how they're taught, it's completely ridiculous and nobody, not even the children, can understand long enough to walk away with knowledge of how this math is SUPPOSED to ve worked out. Go back to simple math, quit making it a million times harder than it needs to be. While taking a college algebra class myself, my I couldn't help my elementary children add and subtract. Utterly appalling educators would care so little about the stress children have gone through trying to comprehend this garbage and then still fail.

The way the questions are worded is confusing for a 9 year old. There are to many steps to show making math more complicated than it needs to be.

4.OAA.2 is algebra and not appropriate for fourth grade. We did not solve problems with a letter standing for the unknown quantity in fourth grade.

I think these standards are fine, but the curriculum that go along with the standards are not appropriate.

The way in which the problems can or should be solved should not be included. My child shouldn't have to draw pictures if he understands the equation.

Language usage could be more descriptive. A student and most parents would not understand the terminology.

As an educator we had to "unpack" these standards and learn what these looked like so I know parents must struggle with the language.

4th Grade Math

We've gone from a country that ruled the world with educational excellence and inventions, that taught latin in high school. Now we teach remedial math and english in college. The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

Stop with the pictures. In real life no one is given the opportunity to draw a picture to figure out a simple multiplication fact that should be memorized. In 4th grade multiplication facts should be second nature. We do not draw pictures in our respective jobs or even day to day life because it is a life skill that is considered basic. It is the same way we do not count on our fingers as adults. Stop making math more complicated and abstract when children have difficulty understand abstract concepts. They need to be taught how to find a correct answer not how to diagram it (which often results in mistakes as well since drawing 63 of anything opens additional opportunities for error).

http://www.hmhco.com/shop/education-curriculum/math/saxon-math I have found that Saxon math works best for my child because it's incremental and distributive. That is, my child has time to understand, practice, and master previous concepts.

We feel the standards would be more understandable if they were written in user friendly language. They are way too wordy.

Some of these standards are too large and it could be more manageable if we were to break the standards up into smaller strands.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

4.OA.A1 I think the standard are durable. My only concern is that students do not have their multiplication facts memorized by the time they enter fourth grade. There needs to be given some reference to taking time to reinforce the basic math skills. These are the skills the students need to survive in the work field.

On 4.OA.A.2 it says to solve using drawings and equations. While I think this is totally appropriate because the drawings helps the students make sense of the equations, I wonder when we have to start holding the students accounting with simply the equation. Is this in 4th grade? Do we start out with the drawing and eventually require all students to be able to represent it with an equation or is that required in a later grade. Some students, while it's not efficient, get comfortable with drawing and will continue to use that strategy long past it's usefulness. I think some teachers struggle with this because as our Lieutenant Governor said in one of the common core committee meetings, "We don't want them drawing circles on the ACT." Well, we as teachers don't want that either, but when the standard reads as "you can use either" we need to know when we start holding them accountable for the more abstract equation. I know there is no "Today we use pictures and next Tuesday we use equations" since it's all so developmental, but a general idea of when we expect students to use the equation would be nice.

4th Grade Math

Factors and Multiples	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
89	87.25%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
13	12.75%

Do you understand what this is even saying? I can not understand the question. How can a child understand this?

This is not how they're taught, it's completely ridiculous and nobody, not even the children, can understand long enough to walk away with knowledge of how this math is SUPPOSED to ve worked out. Go back to simple math, quit making it a million times harder than it needs to be. While taking a college algebra class myself, my I couldn't help my elementary children add and subtract. Utterly appalling educators would care so little about the stress children have gone through trying to comprehend this garbage and then still fail.

Same as above

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

Same as above - Saxon math.

We feel the standards would be more understandable if they were written in user friendly language. They are way too wordy. Break them down into smaller steps ie. 1. find all factor pairs....2. determine the multiple....

Please separate into subparts.. (a,b, etc...)

This standard would be better split into two - (1) factor pairs and multiples (2) prime or composite.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

This feels a little premature. Maybe this needs to wait until 5th grade. Most students aren't fluent enough at this point to actually teach prime and composite in a meaningful way.

This standard has to many task within one standard.

4th Grade Math

Refer back to the previous comments.

I really like this standard for the most part, but I know some teachers struggle because they also want to teach the rules of divisibility with this to help students be more efficient when "determining whether a given whole number in the range 1-100 is a multiple of a given one digit number." I know sure if this is what common core had in mind, but it might need to be addressed.

Patterns

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
90	88.24%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
12	11.76%

Again, understanding the concept and explaining it are two different things. The explanation is simply skip counted by 3. Stop making the explanation portion more important that finding the correct answer.

Same as above - see Saxon math.

We feel the standards would be more understandable if they were written in user friendly language. They are way too wordy.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

The statement "explain informally why the numbers will continue to alternate..." is vague and should be written more explicitly.

Place Value for Multi-Digit Whole Numbers

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
87	85.29%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
15	14.71%

(3) The committee feels that the words "to any place" need to be changed to "greatest place." For example, is rounding to the nearest 10 in a 6-digit number a reasonable expectation at this level? "To any place" is acceptable when rounding a smaller number. Also, the committee feels the jump between 3rd grade's place value expectation (1,000) to 4th grade's (1,000,000) is too broad. Fourth grade teachers are spending a great deal of time extending this understanding.

4th Grade Math

These standards require students to understand math conceptually. I appreciate that it requires teachers to have students work through the concepts, not teach only algorithms. In the past students could meet the standards without comprehending what they were doing. This led to serious gaps in their learning that did not become apparent until later grades. These standards need to remain as-is. They are appropriate as written.

Stop. Just. Stop.

Seems to be a low level skill for 4th grade. Comparing numbers and place value of whole numbers should be mastered by this point.

This is difficult for students to understand

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

See Saxon math.

We feel the standards would be more understandable if they were written in user friendly language. They are way too wordy. The examples provided are too confusing, a more simplistic approach would be helpful for students and parents to understand.

4.NBT.1 - New example, please. This is a fifth grade skill. 4.NBT.2 - Please separate into subparts.. (a,b, etc...)

4.NBT.A.1 - The example needs to be changed to one that fits the standard more closely. The example currently listed better fits the similar 5th grade standard. 4.NBT.A.2 - This standard should be split. (1) Read and write multi-digit whole numbers... (2) Compare two multi-digit numbers...

4.NBT.A2 needs to be broken into smaller pieces.

4.nbt.2 I think the round, write, expanded form and compare need to be broken up. I have kids who can do all but expanded form but the fail the standard because they are all together. 4.nbt.1 needs more explanation.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

NBT.1 I think a comment about how far fourth grade needs to generalize by the end of the year needs to be made. Students are to generalize all the way into the millions and many teachers don't know that. I think information about how far third grade needs to take their students so that this is an obtainable goal in fourth grade needs to be added also.

4th Grade Math

Refer back to the first comment.

Multi-Digit Arithmetic	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
81	79.41%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
21	20.59%

Too complicated. Causes major anxiety for my child.

(4) The committee feels "multi-digit" needs to be more specific (adding and subtracting to 1,000,000?). And is the student required to use the traditional recording system or is partial sums acceptable? (6) Do divisibility rules need to added here for 2, 5, and 10?

Is this really the 4th grade level?

Students must have a background in previous grades to be able to complete these tasks.

These standards require students to understand math conceptually. I appreciate that it requires teachers to have students work through the concepts, not teach only algorithms. In the past students could meet the standards without comprehending what they were doing. This led to serious gaps in their learning that did not become apparent until later grades. These standards need to remain as-is.

No

These are kids. I'm a 40 year old person who's educated and I have trouble understanding these directions. My 9 year old sure won't

4.nbt.B.5. There is too much disagreement on the standard algorithm. Some teachers say it is the tradional way that was learned years ago with carrying and borrowing. Some teachers say the student can partial sums and use place value to solve and that will count. Some say the standard algorithm does not have to used until 6th grade. The expectations here need more clarification.

Again if my student understands the standard algorithm why do they need to show it in a different way. I understand teaching in different ways to make sure each student can use what is easiest for them but to require a picture or array seems like overkill.

Standard algorithm that will be used is unclear.

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who

have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

Again, stop with nonstop pictures.

See Saxon math

We like the first one. However we feel the standards would be more understandable if they were written in user friendly language. They are way too wordy.

The word fluently really needs to be defined within this scope.4.nbt.b.4

4.NBT.4 - Please separate into subparts.. (a,b, etc...) 4.NBT.5 - Please separate into subparts.. (a,b, etc...)

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

NBT.4 needs to state what a standard algorithm is because I think it confuses many teachers.

I think the kids need to be required to learn and be able to use the algorithm for long division and 2 digit x 2 digit multiplication. We taught them forgiving division and other strategies in multiplication (Bow tie method) as alternatives to the algorithm the first year of common core but when they got to middle school they had to know the algorithm which some didn't know.

4.NBT.B4,5,6 We need to concentrate on the basic skills. Then go to higher levels of thinking skills.

I think it has been a VERY WISE move to not require mastery of the standard algorithm until the 4th grade. I think this gives students more time to learn and learn IN DEPTH about what addition and subtraction is. It isn't a series of steps to be followed but an understanding of the nature of numbers. However, a change that I think is NECESSARY is to highlight that this is the first time teachers should require mastery of it. I see teachers in second and third see the word "algorithm" in their frameworks and the only algorithm they know is the standard algorithm. They don't understand all the invented algorithms that children use. Therefore teachers are teaching the standard algorithm in second and third because because they see the word "algorithm" in their standards, not realizing that common core doesn't mean the STANDARD algorithm. This misconceptions must be addressed, but the fact that the standard algorithm isn't until 4th was an excellent move.

Fraction Equivalence and Ordering

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
84	82.35%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

4th Grade Math

Number	Percent
18	17.65%

The committee feels like to overall terminology of the fraction standards is too difficult to interpret. (2) The committee feels 4th grade students are unprepared at this level to "create" common denominators and numerators and should be limited to common denominators at this stage.

See above comment. Our youth is struggling tremendously with this. I say sabotage.

Clarifying statements would be great to include in these standards.

These standards require students to understand math conceptually. I appreciate that it requires teachers to have students work through the concepts, not teach only algorithms. In the past students could meet the standards without comprehending what they were doing. This led to serious gaps in their learning that did not become apparent until later grades. These standards need to remain as-is. They are appropriate as written.

No

This could be explained so much simpler. These questions just make things more confusing for kids.

I feel like this skill is appropriate with visual models but having to multiply denominators to make comparisons is a bit advanced for children that have just mastered multiplication.

Seems better suited for 5 th or 6 th grade.

Very confusing terms.

Same comment

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

Clarify visual models

See Saxon math

Parents often comment they find this confusing and do not understand what is being asked. Thus, students are not receiving the help they need from home.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

The standards for fractions need to define those in which grade four students are responsible. (E.g. Fourths, eighths, twelfths)

I think this standard is too hard for 4th grade to be required to master. Some of the kids can get it but developmentally some are just not ready for this type of advanced fraction problem.

Again, I LOVE that we are focusing on the visual models. I think this is AWESOME for students, but teachers struggle with teaching this. Perhaps some visual examples in the standards should be included, like we had in the old Arkansas frameworks.

Fractions from Unit Fractions

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
87	85.29%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
15	14.71%

Too complicated.

(3c) The committee feels these problems should be limited to no regrouping required. (4c) The committee feels that repeated addition should be added as an acceptable strategy to this standard.

Common Core should make things easier to understand for everyone. This will hurt our country in the future. Those that passed this new process are either paid off easily or are in on the conspiracy themselves.

In order to meet this standard CGI and ECM needs to be provided by districts so that there are not gaps in the present math curriculum. Both of these programs are outstanding and provide problem solving strategies and allow students to realize that it is NOT all about procedures. It provides the understanding which is often the missing link.

These standards require students to understand math conceptually. I appreciate that it requires teachers to have students work through the concepts, not teach only algorithms. In the past students could meet the standards without comprehending what they were doing. This led to serious gaps in their learning that did not become apparent until later grades. These standards need to remain as-is. They are appropriate as written.

4th Grade Math

Come on.

Once again, just seems very confusing. Way to many steps. Over complicated.

If you are not a "math person" these take a lot to figure out and must be related to an example

Mixed numbers are too hard for 4th graders.

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

Clarify visual models.

See Saxon math

We feel the standards would be more understandable if they were written in user friendly language. They are way too wordy.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

I feel that these standards are not developmentally appropriate for 4th graders. The students really struggle with these standards and become frustrated.

Decimal Notation for Fractions	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
86	84.31%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
16	15.69%

Our teachers are having a very hard time of getting this across to the children. The teachers are almost as lost as the kids. Can you please establish community workshops so that parents can go ahead and start teaching this stuff to our own children. Home schooling sounds like the way to go.

Resources need to be provided such as manipulatives, ipads, computers, etc. to make sure this standard can be met with understanding and mastery.

4th Grade Math

These standards require students to understand math conceptually. I appreciate that it requires teachers to have students work through the concepts, not teach only algorithms. In the past students could meet the standards without comprehending what they were doing. This led to serious gaps in their learning that did not become apparent until later grades. These standards need to remain as-is. They are appropriate as written.

No

Same

hard to understand as written

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

Move to 5th

Saxon math

We feel the standards would be more understandable if they were written in user friendly language. They are way too wordy.

Change to "OR justify by using a visual model" instead of requiring a visual model. This allows students with higher level understanding to still be considered proficient without having to draw a visual model, which shows a lower understanding.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

I think if we are going to include this standard, it would be helpful to have a tie-in with decimals when we cover place value.

I think the first part of the standard is too hard to require. They have to be able to find the common denominator and then add the fractions. Some still struggle with this at age 9 or 10.

I feel like, as I understand this frameworks, that 7 should be listed before 6 because, depending on the students mastery of decimals in 3rd grade, they may need to work with visual models of decimals, then compare them to visual models of fractions and discover then that they represent similar quantities and can be written both ways.

4th Grade Math

I feel that these standards are not developmentally appropriate for 4th graders. The students really struggle with these standards and become frustrated.

Measurement	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
85	83.33%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
17	16.67%

way too complicated. My child gets upset after trying to do this for an hour. Takes several hours to complete homework. She understands this math, I don't understand why she has to explain, when that confuses her more

(1) The metric/standard expectation needs to be clarified. While the standard names metric measurement, the example uses standard. The committee is concerned about on which system to focus on the most.

ridiculous

Materials, resources, ipads and apps, programs, manipulatives etc. need to be provided by districts. Money needs to be appropriated to allow teachers to provide lessons and hands on activities for student learning.

The real world applications are critical in all standards.

No

This may be age appropriate math but the wording of the directions is very complicated

Too rigorous.

Language

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

Saxon math

Simplify.

4th Grade Math

4.MD.1- Please separate into subparts.. (a,b, etc...) -- based on units of measurement 4.MD.2 - Please separate into subparts.. (a,b, etc...) -- based on units of measurement 4.MD.3 - Please separate into subparts.. (a,b, etc...)

4.MD. 1 - This is a massive standard and very difficult to assess. Perhaps separate the different areas of measurement? 4.MD. 3 - I would like perimeter and area separated into two different standards. Having them both in the same standard implies that they should be taught together, which is contradictory to brain research and best practices.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

I think these are acceptable as long as a conversion chart is provided.

I like these standards as is but something perhaps 3rd grade teachers need to be aware of is that they learn the formula for area and perimeter in the 4th grade, so in 3rd they should still be teaching for understanding and not going straight to the formula. (which, sadly, I've seen done in 3rd grade.)

Represent and Interpret Data

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
89	87.25%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
13	12.75%

too complicated. Needs to be simplized

No

Made more complicated than it should be

I don't understand why the line plot is only graph studied in 4th grade

Ditto

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

4th Grade Math

I do not understand the need for constant use of number lines. They are almost as frequent as pictures. This is just an additional step that is confusing for kids.

Saxon math

Show an example of a line plot. Break this into two separate standards.

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

This seems to be a very specific standard that is repeated at the various grades. What is its significance? Can we not reason with fractions without using a line plot? Don't see the need.

Needs to be with same denominator

Again, I think a visual model within the standards would be helpful for teachers to understand this.

Geometric Measurements

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
90	88.24%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
12	11.76%

Needs to be more simple. My child has to overanalyze

high school math was easier to understand than this

No

I started this kind of math in jr. high not 4th grade

Better suited for later age groups

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

4th Grade Math

Saxon math

We feel the standards would be more understandable if they were written in user friendly language. They are way too wordy.

Just one question. Why does this skill(angles/measuring) not reappear until 7th grade?

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

learning basis angles and turns within a circle are enough; when using additive parts to find n degrees gets difficult at this age group

I feel that these standards are not developmentally appropriate for 4th graders. The students really struggle with these standards and become frustrated.

Lines and Angles

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
93	91.18%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
9	8.82%

Too complicated. The shorter explanation is better.

(1) The committee feels this standard could be started in 3rd grade and completed in 4th. (2) Is the last part of this standard limited to right angles exclusively?

This reminds me of high school algebra. A child with ADHD will not grasp on to this while in the 4th grade.

No

I believe that this math would be more advanced than a 9 year old

The federal government has no place in our state and local educational choices. By taking those "thirty pieces of silver", Arkansas sold out to the federal government and allowed the feds to take control of our education in our state. The CC standards were written by people who have no business in the education of my child. The CC standards rob out children of a real education and replace it with "teaching to the test". I wish Gov. Hutchinson would repeal CC.

Saxon math

4th Grade Math

I feel it is harder for the children to understand and get the concept of it. I am a accountant and I have trouble figuring it so how do you expect my 4th and 1st grader to understand it.

FOR ALL standards. Sometimes I would just like for them to be written in a more reader friendly version.. not quite so LENGTHY and WORDY!