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TEXAS POLITICS IN THE CITIZENSHIP CURRICULUM: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE TEXAS GOVERNMENT TEKS STANDARDS

In the United States the educational focus is on creating democratic citizens during the primary and secondary school years. The way in which democratic education is constructed varies throughout the United States, and this inconsistency allows political bias into the curriculum. Although there is noteworthy effort to indoctrinate young students into the political structure of the United States in the primary grades, this study focused on the effort to assimilate students into the current political structure at the high school level. The study involved a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the government Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS standards) using the framework of James Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks. The study uncovered the existence of partisan power structures implicit in the learning standards, despite claims from the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) that their goal was to provide ideological balance (Rogers, 2011, Henry, 2010, Aug. 22). In fact, the language used in the learning standards clearly demonstrated the partisan ideas which created an imbalance of power.

Despite the societal goal to create democratic citizens, a social consensus as to the nature of democratic education does not exist. Even the views about the way in which education should be delivered spark debate amongst scholars. The discussion around democracy in education can be traced throughout the history of the United States following several key educational theorists, including John Dewey, Albert Bandura, Paolo Freire, Jean Lave, Etienne Wenger, Michael Apple, and Bradley Levinson. These theorists’ work in education continues to influence the conversation on democratic education. These educational theorists promote a system of education that allows for the development of the student as a whole person. Education should not be a system in which the curriculum and knowledge worth knowing are dictated to students and
teachers, but a collegial, communal process (Dewey, 1916, 1938; Freire, 2009; Levinson, 1999, 2005; Lave and Wenger, 1990). Furthermore, students must build upon their existing knowledge in order to make meaning from the content they study. Without meaning, the learning becomes irrelevant, and students become disengaged from the process. Education is meant to help teach students how to become life-long learners, not experts at passing standardized tests (Apple, 2005, 2011; Levinson, 2005; Bandura, 1997).

The work of these scholars counteracts recent efforts to base public education on a business model (Smith, 1992). This business model of education seeks to obtain proof of learning, in much the same way that businesses report proof of success through profits. In this model, students are treated as a commodity that produces desired results on examinations which in turn become proof of their learning. The current educational model in Texas reflects a national shift toward conservatism in the 1980s. Smith (1992) discusses the changing views of curriculum and the purpose of education as a result of the conservative movement, noting the two dominant perspectives on education: the educationist and the anthropological. Anthropological education includes the development of the whole student through a focus on the relational components of education, which Smith suggests provide a more enriched perspective of education. He points to the conservative movement, led by President Reagan and his Secretary of Education, as a pivotal moment in the educationist effort. Educationists’ primary concern lies with testing and identifying students who learn and who do not learn. Smith points to this business model philosophy of education as a catalyst to the prevalence of standardized testing.

The belief in democratic education continues to persist as more discussion emerges in the United States about the goals of the public education system. As Apple (2011) writes, more people in the United States are beginning to reject the idea that a high stakes, economic model of
education is the only manner in which reform might occur. Instead, many theorists share Levinson’s (2005) perspective that democratic education in other countries serve as a model to help return a sense of social justice and perhaps even equity to American schooling. Despite the growing desire of educational scholars to return a sense of an authentic democracy to education in the United States, the question still remains: what is democratic education? What does this concept look like? How do students engage in the process? The purpose of the study is to describe the current status within the Texas high school government standards of a) democratic education, b) citizenship education, and c) the balance of power between teacher and students and among students, as evidenced by the TEKS standards.

Theoretical Framework

This study involved a critical discourse analysis, CDA, of the government Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS standards). The framework used in the CDA was Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks. James Gee (2006) identifies his seven building tasks as critical discourse analysis because he argues that his work focuses on the “language-in-use” (Gee, 2011, p. 28). Typically, an analysis using Gee’s framework would not be identified as CDA. However, the Texas government TEKS standards are not simply “language-in-use” (Gee, 2011, p. 28). As Rogers (2011) points out Gee’s description of the discourse with a small d, “refers to the grammar of what is said or written,” while the distinction of a capital D discourse references the ways in which language is used to make meaning and create political power structures. A course on the function, form, and use of a system of government is more than specific grammar. As Fairclough asserts, CDA should look for the use of power “‘power to’,” “‘power over’”, and “‘the power under’” (Rogers, 2011, p. 4). A mandated set of learning standards which are required for use in all public school classrooms throughout the state of Texas, fit within this
paradigm of power, as described by Rogers. Using CDA, the study uncovered the power structures implicit in the curriculum (Rogers, 2011, Henry, 2010, Aug. 22). Language chosen for use in the learning standards is an important tool to guide the analysis. The research questions which guided this study include the following:

1. How do the government TEKS standards promote democratic education?
   a. How do the TEKS standards promote democracy?
   b. Who and what is included in democratic education according to the government TEKS standards?
   c. Who and what is excluded?
   d. How do the government TEKS Standards align with educational theorists’ definition of democratic education?

2. How do the government TEKS standards promote citizenship education?
   a. How does the government curriculum define citizenship?
   b. Who and what is included in citizenship education by the government TEKS standards?
   c. Who and what is excluded?
   d. How do the TEKS standards align with educational theorists’ definition of citizenship education?

3. How does the language of the government TEKS standards encourage a balance or imbalance of power amongst students and teachers?

4. How does the language of the government TEKS standards encourage a balance or imbalance of power among students?
The answers to these research questions provided an in-depth critique of the current government learning standards. In the discussion of the curriculum, five terms are key to describe the results. A brief definition for each term is provided below to clarify the meaning in the discussion and analysis of the Texas government TEKS standards.

American exceptionalism: the belief that the United States is an exceptional nation state through the development and use of a republican system of government, democratic practices, and the use of a capitalist economy. Early in American history, this notion was demonstrated through manifest destiny – a belief that God ordained the nation and provided the natural resources for the growth of the United States (Gutek, 2004; de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999).

Conservatism: an ideology which embraces tradition and existing cultural norms. Those who espouse conservative beliefs seek to maintain the original purpose and intent of governments, organizations, and social norms (Gutek, 2004; Fishman, 2012).

American political liberalism: an ideology concerned with seeking progress and change in society. Those who embrace a liberal philosophy support change in society to improve living conditions for people, and desire the protection of personal rights and freedoms (Grimes, 1962; Gutek, 2004). Traditionally, liberalism, or classical liberalism embraces a small national government. In the United States, liberal ideology has many interpretations, but it is generally accepted American liberals support the role of an active national government in the regulation of society and areas of inequity (Edwards, Wattenburr, and Lineberry, 2008).

Neoconservatism: is the ideological preference for tradition. Neoconservatives embrace traditional gender roles, familial structures, and deference to the past as an example of good societal values (Apple, 2005). Neoconservatism traces the roots of the movement as response to cultural changes in the United States, particularly in the 1960s. Conservatives tend to agree with
the preference of social values of neoconservatives, while differing in economic, military, and defense issues (Apple, 2006; Fishman, 2012).

Neoliberalism: is the social and political framework of society which chooses to focus on the economic nature of society. The function of education, in this ideology is to prepare students to be future employees, and so they must acquire the necessary skills to be efficient. Schools are mechanisms for the production of future participants in the economy, and must allocate time, attention, and resources to this task. Neoliberalism tends to advocate free market/capitalist economies as the preferred system (Apple, 2005; 2006).

In the results of the CDA, each of these terms are found in the learning standards and alluded to as the preferred constructs of democratic and citizenship education. Citizenship education in the twenty-first century requires a paradigm shift. Instead of a curriculum that promotes the individual as the central figure in democratic choices, the curriculum must acknowledge that democracy and learning are social processes. The “communities of practice” Lave and Wenger (1991) acknowledge human beings’ social nature and allow them to work together to derive meaning from the world around them. Democratic education must include a social component, or it is not democratic education. Individualism does not promote the unity and equity necessary to develop a shared cultural norm from which students and citizens may operate.

Democratic education must allow for the students, teachers, and other stake holders in public education to function together as a cohesive unit – not in a top-down power structure in which one party clearly dominates the other. As Apple (2006) illustrates, this power structure strips away the basis of trust in a learning community and does not allow students to think freely and problem solve. Rather, the current educational structure reinforces the existing power
organization which leaves many silent because they have no connection or sense of purpose in the educational system. Authentic democratic education encourages students and teachers to work together to determine the curriculum. As Freire (2009) explains, the “naming of the world” must occur as a process where all participants are given equal opportunity to share insight about the world around them (p. 151). An, on-going, collective conversation about democratic education is essential in order to adapt to the desires of the people. Democratic education cannot be dictated from above; instead it must be a continuous dialogue among people who recognize their status as equals implementing democratic education into practice requires careful consideration.

As Dewey (1938) mentions in *Experience and Education*, rejecting traditional classroom structure is unnecessary. In fact, Dewey criticizes former students and progressive reformers who seek to eliminate everything from prior models of learning. Allowing students the freedom to dictate their learning with no direction and no guidance creates lazy and ill-prepared students. The question of guidance becomes problematic in describing democratic education (Dewey, 1938). The implication is not that guidance from a teacher or mentor should dictate the curriculum, but this assistance should promote critical thinking skills by asking tough questions, encouraging innovation, and providing students the freedom to solve authentic problems. Dewey believes “what we need is education pure and simple, and we shall make surer and faster progress when we devote ourselves to finding out just what education is” (p. 90). The goal for education should be the best interests of all participants. Education cannot be considered “good” because it rejects the old methods of instruction, nor can it be considered “good” for embracing new techniques for instruction. Instead, education is authentic when a collective approach is used to work toward the best interest of all participants. Democratic and citizenship education cannot
be accomplished until the debates surrounding education are abandoned in favor of a collective desire to find the pure and simple education Dewey advocates (p. 90).

Method

Critical discourse analysis, CDA, provided an excellent fit for analysis of the Texas government curriculum due to its focus on the power of language. Rogers (2011) notes that scholars who use “critical approaches to discourse analysis recognize that inquiry into meaning making is always also an exploration into power” (p. 1). Further, this method uses the study of related texts to disseminate, regulate, and interpret social reality. CDA helps researchers identify organizational and structural changes. Rogers (2011) explains that CDA is research methodology which provides the necessary tools to explore and address issues of power and inequality in the modern world. Blommaert and Blucaen (2000) list several key topics that are the focus of many CDA studies. These include politics, ideology, racism, economics, advertisements, media, gender, intuitional language, education, and literacy. CDA examines issues of power, inequality, and other issues of rights and freedoms. Moreover, CDA functions to reveal meaning behind text and is a way for scholars to reveal meaning and power struggles from text (Bryman, 2008; McGregor, 2004).

The government TEKS standards were analyzed using Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks. Gee’s framework for CDA include significance, activities or practices, identities, relationships, politics, connections, and sign, systems and knowledge. Gee (2011) suggests that “language-in-use is a tool, not just for saying and doing things…to build things in the world” (p. 30). The frame for this analysis is limited to the government TEKS standards (Lakshmanan, 2011). To critically analyze the government TEKS standards, first I looked at the significance of the language used in the learning standards. Language use creates “social practice” (Rogers et al.,
Social practice is the process by which language produces social interactions among people. Rogers et al. (2005) therefore point out that “language cannot be treated as neutral, because it is caught up in political, social, racial, economic, religious, and cultural formations” (p. 369). Therefore, all of Gee’s (2006) building tasks and the language in the texts represent the process of building the power structures for control of the political and educational discourse in Texas. As I read through the texts of the documents, I looked for the “social practice” created by the texts and the relationships that build an identity of democratic participants in education (p. 369). This process helped to make meaning of the impact on education these curricular standards will have in Texas (Rogers et al, 2005).

The document analysis focused on answering the seven questions Gee (2006) asks in relation to the seven building tasks.

1. Significance: How is language used to denote significance or insignificance of aspects of the curriculum? What words or phrases are used to indicate significance in the documents?

2. Activities: How does the language used encourage actions (Gee, 2006, p. 11)?

3. Identities: What identities of students and citizens are being constructed from the language used in the learning standards?

4. Relationships: What relationships between the government and the curriculum are the documents seeking to create?

5. Politics: “What perspective on social goods (public goods, available resources for all people) is this piece of language communicating”? For example, Lakshmanan (2011) suggests this implies “what is being communicated as to what is taken to be normal, right, and good, appropriate…high or low status” (p. 90).
6. Connections: How do the learning standards connect or disconnect students to the curriculum?

7. Signs and systems knowledge: How do these documents create “different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief” (Gee, 2006, p. 13)?

To answer each question, I read through the government curriculum several times, in order to become familiar with the content of the document. Next, I read the document carefully considering each question, and looking for language which would provide answers to the questions posed. For instance, as I read through the curriculum, considering the first question of significance, I looked for words that appeared to be important through repetition, placement in the text, or verb usage. Verbs were important in the analysis because they imply action necessary from students or teachers. After reading for answers to each of the seven building tasks, I made notes, tallied the number of times verbs were used, jotted down the frequency with which specific works and phrases appeared, and wrote down emerging themes or patterns. Eventually, I returned to my research questions, and using the notes, themes, and observations collected, began to form answers to each research question, from each of the seven building tasks analyses. Once I put together an outline of results, I began to review the data and develop emerging themes.

Data Analysis of Texas Government Standards

Summary of the Texas Government Standards

The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for government is divided into eight parts, or strands. At the beginning of the curriculum, there is a seven part introduction to the learning standards, which offers an explanation of the course. The purpose of the course introduction is to offer some rationale for the course, explain the assumption that students enter this course with
broad content knowledge in civics and other social studies content, and finally, states the knowledge a majority of board members believe students in Texas should know about government.

A final component of the introduction includes a section regarding “Celebrate Freedom Week” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44, (c) 7). According to the TEKS standards, this week is a celebration of significant events in U.S. history and government. Participation is required by federal laws and Texas Education Code. This particular section holds two interesting interpretations of United States history. The first, espouses the belief in the connection of the Declaration of Independence to the rich diversity of the United States. The curriculum further suggests that the ideas in the Declaration of Independence are the genesis for many significant changes in U.S. society. Two notable events this curriculum ties directly to the beliefs encapsulated in the Declaration are “the abolitionist movement, which led to the Emancipation Proclamation, and the women’s suffrage movement” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44, (c) 7 A). The TEKS standards imply that the events in United States history which lead to the Emancipation Proclamation and the ratification of the 19th Amendment were easily accomplished. This viewpoint implies that the goal of equality found in the Declaration was achieved as a result of these events. The text does not provide room for questioning the concept of equality found on paper, versus reality for formerly enslaved people after the Emancipation Proclamation. At the same time, the struggle for equality and suffrage for women is also not considered.

The second piece of this mandatory, weeklong celebration is the requirement that “students in Grades 3 – 12 must study and recite” the first lines of the Declaration of Independence (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44, 7 B). The required text ends with the
phrase “That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed.” It is noteworthy that the curriculum introduces the notion that a government has authority from the people. It is a theme which is reiterated throughout the learning standards. The last sentence of the introduction requires students to evaluate the success or failures of all governments in the United States at living up to the values found in early American government documents, such as the Declaration of Independence.

After the introduction, the curriculum breaks down the information students should attain during the course. There are eight strands which include: history, geography, economics, government, citizenship, science and technology, and social studies skills. Each strand has learning statements describing the information and skills students should be able to demonstrate. There are twenty two standards encompassed in the curriculum. These learning statements are also broken down into sub-strands. There are eighty one sub-strands. The main learning statements are numbered from one to twenty two, while each sub-strand is linked to the numbered learning statement as alphabetic character. The government course contains two history strands, two geography strands, two in economics, six strands categorized as government, four labeled as citizenship, one designated culture, two listed a science and technology, and three referred to as social studies skills.

Significance

Gee’s (2006) first building task is significance. Using Gee’s task, I analyzed the document for significant language in the curriculum. The Texas government TEKS standards are broken down into eight strands of knowledge. Each of these strands covers an important social studies concept. These strands include content in history, geography, economics, government, citizenship, science and technology, and social studies skills. In the introduction to the course,
the curriculum identifies the knowledge that assigns significance through the use of the words “including” and “such as” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44(b) 2 C). The curriculum explicitly states that “[s]tatements that contain the word ‘including’ reference content that must be mastered.” This language directs teachers and students to place importance on content standards where they read the word including (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44(b) 2 C). This emphasis on mastery directs teachers to ensure that students thoroughly understand the information contained in one of these learning standards, while other learning standards may be used to provide examples, or are overlooked in favor of emphasis on the standards in which mastery is expected. Texas Education Agency (2011) explains that TEKS Standards “containing the phrase ‘such as’ are…possible illustrative examples” (113.44 (b) 2 C ). This further delineates the importance of certain learning standards. Learning standards with “such as” are worth considering as a potential example; the implication is these ideas are worth considering, not required learning.

The analysis noted that the learning standards that contain the word “including” use language that is similar to that used by the Republican Party, as found on its summation of party beliefs, *Our Party*, (2013). The bias of the curriculum becomes evident through careful examination of the TEKS standards which contain the word “including.” These are the 12 learning standards which must be mastered as a result of a student’s participation in this course. The language present in these standards fits within the paradigm of American exceptionalism. Shafer (1999) writes, this ideology supports freedom of choice, the rights of the individual, and limiting the authority of the national government. For instance, the TEKS Standards which require mastery contain several words and phrases which demonstrate a preference for limiting the authority of government: “the law’s [sic] of nature and nature’s God, unalienable rights, the
rights of resistance to illegitimate government, and separation of powers” and responsibilities of the individual (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44. (c) 1 A, B, 7 D). Language choice reaffirming the importance of the individual is present in many of the government TEKS standards, but specifically those requiring mastery, use “individual rights…identify the individuals…voluntary individual participation…issues of liberty, rights, and responsibilities of individuals” to imply that government is a collective effort of many individuals making separate decisions about the way in which the government may act for a single person’s benefit (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 1 A, B, C, F, 7 D).

Equally important, is the more frequent appearance of right-wing historical figures in the TEKS standards, than left-wing figures. To illustrate, one of the 12 required TEKS Standards directs students “to identify significant individuals in the field of government and politics, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Ronald Regan” (Texas Education Agency, 113.44 (c) 1 F). All of these historical figures contributed to U.S. history, but only two, Andrew Jackson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, represent the American political left, while three represent conservative beliefs. Initially, this seems of little consequence. However, considering the amount of information contained in the government curriculum, even seemingly small discrepancies represent the desire of some Texas SBOE members to infuse the government curriculum with their political and ideological views. This illustration represents a consistent theme of including more conservative, right-wing beliefs and people than liberal, or left-wing ideas.

While the phrase “including” indicates required learning and tends to introduce more right-wing ideas, with some neoliberal and neoconservative influence evident (Apple, 2005;
Neoliberal beliefs view students as potential capital in an economy, and education is a way in which students are prepared for their future role in the United States economy. This neoliberal perspective appears throughout the government TEKS standards in the repeated emphasis of a free enterprise economic structure. Any ideas or issues supported by the American political left are found in the learning standards which contain the phrase “such as” (Grimes, 1962). This is significant because these learning standards are not part of the standards the board intended students to master. They are separated to signify a level of importance not afforded to the learning standards without the phrases of significance “including” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a)(b) 3 c). To illustrate, some of TEKS standards ask students to consider the impact of important court cases, “such as” Baker v. Carr, Hernandez v. Texas, and Grutter v. Bollinger. These potential examples, all preceded by “such as,” address concerns of equity, a notable portion of the ideology of the political left in the United States (Grimes, 1962). Similarly, government policies and interest groups that seek the expansion of voting rights, equity, and embrace the notion of a collective good in governance are present in the Texas government curriculum. However, these standards are also categorized as potential examples, and students are not required or expected to leave the course with a mastery of these policies and groups, namely, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, the League of Latin American Citizens, or the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 3 C, 16 A, 17 A, B). The distinction in word choice and the emphasis for what students must learn versus information that may be used as an example demonstrates a preference for conservative, and neoconservative values embedded within the curriculum.
Activities

A second building task that Gee (2006) highlights is activities. Specifically, what kinds of action does the language in the curriculum promote? The TEKS standards for government ask for only three non-cognitive activities in the curriculum. The introduction states that students should recite the preamble to the Declaration of Independence during the required “Celebrate Freedom” week. The second and third instances of action urged are found at the end of the curriculum in the learning standards labeled “social studies skills.” The standards suggest that students demonstrate the ability to transfer information as part of a presentation on a social studies topic, while also asking students to create a product to use in conjunction with their presentation (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 22 A, B). The other verbs at use in the curriculum direct students to perform cognitive activities as part of the consumption of new information. The introduction to the course refers to government as a culmination of knowledge students’ gain throughout their schooling, asserting that the expectation is that students are both reviewing and learning new information. The curriculum reinforces this notion as students are asked to understand, identify, explain, evaluate, examine, analyze, give examples, compare, and describe, repeatedly throughout the course. The government standards do not promote social interaction, group dialogue, or collaborative work. Instead the emphasis is on individual comprehension and individual tasks.

Identities

The examination of the identities constructed by the curriculum for students and citizens is the third building task emphasized by Gee (2006). The curriculum promotes the idea of a citizen whose identity is based upon an individual who supports a market capitalist economy, a republican form of government, and one who questions the authority of government – in line
with the ideological stance of neoliberalism (Apple, 2005;2006). The government TEKS standards suggest students “analyze historical and contemporary conflicts over the respective roles of national and state governments” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 9 C). In addition, the curriculum constructs an identity of a citizen who also continually questions the authority of the government and its place in his life, for the most part on a daily basis. It is necessary that students “understand the roles of limited government and the rule of law in the protection of individual rights” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 A). Finally, the citizen produced through the curriculum is one who professes a belief, either through moral support, or religious faith, in the importance of the Bible and biblical teaching in the history of the United States. Some of the moral teachings of the Bible are overtly reinforced through the emphasis of the role of Moses and the Ten Commandments as an influence on the United States Constitution (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 1 A) despite the fact that the influence of Christianity on the Founding Fathers is debated by historians and constitutional scholars (Flax, 2012, Sept. 25). This attention placed on the Bible and the Judeo-Christian faith aligns with neoconservative beliefs and the preference for the past, in which the notion of the United States as a protestant, Christian nation is supported.

Relationships

Another important topic for consideration is the relationship formed between the curriculum and government. Gee (2006) focus on relationships allows us to understand the way in which the curriculum attempts to create a connection between civic education and the government. The government TEKS standards emphasize the importance of republicanism and federalism, particularly the notion of shared powers. The text also highlights the limits on the government through checks and balances, the distinction of separate powers, and the rights of
individuals. Using the latter, the curriculum builds an underlying theme of questioning the authority of the national government. One way this is accomplished is through repeatedly stressing the limited authority of the national government. Directing students to “identify the freedoms and rights guaranteed by each amendment in the Bill of Rights” is an understated method of accentuating the boundaries of the national government’s ability to restrict individual liberties (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 C). Placing an emphasis on the rights of the individual and the protection of individual rights creates a relationship that implies distrust and almost an expectation that the federal government will betray the people, if the people are not diligently monitoring the government’s power.

The curriculum, then, is a tool useful for teaching students how to navigate the current system of government. Much of the language is used to describe the cognitive tasks students must complete as part of the curriculum. Students are encouraged to continually analyze the authority of the national government (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c)). At the same time, the course reinforces the idea of accepting the current system of government and history of the nation. To illustrate, the introduction to government states that a large portion of the “course is on the U.S. Constitution, its underlying principles and ideas, and the form of government it created” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 1). This relationship dictates, in a top down manner, the knowledge worth knowing is prearranged for teachers and students alike, from the combined effort of the Texas Education Agency and the SBOE, and the curriculum is a means for acceptance of the status quo. The emphasis used by the word “including” singling out those TEKS Standards which require student mastery distinctly reference the knowledge deemed most important by several SBOE members. The SBOE members whose personal political preferences
are toward right-wing, conservative beliefs remove education freedom from teachers and students in Texas.

*Politics*

Discovery of the ways in which societal norms in politics are cultivated by language serves as Gee’s (2006) fifth building task. The Texas government curriculum produces political norms through the use of mostly cognitive verbs in the learning standards. These verbs reflect a preference for critical thinking, where students are asked to evaluate and analyze information presented to them, and then make determinations regarding the validity or acceptability of the material. However, the cognitive verbs ask for no action or changes to the current government structure, but simply directs students to understand the existing system. The standards promote political norms that include patriotism, a free enterprise economic system, and an appreciation of basic democratic values, such as popular sovereignty, election of public officials, and elected officials that abide by the wishes of the people (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a)(b) 5). Almost absent, but most certainly underrepresented is the notion that citizenship and patriotism can be demonstrated through peaceful civil disobedience. Protests, important in American political history, are not referenced as an example of citizenship. Were those who participated in the Million Man March on Washington, not fully embracing their citizenship? Were the women who, for decades, actively sought the right to vote, not embracing their citizenship?

Moreover, the curriculum expresses belief in American exceptionalism and neoconservatism in the learning standards (Gutek, 2004; Apple, 2006). References in the TEKS standards to the foundation of the United States embrace the past as crucial in the continuity of the current government structure. This learning standard indicates a belief that is in line with a strict, constitutionalist perspective. A constitutionalist perspective is the interpretation of the
United States Constitution through a narrow interpretation of the document. Constitutionalist do not view many implied powers of government as allowable by the Constitution. The curriculum also demonstrates a belief in the importance of the Judeo-Christian faith, and that religious freedom is evident in the Constitution, while the notion of separation of church and state not (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 7 G). The influence of Christianity on the American government is referenced in the first learning standard. Students are directed to understand how the creation of American government was affected by biblical law. The learning standards specifically mention the impact of Moses and the Ten Commandments. At the same time, students are, in another standard, asked to “examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America and guaranteed its free exercise” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 7 G). Immediately after students are instructed to identify why Congress cannot establish a national religion or deny people the ability to freely exercise a religion, students are required to “compare and contrast this to the phrase “‘separation of church and state’” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 7 G). Without expressing it in the learning standards, the Texas government curriculum uses language to reinforce the notion that authentic government in the United States supports the right-wing conservative political ideas. The way in which the curriculum addresses the size of the government, the interpretation of the Constitution, and the role of the national government refers back to the origins of the United States. A majority of conservative beliefs in the United States embrace maintaining tradition and the status quo (Fishman, 2012; Gutek, 2004). This is precisely what the language in the TEKS standards attempt to form as a political norm in Texas (Gee, 2006).

The curriculum also addresses the issue of the size and scope of the national government through overtly and subtly suggesting the appropriate size of the national government should be
small and its authority, as granted by the Constitution, is limited. To illustrate, refer to TEKS standards 9 A – D, in which the emphasis of the main learning standard, and the four sub-standards, is the division of power in the national government. Students are asked to examine how this political structure is different from other forms of government, while at the same time, students are directed to “understand the limits on the national and state governments in the U.S. federal system of government” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 9 D). The preference for small national government is also evident in the portion of the curriculum that guides students to analyze judicial activism. This word choice is important to note because judicial activism is a term used to express displeasure at the role judges assume in their rulings and interpretations of the law. Instead of asking students to consider the ways in which court rulings have enforced, protected, or implemented civil rights and liberties, students are only required to study the role of the courts from the perspective that judges occasionally step beyond their sphere of influence to create policy, rather than interpret laws to ensure they agree with the Constitution.

Although the curriculum encourages students to identify opportunities for people to participate in government, it does not suggest students begin to participate, only that they learn of the opportunities for participation. Toward the middle of the curriculum, in the citizenship strands, it is explicitly stated that “the roles of limited government…in the protection of individual rights” are important for students to appreciate (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 A). The government TEKS standards imply, by contrasting the two ideas, that a large national government will abuse the rights of the individual, and therefore for the protection of individual freedoms, it is important to limit the size of the national government.
Finally, it is worth noting that all suggestions or illustrative examples for participation in government reflect activities that can be linked to the interests and concerns of the right, particularly the Republican Party. As an example, TEK 14 C, part of the citizenship strands, asks students to learn about the tasks associated with citizenship, “such as being well informed about civic affairs, serving in the military, voting, serving on a jury, observing the laws, paying taxes…” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c)). The relationship between the curriculum and the government develops a notion of politics which is representative of many Republican Party issues, embraces the status quo, and reinforces the idea that fundamentally, the United States government was created with concern for individuals and the desire for a small national government.

Connections with the Curriculum

As previously mentioned, there are numerous studies that find young adults are the least engaged in political activities (Andolina, et al., 2002; Khane, Chi and Middaugh, 2006; Khane and Sporte, 2008; Knight, Abowitz and Harnish, 2006). One way in which researchers can uncover more of the reasons behind this trend is to search for the connections or disconnections that are created between the government curriculum and students (Gee, 2006). The Texas government curriculum creates a top-down power structure, which likely disconnects students from the content. Dewey (1916) and Freire (2009) both discuss the need for all participants in education to choose the knowledge worth knowing, “the naming of the world” and allow for civic education to be a democratic practice. A required curriculum does not represent democratic education.

Equally significant in potentially disconnecting students from the curriculum are conservative and American exceptionalism philosophies evident throughout the curriculum.
Edwards, Wattenburg; Lineberry (2008) explain that the strongest influence in the political socialization of young adults is the family. In Texas, government is generally taught at the senior level. Students arrive in a class at age seventeen or eighteen, and by that time, whether they recognize it or not, have generally aligned their political beliefs. Students who do not identify with conservative and American Exceptionalist beliefs could easily disconnect from a curriculum filled with obvious or indirect preference for these ideological perspectives.

Furthermore, the TEKS standards directly mention the influence of the Judeo-Christian faith in the curriculum. Students are required to “identify major intellectual, philosophical, political, and religious traditions that informed the American founding, including Judeo-Christian (especially biblical law)” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 1 B). This is noteworthy due to the fact that only mentioning one major religion possibly alienates students other faiths or no faith at all. Nevertheless, this learning standard is one of the 12 which students are required to master throughout the course. This TEKS standards also highlights the conservative ideological preference in the Texas learning standards. Conservatism seeks to preserve tradition, maintain the status quo in institutions, and advocates the “transmitting of beliefs about knowledge and values from one generation…to the next” (Gutek, 2004, p. 198).

Similarly, the curriculum disconnects students through the insinuation that questioning the current government structure is discouraged. The curriculum implies that there is nothing further for students to contribute. Their civic duty is to embrace the current structure, which in many aspects, does not represent them. The TEKS standards do not allow or acknowledge the passion and interests of students, nor do the TEKS standards draw current events into the content. For example, despite the fact that this curriculum was written and adopted in 2009 – 2010, there is no mention of President Obama. The 2008 presidential election is an excellent
example of the ideas set forth in the Declaration of Independence and Constitution occurring in
the United States. This significant event in American political history demonstrated the
possibility for future inclusion of underrepresented groups in the United States. Further, there is
an assumption at the beginning of the curriculum that all students have an equal knowledge base
of social studies concepts. The introduction to the government standards explains, “Throughout
social studies in Kindergarten-Grade 12, students build a foundation in … economics;
government; citizenship; and social studies skills. The content…enables students to understand
the importance of patriotism, function in a free enterprise society, and appreciate the basic
democratic values of our state” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.(c) 5 and nation as
referenced in the Texas Education Code (TEC), §28.002(B). Students are expected to be able to
“focus…on the U.S. Constitution, its underlying principles and ideas…students identify the role
of government in the free enterprise system” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a) (b) 1).
Students without the prior knowledge will disconnect from the curriculum, as it will not be
relevant information. Dewey (1916) advocates allowing students to build from their common
experiences, so that learners form connections and assign meaning to their education.

The curriculum excludes references to people and groups who believe, act, and in some
instances, look differently than the majority of the board members. To illustrate, there are only
five references to minority groups or past areas of discrimination in the government TEKS
standards. The only references to the civil rights movement found in the government curriculum
gloss over the abuses against African Americans civil rights and liberties, in fact they are hardly
even referenced: “recall the conditions that produced the 14th Amendment and describe
subsequent efforts to selectively extend some of the Bill of Rights to the states…evaluate a U.S.
government policy or court decision…affected a particular racial…group, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 F, 17 A).

Lastly, the government course promotes patriotism and equity, and yet does not ask students to find examples of these concepts in current society. Students are not asked to connect the information they learn in class to society. This does not allow for students to connect with the curriculum in that what students learn in class is authentic information that relates to students experiences. The TEKS standards also do not ask students to consider how the government affects them. Furthermore, there is no acknowledgement of students’ changing perceptions of government. In its place is the expectation that students recognize the benefits of the current system, while also encouraging students to embrace a small national government as best (Andolina et al., 2002).

*Signs and Systems of Knowledge*

After careful review and consideration of the government curriculum, one of the most important ideas to consider is the attempt to influence what students know and believe built into the TEKS standards (Gee, 2006). The curriculum represents required information that students must study and demonstrate successful completion of in order to receive a diploma in Texas (Texas Education Agency, 2013). Due to the state of the curriculum as a mandate from above, the knowledge worth knowing—what is important to learn about government, is pre-determined for teachers and students.

As a result, the Texas SBOE distinguished the ideas that are most important using “including” as a signal to teachers and students that those learning standards require mastery. Government TEKS standards include many ideas fundamental to the political right. The board, comprised at the time of ten Republicans and five Democrats, interjected many implicit and
explicit values of limited government, rights of the individual, and the benefits of a free enterprise economic system. At the same time, the curriculum lacks any significant mention of diversity or the role of government in the expansion of civil rights or civil liberties for many underrepresented groups in the United States. To illustrate, there are other economic systems, such as a centrally planned economy, in which the state owns all resources and then, theoretically, equitably distributes resources to the population of the state. This potentially prevents, or corrects for the extreme gap between that exists in capitalist, free market, capitalist, unregulated market economies.

The phrase “such as” reflects another way in which the board attempts to exert influence over student beliefs. The learning standards which contain this phrase propose that the information after “such as” could be considered important in the context as a meaningful example. There are few examples of diversity, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, these learning standards are described as “possible illustrative examples,” infer that the information is not substantial enough to require mastery (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a) (b) 3). The most significant repercussion is that conservative and American exceptionalism values are emphasized (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). What, then, of the other learning standards? If those TEKS standards contain neither required information nor potential teaching examples, then what value is associated with those parts of the curriculum? Is that information worth considering?

Discussion

The Texas civics curriculum demonstrates the “educationist,” business model philosophy Smith (1992) that emerged as a result of a shift toward right-wing conservative views in the 1980s. Apple (2007) argues that the current curriculum available in many public schools
nationwide reflects the belief that school reform must include high pressure, high stakes testing to demonstrate improved student achievement. This influence manifests in the form of the Texas curriculum standards or Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS standards) for government. The state assigned curriculum includes only four specific content areas with an emphasis on citizenship. The piece of the curriculum that directs students to learn of citizenship specifically emphasizes actions taken by individuals. Within this mandated curriculum there is one standard that hints at democratic practices being communal. However, the learning standards continue to emphasize the individual interpreting other perspectives. The Texas Education Agency’s Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (2011) for high school government highlight the individual in the learning standards:

   Citizenship. The student understands the importance of the expression of different points of view in a democratic society. The student is expected to:

   (A) analyze different points of view of political parties and interest groups on important and contemporary issues;

   (B) analyze the importance of free speech and press in a democratic society; and

   (C) express and defend a point of view on an issue of contemporary interest in the United States (113.44, 17 A,B; C).

This language demonstrates a preference for the individual, market based structure which currently dominates so much of education. Apple’s (2005) concern is that existing educational programs reinforce the neoliberal perspective of students as human capital. Students require training as their education in an effort to efficiently produce and reproduce the existing structure. This learning standard mentions nothing in regards to students forming political opinions nor ideas, only that students must understand what is already in place, accept the prevailing thought, and defend the current paradigm.
The Texas learning standards require the anti-thesis of democratic education. The standards are a top-down mandate that forces teachers to teach specific content without allowing students a voice, and offers teachers minimal choice in the decision regarding instruction of required curriculum standards.

National Government with Limited Authority

Democratic and citizenship educations are an important component of instruction used globally to reinforce support for existing structures of government (Edwards, Lineberry; and Wattenberg, 2008; Wiseman, 2003: Andolina et al, 2002). The Texas SBOE sought to influence the development of young Texans education in the public school system through the curriculum revisions to the government course. The government curriculum reveals subtle framing of content toward a decidedly conservative bias, and a preference toward American exceptionalism. In the government curriculum, the notion of democratic education is not democratic at all. Democratic education seeks to have teachers and students equally responsible for the content learned, and are an educational structure that responds to the needs of the learners (Dewey, 1916, 1938; Freire, 2009; Lave and Wenger; 2001; Levinson, 1999). By contrast the Texas construct of democratic education is characterized by learning about the positive aspects of United States history, paying particular attention the Framers or Founding Fathers, and the ways in which a Judeo-Christian world view supposedly influenced the Constitutional government created. Furthermore, citizenship education is supported by learning of the existing structure of government, how it operates, which people or institutions are responsible for various tasks, and the main purpose of the national government: protecting the rights of individuals.

Persons included in the curriculum mostly represent a republican government, with great support for a small national government of limited authority. The learning standards in the Texas
government course promote limiting the power of the national the government in the best interest of the people. The implication is that that the larger the national government becomes, the more abuses of the people are possible. It is only through controlling the authority of the national government that the safety of the population can be assured (Texas Education Agency, 113.18, 19, 41; 118.4).

Moreover, the Texas construct of citizenship education also questions the authority of the national government. Students are directed to celebrate patriotism, good citizenship, and at the same time, the curriculum undermines the national government’s authority by implying that a limited national government is a critical component of the existing structure. Citizens, by definition of the Texas government curriculum, are individuals who express their patriotic pride, embrace Judeo-Christian values, and support a literal interpretation of the Constitution.

Finally, and perhaps the most disturbing, is the way in which the history of America and American government are portrayed in such an optimistic perspective. Historical references are limited to the Founding Fathers, a few, selected, prominent U.S. presidents, and the philosophical arguments that influenced the framing of the Constitution. While some may argue that a historical study of past discrimination is not necessarily required, I think this to be a foolish argument. Even the history courses gloss over the civil rights movement, and past discrimination of minority groups. There are numerous reasons why this is important, most notably that if the curriculum does not acknowledge discrimination from the past, it most certainly ignores areas of inequity in the present. As Apple (2011) notes “education is deeply connected to the social context in which it exists…education [is] as a set of institutions that are not necessarily neutral, as implicated in the reproduction and contestation of relations of dominance and subordination” (p. 25).
The public education system already reinforces social structures which overlook certain socioeconomic, ethnic, and racial demographics in society. The Texas government TEKS standards given relatively insignificant coverage in to past discrimination not only reflects the conservative ideological desire to maintain tradition, but also represents the glossed over version of the past embraced by American exceptionalism (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). There is a notable absence of contributions from Americans who support the role of the national government to provide or enforce equity through the courts, presidential authority, or government programs. In instances where the curriculum addresses these people or programs, students are always asked to consider the merits and problems associated with the expansion of the national government’s authority. The emphasis remains on the negative effects of a larger national government (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113. 12, 13, 14, 15 18, 19, 41).

The focus of the curriculum on the benefits of a limited national government creates one area in which there is a balance of power among teachers and students. Initially, there is balance in authority between students and teachers as a result of the curricular origins. The state of Texas requires school districts in throughout the state to use the curriculum approved from the Texas Education Agency and SBOE. This places teachers and students equally without power as to the choice and variety of the curriculum. Both groups are subject to the assigned curriculum. Both teachers and students are told the knowledge worth knowing from the state. Neither group has the opportunity to contribute to Freire’s “naming of the world” (2009).

Unfortunately, the balance of power between teachers and students is far less prominent than the imbalance of power. Teachers retain more power in the classroom for several reasons. The teacher has the ability to determine the way in which the information is delivered to students. The teacher also has the discretion to select the primary and secondary sources used by
students. The capacity to control the presentation and selection of information puts students at a
direct disadvantage, especially if they are unaware or unfamiliar with how to locate opposing
viewpoints in order to have a better understanding of complex issues. Instructors may also
control the flow of information to students with the control of selecting current issues,
determining the products students must create, and the authority to evaluate student products.
Essentially, students are subject to their teacher’s interpretation of the curriculum. Khane and
Sporte (2008) report this influence of the teacher is significant because the way in which civics
courses are taught encourages or discourses student participation in the political process.

At the same time, teachers are also at a distinct disadvantage with respect to the power to
choose or design the curriculum. Dewey’s (1916) argument in support of democratic education
requires that all stakeholders be participants in the creation of educational experiences. The
mandated curriculum standards teachers must cover reflects a mistrust of the teaching profession.
Although teachers are licensed professionals, they are not given the freedom to facilitate the
learning of their students. Dewey specifically argues against a top-down power structure in
democratic education. Instead, he argues that democratic education must be a collective and
inclusive experience.

CDA allows for a richer understanding of the ways in which language impacts and
controls social situations. The language used by the conservative SBOE members in the Texas
government curriculum generates an imbalance of power among students. The government
curriculum contains words and phrases which slant the curriculum toward conservative beliefs,
such as the benefit of a limited national government. The conservative bias in the learning
standards creates a set of political norms which describe what is good and right about society
(Lakshaman, 2011). These documents establish a limited national government as a political
norm. Students who believe the national government should administer programs, ensure equity among groups, and maintain a general concern for the collective good, are left with a sense of isolation or rejection. When students do not view civics courses as relevant to their lives, they are much more likely to disengage from the content, and possibly from political participation (Khane and Sporte, 2008; Khane, Chi, and Middaugh, 2006; Andolina et al, 2002; Wiseman, 2003).

*Importance of Individual Rights over the Collective Good*

A second theme that emerged as a result of the CDA of the government TEKS standards is the importance of the individual in democratic and citizenship education. While the notion of democratic education conceptualized by many educational theorists urges a cooperative education system where teachers and students work together, (Dewey, 1916 and 1938; Bandura, 1997) the Texas SBOE developed a curriculum which repeatedly places emphasis on the importance of the individual.

Citizenship education in Texas views political participation as a personal decision. As the Texas government curriculum instructs, “student[s] understand the importance of voluntary individual political participation” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 15). The highly personal decision to participate is important to individuals who are concerned with protecting their rights. The government curriculum references individuals or individual rights twelve times, but only once asks students to “evaluate whether and/or when the obligation of citizenship requires that personal desires and interests be subordinated to the public good” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 14 B). Texas citizenship education promotes individual rights and the protection of those rights as supreme over the state of the collective good, which directly contrasts other notions of citizenship education. Pratte (2001) explains that citizenship education requires more than just teaching students about the structure and function of government. This
form of education ought to include “the capacities or tendencies to think of the public interests or common good rather than self-interest” (p. 304).

Citizens, as depicted by the Texas government curriculum are students who are keen to embrace the rights of individuals in American political society, and work to continue a system of government which prioritizes individual rights and freedoms. Included in the notion of citizenship education is the “impact of individuals…the importance of voluntary participation in a constitutional republic” as a means to protect the rights of individuals (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 9 (a) 1). Citizenship in Texas also includes the requirement that students learn to distinguish “between personal and civic responsibilities” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 14). Students must decide if and when there are any circumstances in which personal interests should secondary to the collective good. Also, the curriculum describes citizenship as those individuals who are “well informed about civic affairs, [service] in the military, voting, serving on a jury, observing laws, and paying taxes” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 14 C).

Citizenship education in Texas excludes any real, in-depth consideration of past discrimination in citizenship. The government curriculum only alludes to slavery in the U.S. by asking students to “recall conditions that produced the 14th Amendment” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 F). The U.S. civil rights movement, a period of great historical significance in the 20th century, allowed for more of the ideas expressed in founding documents to be fulfilled as the U.S. government enacted policies which began to provide more equality of access and opportunity for minorities in the U.S. However, once more, this area of historical and political significance is all but excluded from the curriculum. The single reference to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is located in a “culture” learning standard of the government curriculum. The
curriculum only asks students to “evaluate a U.S. government policy or court decision that has affected a particular racial, ethnic, or religious group, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 17A).

Further, the language found in the government learning standards creates an imbalance of power among students. The notion of individual rights is pervasive throughout the curriculum. This theme is so prominent that it is clearly framed as the correct way to view the role of the national government-as protector of individual liberties. Students that support the concept of the supremacy of individual rights over the collective good, embrace the inferred superiority from the curriculum. Students with a political view which embraces the idea of citizenship education’s purpose to teach about the responsibility of other to the collective good, note the second class status assigned to them, particularly with the minimal attention given to events and policies that included more Americans in the political process.

*Emphasis on a Free Market Structure*

A final theme that emerged as a result of the CDA of the government is the overwhelming emphasis of a capitalist market structure as best. The idea of American exceptionalism esteems this economic system as the method in which the most people benefit. Capitalist economies are also touted as the economic structure with the most opportunity for prosperity. The support for American exceptionalism is apparent in the government standards. The emphasis on a free market structure adds to the Texas construct of democratic education. Students and teachers do not have the freedom to discuss and choose the economic systems they might like to study. Teachers and students also do not have the ability to categorize the economic system of the U.S.
Citizenship education in Texas promotes that citizens not only accept, but embrace an unregulated, free market structure. The government TEKS standards contain only references to the benefits of a free enterprise. There are no instances in which the quality of or disadvantages of the economic system are questioned. The notion of citizenship education in Texas singularly promotes the beneficial components of capitalist, free market economies. What is left out of the government curriculum is that the division of wealth and inequity in economic opportunity is a much wider gap now, than at the start of the 20th century (Slater, 2001). This relates directly back to the second theme, the importance of the individual. A capitalist, free market structure is characterized by the freedom of individuals to act in their own best interest. The idea, as noted by Adam Smith, is that when businesses or individuals act in their own self-interest, scarce economic resources are used most efficiently, and the work of the “invisible hand” benefits the marketplace as a whole (Smith, 1776). The language in the government TEKS standards reveals little, if any support for opposition to an unregulated free market economy. Students or teachers with views differing from the dominant discourse in the government curriculum find themselves on the fringe of the Texas version of democratic and citizenship education.

Finally, the questions of power and imbalances of power between teachers and students, and among students once again depend upon the outlook of each individual in Texas classrooms. Students and teachers, who advocate the superiority of a capitalist, free market economic system, align with the political and social norms accepted by the majority of the SBOE in the curriculum. This assigns them a place of importance in the Texas societal hierarchy. These are the people included and accepted in democratic and citizenship education. At the same time, the students and teachers who do not support a capitalist economic system are relegated to second class citizenry.
The findings in the Texas government learning standards are not dissimilar to the findings in another unpublished CDA I conducted of the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting minutes from the spring of 2010. It was in the early months of 2010 that the Texas SBOE discussed, amended, and ratified revisions to all Texas social studies courses from grades K – 12. Throughout the analysis conducted over the meeting minutes, the same preference for conservative, right-wing ideology, along with the notion of American exceptionalism was uncovered. Additionally, the neoliberal and neoconservative stances evident in the Texas government standards were also apparent in the meeting minutes. Texas has proved to be an excellent example of the merging of the neoliberal and neoconservative beliefs in education.

Conclusion

The government TEKS standards are currently in use by public schools throughout the state of Texas, as required by the Texas Education Agency, and Texas Education Code. Additionally, these learning standards hold significance in the instruction of students throughout Texas because state law requires that the standards adopted by the SBOE are required to be used in classrooms statewide. Further, Texas is a major consumer of textbooks, and textbook companies often use learning standards from larger states, such as Texas. The textbooks in other states occasionally reflect learning standards that are similar to learning standards found in Texas. As such, the Texas government learning standards have the potential to impact a large student population throughout the United States (Collins, 2012). At the same time, the numerous responses to the curriculum’s passage indicate there are problems of equity and power structures within the curriculum.

One of my primary concerns involved comprehending what democratic and citizenship education represent in Texas. The government curriculum demonstrated a minimal commitment
to including all students in democratic and citizenship education. The basic structure, function, history, and philosophical influences of the U.S. government are in place. However, I uncovered considerable preference toward conservatism and American exceptionalism (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). If the notion of democratic and citizenship education created by educational theorists such as Dewey (1916) Freire (2009), Bandura (1993), Levinson (1999; 2005), Levinson and Brantmeire (2006), and Apple (2005, 2006; 2011) is to be realized, then the curriculum must be more inclusive of teacher and student opinions. It is imperative that the curriculum be revised to include, at the very minimum, a much more balanced approach to different creeds in U.S. politics. Fairclough (1993) would argue that it is not possible to produce a bias free curriculum, but policymakers, teachers, students, and the people of Texas can fashion a more inclusive curriculum that acknowledges the complete past of the U.S, the accomplishments made toward fulfilling the ideas espoused in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and most importantly, the areas in which we still lack equity.

Issues of exclusion must be addressed in order for a system of education to be democratic. A democracy embraces the notion of majority rule with minority rights, which not possible with the exclusion of certain groups from participation (Edwards, Wattenberg; Lineberry, 2008). This issue is of particular importance in Texas, where the state mandated curriculum leaves noticeable contributions of important historical figures out of the curriculum. Key figures and events in American history, such as Gloria Steinem, the Stonewall Riot, and many contributions of Tejanos at the Alamo, are absent from Texas standards (Muñoz and Noboa, 2012; Stutz, 2010, Jan 9). In addition, the roles of men and women are conservative, traditional, and fail to acknowledge many significant contributions of women in government and civic education (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a) (b) (c)). The refusal to recognize the
contributions of many Americans to society prevents the curriculum from fulfilling its intended purpose. A democracy in which the majority tries to minimize or eliminate important contributions from the minority is not a democracy at all. Democratic education in the United States, particularly in Texas, is not possible until the curriculum is inclusive and not only acknowledges, but celebrates the contributions of all members of society equally.
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TEXAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SOCIAL STUDIES STANDARDS REVISION: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The Texas State Board of Education’s (SBOE) spring 2010 revisions of the social studies learning standards have produced ripple effects across the state, and as some critics worry, these effects could impact social studies curricula in other states (Collins, 2012). The SBOE is in charge of curricular content in Texas public schools and the adoption of new textbooks. Every ten years the board reconsiders and revises the curriculum in all subjects offered in public schools (Texas Education Agency, 2012). In 2010, the board, led by a conservative, right-wing bloc, produced learning standards for the more than five million students in Texas that move the curriculum to an obvious bias toward neoliberal and neoconservative ideology (Stutz, 2010, Jan 16). The changes have brought Texas critical national attention regarding the new learning standards. Journalists, educators, and interest groups, such as the Texas Freedom Network, League of United Latin American Citizens, the NAACP, and others, fear the potential impact in classrooms around the nation. Texas is one of the largest consumers of textbooks, and as Henry (2010, Aug 22) reports, many publishers keep content from their largest clients in textbooks marketed to other states.

Rather than allowing all participants to communally “name the world,” the Texas SBOE determined the social studies curriculum. Students are required to learn from the pre-determined learning stands (Freire, 2009). The current program of study in Texas does not allow for “communities of practice” which not only allow students to develop as a whole person, but also aid students in understanding the importance of the common good (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Instead, the social studies courses in Texas reflect an interesting conglomeration of neoliberal and neoconservative beliefs (Apple, 2006).
Theoretical Framework

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a research methodology which provides the necessary tools to explore and address issues of power and inequality in the modern world (Rogers et al., 2011). According to Rogers a discourse study which uses a critical approach must that “an inquiry into meaning making is always also an exploration into power” (p. 1). Rogers further explains that Fairclough’s directive is to always consider where and how power can be exerted over people (2011). Blommaert and Blucaen (2000) list several key topics that are the focus of many CDA studies. These topics include the following: politics, ideology, racism, economics, advertisements, media, gender, intuitional language, education, and literacy. CDA examines issues of power, inequality, and other issues of rights and freedoms. Moreover, CDA functions to reveal meaning behind text and is a way for scholars to reveal meaning and power struggles from text (Bryman, 2008; McGregor, 2004).

Importantly, CDA uncovers some of the many language uses which allow the researcher the opportunity to expose inequality and the ways in which inequality is reproduced through language. Van Dijk (1993b) emphasizes that use of critical discourse analysis, CDA, as not only a research method to expose inequality, but a way in which the status quo is challenged. Fairclough (2008) argues “one ‘good thing’ about language…use[d] to generalize about large numbers of separate events…while discounting differences irrelevant for the purposes at hand” (p. 813). Farelly (2010) advocates the use of CDA because “CDA can focus analysis on the order of discourse” (p. 103). CDA is a useful methodological tool as a means to illustrate the order of thought, connection of ideas, and thus can help uncover the power structures evident in the writing (p. 103). CDA highlights these complicated relationships that exist among language
and power structures. Social interactions are instrumental to understanding how all of this control fits together as pieces of a complicated and constantly evolving social fabric.

The purpose of the study is to describe the ideological perspectives inserted into Texas social studies courses of a) democratic education, b) citizenship education, and c) the balance of power between teacher and students and among students, as evidenced by the Texas State Board of Education meeting minutes.

Democratic Education

Several key educational theorists, such as John Dewey, Paolo Freire, Bradley Levinson, and Michael Apple, have created a framework for democratic education in the classroom. Dewey (2009) explains that education is a function of social values and culture. In order for students to learn they must relate their life experiences to the content. Students must take ownership of their learning and process the acquired knowledge for education to be successful. The significance of learning cannot be dictated by another person.

Equally important to democratic education is Albert Bandura’s social learning theory. Bandura (1993) believes “Effective intellectual functioning requires much more than simply understanding the factual knowledge and reason operations for given activities” (p. 117). In this manner, Bandura advocates the need for social learning and imitation as a method for students to develop into democratic practitioners. Bandura notes that self-influences allow learners to construct meaning and recognize their ability to influence change. For example, Bandura (1993) writes regarding the importance of efficacy: “those who have a high sense of efficacy visualize success scenarios that provide positive guides and supports for performance” (p. 118).

Democratic education requires more than social experiences. Students must also be provided the opportunity to reflect upon and interpret social experiences. Bandura’s further
contributes to the development of democratic education through the study of the cognitive process and concepts that intrinsically motivate student participation in education and society at large. Bandura’s (1997) social learning theory represents a person’s belief in their ability to perform. The implications of Bandura’s social learning theory for democratic education are critical. The roots of democratic education include the expectation that decision-making and participation is open and voluntary. Bandura et al. (1996) makes the assertion that students’ desire to participate in their education and in life, due to their sense of self-efficacy. However, self-efficacy requires nurturing through appropriate instructional methods that support students’ personal beliefs and interests.

Democratic education not only requires social interaction, a study of self-efficacy, but also entails freedom from dictated power structures. Paulo Freire advocates democratic education through the “pedagogy of the oppressed” (2009, p. 149). Freire suggests that education emerges from all participants communicating and engaging in critical thinking about existing power structures. Without reflective practice, there can be no genuine communication, and in the absence of such, critical thinking is also absent. As a result, Freire’s definition of “true education” does not occur (p. 150). Democratic education must emerge as a “thematic investigation…a process of search, of knowledge, and thus of creation, it requires the investigators to discover the interpretation of problems, in the linking of meaningful themes” (2009, p. 151).

Finally, a recent theorist, Michael Apple, proposes that democratic education is markedly different from the current state of education in the United States. Apple (2005) writes the control of modern education in the United States belongs to neoliberals. Neoliberals assert that virtually everything in modern life is part of a market structure. This view stretches to the public school
system where students are human capital and are trained as efficient workers in a larger economy. Thus, the function of education for neoliberals is to produce skilled workers for the market place. Apple argues that “consumer choice” is the foundation for democracy to neoliberals (p. 204).

Democratic education must be a critical education that does not allow for a small group of representatives to make all the decisions. Instead, Apple proposes an education system that is constantly evolving as all participants collectively define education. A democracy encompasses the voices of all, and will lay the necessary foundation for democratic education. The implications for this system of education indicate the necessity of constant scrutiny in the development of schooling. Apple (2007) contends that education should not be linked in any way to the economy or market, but must direct its focus to critical pedagogies that acknowledge the difficulties of individuals to be heard in an oppressive educational climate. Likewise, schools that may be considered democratic have certain qualities, such as a curriculum with time and space for students and teachers to address “authentic problems and issues” (p. 36.). In Apple’s model, students, teachers, and administrators all have a voice in the decision-making process. The curriculum allows and responds to student selections for the curriculum. Apple (2007) suggests that in a democratic school there must be projects, lessons, and space for critical-thinking and intellectual development. Overall, democratic education is inclusive, responsive to teachers and students, developed through collegial conversation among all participants, and practice of democracy (Dewey, 1916, 1938; Freire, 2009; Apple, 2005, 2006).

Democratic and Citizenship Education Associated

Democratic education is closely associated with the concept of citizenship education. Several educational theorists highlight the need for social learning through a variety of
instructional activities that encourage critical thinking, student choice, and permits students to construct meaning from educational experiences (Apple, 2007; Dewey 1916; Freire, 2009; and Bandura, 1993). Democratic education accentuates the need for students to use social learning experiences and opportunities in the development of the whole person (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

At the same time, citizenship education focuses on the task of maturing students into citizens who are willing to participate in the current government because they associate civics with problem solving, inquiring into social issues, and attaching personal, meaningful, experiences to the government (Dewey, 1938; Schunk, 2008; and Hyslop-Margison and Strobel, 2008).

Citizenship Education

Recognized for his contributions to the development of citizenship education, Dewey (1916) suggests that citizenship education requires development and recognition of socialization within democratic education. A society “which is mobile, which is full of channels for the distribution of a change occurring anywhere, must see to it that its members are educated to personal initiative and adaptability” (Dewey, 1916, p. 102). A society where students are only taught about the structure, form and function of their governing system through textbooks and standardized testing cannot hope to reach the objectives of Dewey’s vision, particularly not in an educational system where “children can barely read or write” (Bernstein, 2008, p. 22).

Dewey (1916) creates the idea of citizenship education as one in which students pursue independent objectives in their course of study (Hyslop-Margison and Strobel, 2008). If, as Dewey (1916) argues, humanity consists of the series of social interactions between and among humans, then social interaction in education is of paramount importance.
Bandura’s social learning theory is an important aspect to effective design of civics education. Motivation is a critical aspect of developing citizens because learners are interested in modeling behaviors that are significant to them personally. In the United States, numerous researchers report consistently that young Americans are the least likely to participate in the political process. Kahne and Sporte (2008) report that most young adults in the United States find government and politics irrelevant to their lives because of the way in which these courses are taught. The number of experiential curricular opportunities, forms of lesson delivery, and teaching methods prove to be significant links between students’ civic learning opportunities and future civic participation. Research indicates that social learning settings, such as, “engagement in service learning, and the use of simulations on the one hand, and students’ civic commitment and capacities on the other” have a direct correlation to high school students’ civic awareness (p. 742). A statistically noteworthy link exists between “civic learning opportunities and students’ commitment to civic participation” (p. 751). The implications of Bandura’s social learning theory for the creation of citizens are critical.

Moreover, there are numerous scholars and research projects that support a movement away from standardized testing towards more participatory citizenship education. Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006) seek to understand the concept of citizenship. They contend that citizenship is not a natural idea and question the emergence of citizenship. Further, Abowitz and Harnish (2006) inspect the cultural conversations that help form current meanings of citizenship. Levinson (2005) suggests that cross cultural comparisons could provide new insight into the field of civic and democratic education. In his article “Citizenship, Identity, and Democracy: Engaging the Political in the Anthropology of Education” (2005) Levinson identifies his primary concern, which is bringing democracy to education in the United States.
He refers to an ethnographic study he conducted in a secondary school in Mexico. Levinson expected to find that the school peer structure reinforced societal inequities from outside of the school; instead, he found a school culture that promoted equality within the school. This shared experience of equality within the school affected the social structure for these students outside of school as well. Levinson (2005) explains that this particular project “developed ‘citizenship’ in [his] own work” (p. 331).

Levinson (1999) asserts that educational discourse and its benefits have been largely ignored as a critical component of engaging in participatory citizenship within schools. He suggests that scholars do not pay enough attention to the social structures or power hierarchies that exist within schools. Levinson states that to dismiss these important elements of schools in the United States and abroad loses an important concept critical to understanding identity formation in youth.

Kahne, Chi; and Middaugh (2006) suggest that one reason for the apathetic showing among young adults is the way in which civics education is taught in the U.S. Young adults who are taught about active participation in government and politics through the use of lecture and worksheets cannot reasonably be expected to then go into society and become active in the political process. Participatory citizenship opportunities within the curriculum indicate a more likely success rate in the desire to develop participatory citizens. The purpose of the study is to describe the power structures created within the Texas social studies course of a) democratic education, b) citizenship education, and c) the balance of power between teacher and students and among students, as evidenced by the Texas SBOE meeting minutes.
Background

Concern for Students

Collins (2012) writes that the battle for Texas curriculum standards has been ongoing since the 1960s when Mel and Norma Gabler first brought up a long list of curricular objections they had to the State Board of Education. The Gabler’s interest in the content of textbooks first arose over their objections to material in their children’s school books (Martin, 2007). At the start of the mid-twentieth century curriculum controversy, Norma Gabler testified at many textbook hearings and suggested many conservative ideas needed to be more predominantly emphasized in the curriculum. She advocated moral, a free enterprise economic system, and wanted to undermine the theory of evolution. The Gablers expanded their influence beyond textbook hearings when they began to publish a list that noted every factual inaccuracy found in Texas history books (Martin, 2007).

Once outside groups, such as the Gablers, became interested in influencing the content of Texas public school textbooks, the SBOE’s revision process for learning standards in Texas curriculum became more politicized. Notably, the most recent curriculum revisions were highly political, and featured the conservative bloc’s success at passing amendments that advance a conservative viewpoint. The concern for students is that the ideological stance evident in the curriculum will be spread across the nation. Collins (2012) explains that other scholars have found disturbing numbers as to the extent of the curricular influence from Texas:

Keith Erekson, director of the Center for History Teaching and Learning at the University of Texas El Paso…says he’s seen estimates that the proportion of social studies textbooks sold containing the basic Texas-approved narrative range from about half to 80 percent. (p. 111)

The curriculum standards that will most likely affect a significant number of students across the United States, did not just anger moderates or liberals. As a concession to make the
standards appear less biased, textbook companies often use generic language to soften the influence of one side over another. The result, according to Collins (2012) is textbooks which are general, vague, and largely uninspiring. One of the most distressing consequences of the textbook battles is that “‘current history textbooks … have lost their compelling narrative’” (Shorto, 2012, p. 116). One of the most distressing consequences of the fight for ideological control of the social studies curriculum is that textbook companies, in order to make a profit, and satisfy all clients, have reduced important subjects for the development of the common good, such as history, to boring and mundane subjects. Students are not interested in learning about vague historical events with which they cannot find a true connection. Instead, students suffer through these courses and miss out on the opportunity for understanding the messy, complicated, and contrary tapestry that is the history of the United States.

Scholars and educators are not only concerned about the Texas standards because of the influence Texas has in the textbook industry, but there are concerns for Texas students about the education which they receive under these new learning standards. Ruth’s (2010, May 28) concern for students includes the probability that the new standards will produce students that “are more delusional about their country’s history than North Korea’s Kim Jong Il” (p. 15A). While Ruth’s position may seem a bit extreme, other scholars, such as Keith Erekson (2012) suggest the most important concern for students was overlooked through the media circus that surrounded the board’s meetings. Erkeson’s (2012) primary concern for students in Texas is that “[s]kills necessary for success in college and careers were ignored” (p. 4). Further, Erekson (2012) points out other problems created for students by the new standards. One such problem is the size of the new curriculum standards increased significantly. If teachers had any difficulty
finding adequate time to cover all the material listed in the previous standards, that problem has not been alleviated in the new curriculum.

Other sources of concern for students include the manner in which ideology has been inserted into the curriculum. Erekson (2012) explains the increase in the length of the curriculum is directly tied to the insertion of various ideological preferences. The resulting standards are unbalanced in the portrayal of social studies content in Texas. For example, “the free enterprise system” has only benefits, while the Great Society, Title IX, and affirmative action have only “unintended consequences” (p. 12). Throughout the learning standards there exists a “complete lack of context” for specific people, ethnic groups, and events (p. 13). One example of this lack of context is that the learning standards teach civil disobedience as a means to fight against taxes, or other unwelcome aspects of government control, while civil disobedience is not taught as a means to method in which students could demonstrate their disapproval of war or social issue policies (p. 13). These inconsistencies within the curriculum do not provide Texas students with a sound social studies education that is reflective of the diverse, multidimensional, twenty-first century world in which they live. Instead, it presents an ideologically slanted, hodgepodge version of social studies education, which will most likely confuse students once they enter a different educational environment.

Muñoz and Noboa (2012) wrote about their experience while working on the eleventh grade U.S. History course. These revisions highlighted a much larger problem with the social studies curriculum The ideology, vision, and desire to include “people like me,” prevented the committee from creating a set of learning standards that would most benefit students throughout the state of Texas (p. 53). As Muñoz and Noboa (2012) assert:

This emphasis on “who’s missing” prevented us from building a set of standards that reflected the college readiness goals of interdisciplinarity, diversity of experience, global
interdependence, cognitive development, and effective communication. Instead of focusing on the broad goals of social studies, our committee conversations disintegrated into battles over promoting one kind of history over another rather than creating a set of standards that could allow multiple perspectives or a multifaceted history to emerge (p. 54).

The experience of Muñoz and Noboa reflect the most critical area of concern throughout the entire process of the social studies course revisions: the political attitudes and self-interest driven agendas of the adults engaged in the process did not work to promote the best interest of Texas students.

**Responses to the New Curriculum**

Responses to the actions of the SBOE were almost immediate. Criticism emerged before the board took the first vote to approve or reject the curriculum. *The New York Times* published several letters from around the nation criticizing the Texas standards in early March. Most authors’ primary concern was the intentional ideological stance that emanated from the proposed standards. These standards reveal that Texas public education is undemocratic and exclusive (*Wall Street Journal*, 2010, March 7). Not only were the standards garnering attention from across the United States, but criticisms of the standards emerged internationally as well. Whittell (2010, March 12) of *The Times*, in London, wrote that the Board intended to eliminate or reduce the role of FDR and New Deal Legislation in American history; “watershed achievements for Democratic governance in the 20th century” (p. 43). The *Weekend Australian* (2010, March 13) also reported the controversy in Texas education, and included that Texas was one of only two states to opt out of nationally proposed standards in order to maintain control of content taught in Texas schools. Frank (2010, March 18) wrote that the “liberal world has watched in horror as Texas State Board of Education’s dominant conservative faction “ rewrote the history of the
United States, and other social studies courses to reflect a partisan, ideological version of history (p. 19).

Not all of the criticism of the social studies curriculum emerged from the left, nor were all of the critiques accurate. The Texas Education Agency (2010, March 10) responded to claims made by a program on the Fox News network that Texas history books were removing important historical figures, such as Abraham Lincoln and George Washington. Moreover, the Texas Education Agency replied to other erroneous claims made by Fox News that included that the SBOE was selecting textbooks, when actually, the board was in the process of revising curriculum standards. Also, Fox charged that the state removed Independence and Veteran’s Days from the curriculum, and indicated that Christmas was no longer included in a list of important religious days for world religions. Stutz (2010, March 11) reported that Steve Doocy, of the Fox News Channel’s Fox and Friends, attempted to fix the reporting errors by suggesting the incorrect information reported on Fox and Friends were only suggestions, not statements of fact. The network did not clear up any of the other misinformation regarding the curriculum standards. Additionally, the show once again referred to the process in Texas as textbook adoption as opposed to curriculum revision. This controversy highlights the nature of response the proposed and then later, adopted standards received from all sides. The SBOE made very few happy and the resulting notoriety negatively impacted the credibility of Texas public education among liberals and conservatives.

Responses from those who agreed with inserting more conservative ideology into the curriculum and supported the curricular changes were limited and hard to locate. Josh Levs, CNN correspondent on Saturday Morning News, indicated that the news network believed it was important to present both sides in a balanced manner, and yet viewer response was “about 90%
of [the response]… is slamming the decision in Texas. So if you're someone out there who agrees with it, we certainly want to hear from you, too. We want to hear all sides of this” (para 125).

One of the most vocal supporters of the new curriculum standards was Jonathan Saenz, of the Liberty Institute, a conservative think tank, who also appeared on CNN’s *Saturday Morning News*. Saenz (CNN, 2010, May 22) embraced the curriculum changes in Texas as increasing diversity within the course of study. For instance, the new standards included Wallace Jefferson, along with Sonia Sotomayor. Both figures represent diversity in ethnic and gender groups for the state and federal court systems. Saenz further argued that the Texas curriculum was widely supported by many teachers, university professors, and citizens in Texas. Saenz did not offer the names or specific references to any educators or citizens that supported the newly adopted standards. The controversy, according to Saenz, evolved because many who criticized the standards had not read them. If the critics had read the standards, then Saenz believed much of the controversy surrounding the curriculum would evaporate.

**Research Questions**

Through the process of CDA scholars can not only highlight these interwoven relationships, but also attempt to fight these structures for the cause of change and social justice (Poole, 2010, p. 137-8). Finally, Rogers et al.. (2005) support the use of CDA due to the perception among scholars who utilize CDA that other discourse analyses do not stretch as far. Non-critical discourse analyses merely describe and interpret language, whereas CDA scholars begin the goal of identifying areas of inequality and social injustice, created through the written word. Once identified, the purpose behind CDA is to “transfor[m] conditions of inequality” (p. 369). This distinction separates CDA from non-critical discourse analysis. The research questions that will guide the study are as follows:
1. How do the government TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE promote democratic education, as defined by educational theorists?
   a. How do the Texas SBOE meeting minutes define democracy?
   b. Who and what is included in democratic education according to the Texas SBOE meeting minutes?
   c. Who and what is excluded?
   d. How does the Texas SBOE align with educational theorists’ definition of democratic education?

2. How do the government Texas SBOE meeting minutes promote citizenship education, as defined by educational theorists?
   a. How does the Texas SBOE define citizenship?
   b. Who and what is included in citizenship education by the Texas SBOE?
   c. Who and what is excluded?
   d. How do the Texas SBOE align with educational theorists’ definition of citizenship education?

3. How does the language of the Texas SBOE meeting minutes encourage a balance or imbalance of power amongst students and teachers?

4. How does the language of the Texas SBOE meeting minutes encourage a balance or imbalance of power among students?

Method

The State Board of Education meeting minutes were analyzed using Gee’s (2011) seven building tasks. It is important to note the distinction of the use of CDA. James Gee (2006) identifies his seven building tasks as critical discourse analysis because he argues that his work
focuses on the “language-in-use” (Gee, 2011, p. 28). Typically, an analysis using Gee’s framework would not be identified as CDA. However, the Texas social studies TEKS standards are not simply “language-in-use” (Gee, 2011, p. 28). As Rogers (2011) points out Gee’s description of the discourse with a small d, “refers to the grammar of what is said or written,” while the distinction of a capital D discourse references the ways in which language is used to make meaning and create political power structures. All of the standards and words used to convey “the knowledge worth knowing” represents more than specific grammar. As Fairclough asserts CDA should look for the use of power “‘power to’, ‘power over’”, and “‘the power under’” (Rogers, 2011, p. 4). Required learning standards which are required for use in all public school classrooms throughout the state of Texas, certainly fit within this paradigm of power, as described by Rogers. Gee’s building tasks included significance, activities or practices, identities, relationships, politics, connections, and sign, systems and knowledge. Gee (2011) suggests that “language-in-use is a tool, not just for saying and doing things…to build things in the world” (p. 30).

The analysis was limited to the Texas State Board of Education meeting minutes from January, March, and May meetings (Lakshmanan, 2011). Typically, the board met anywhere from two to five days. Some of the meetings were noted as “General Committee of the Full Board” while others were listed as “Committee on Instruction.” The Texas SBOE meeting minutes used in this analysis are a secondary source. I was not present during the meetings to record the information myself. I used the Texas Education Agency’s website to access the public meeting minutes. To critically analyze the board meeting minutes, first I looked at the significance of the language used. Language use created “social practice” (Rogers et al., 2005, p. 369). Social practice, according to CDA scholars, was the process by which language produced
social interactions among people. Rogers et al. (2005) pointed out that “language cannot be treated as neutral, because it is caught up in political, social, racial, economic, religious, and cultural formations” (p. 369). Therefore, all of Gee’s (2006) building tasks and the language in the texts represented the process of building the power structures for the political and educational discourse in Texas. As I read through the texts of the documents, I looked for the “social practice” created by the texts and the relationships that build an identity of democratic participants in education (p. 369). This process helped to make meaning of the impact on education these curricular standards (Rogers et al. 2005).

The document analysis focused on answering the seven questions Gee (2006) asks in relation to the seven building tasks.

1. Significance: How was language used to denote significance or insignificance of aspects of the curriculum? What words or phrases were used to indicate significance in the documents?

2. Activities: How did the language used encourage actions (Gee, 2006, p. 11)?

3. Identities: What identities of students and citizens were constructed from the language used in the learning standards?

4. Relationships: What relationships between the government and the curriculum did the documents create?

5. Politics: “What perspective on social goods (public goods, available resources for all people) was this piece of language communicating”? For example, Lakshmanan (2011) suggests this implied “what was being communicated as to what was taken to be normal, right, and good, appropriate… high or low status” (p. 90).
6. Connections: How did the learning standards connect or disconnect students to the curriculum?

7. Signs and systems knowledge: How did these documents create “different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief” (Gee, 2006, p. 13)?

The application of these questions allowed me to determine the “dominant Discourse” in the board meetings and government learning standards regarding the aims of the government to promote democracy and freedom of choice for all. The study provided insight into the idea of democratic education and revealed the board’s agenda as far as freedom of choice for all (Lakshmanan, 2011, p. 73). Additionally, my analysis helped disclose the relationships between students and the curriculum and an imbalance of power for those who do not share the same ideological stance evident in the meeting minutes. Activities encouraged by the SBOE through the production of the current learning standards attempt to motivate those with similar ideological views to become active in government and to dissuade others who do not share the same views from action. Furthermore, the results emerged from a thematic analysis of the Texas SBOE meeting minutes (Bryman, 2008). Thematic analysis is a qualitative research methodology which generates themes from the documents analyzed (Bryman, 2008). The TX SBOE meeting minutes were analyzed using a thematic approach, and not coding or counting the frequency in which specific words appeared in the text.

Research in Context

The state of Texas administers its public education system using the Texas Education Agency. TEA is responsible for the administration and enforcement of laws passed by the state legislature concerning education in Texas (Texas Education Agency, 2013a). The authority of the TEA is shared by the Commissioner of Education, who serves a four year term, concurrently
to the governor’s term, and the SBOE. The SBOE is comprised of fifteen members. Each board member is elected from a single member district. Terms are four years long, and terms are staggered so that not every place on the board is up for re-election at the same time (Texas Education Code, Chapter 7, Section 7.104 b, 2011). Texas Education Code designates that the SBOE is responsible for “[adopting] rules to carry out the curriculum required or authorized under Section 28.002 (Texas Education Code, Chapter 7, Section 7.102 11, 2011).

The responsibility of selecting and approving the curriculum for public schools in Texas gives the SBOE a great deal of power and influence in regards to what school children in Texas are accountable for learning. The extent of this influence became apparent during the 2009 – 2010 work of the SBOE in which the newly revised curriculum standards for science and social studies courses were up for approval by the SBOE (Stutz, 2010, Jan 9; Stutz 2010, May 17). Texas Education Code states that “the Texas State Board of Education, with the direct participation of educators, parents, business and industry representatives, and employers shall by rule identify the essential knowledge and skills of each subject of the required curriculum that all student should be able to demonstrate” (Texas Education Code, Subtitle F. Curriculum, Programs, and Services, Chapter 28, Section 28.002 c, 2011). The SBOE chose to implement this statute through a process which allowed educators, and other committee members, to revise the TEKS standards. Then, the expert reviewers appointed by the board would review the TEKS standards, the committees would be allowed the opportunity for revision, and then the board would read the TEKS standards, and propose amendments, as members believed were necessary (Texas Education Agency, 2011).

To initiate this process, SBOE members were allowed to select an individual to participate on each of the committees formed to write the initial draft of each social studies
Texas Education Agency (2011). Not all board members elected to nominate a representative to sit on any of the TEKS standards review committees, including members Rick Agosto, Lawrence Allen Jr., Cynthia Dunbar, Terri Leo, and Ken Mercer (Texas Education Agency, 2009c and 2009d). Once the TEKS standards review Committees were in place, the Texas Education Agency, directed by the SBOE, gave the committees the process in which they would review the existing TEKS standards in order to create new learning standards. The committees had to complete the first draft of the new TEKS standards by July of 2009 for the board’s consideration. One of the requirements for the committees to submit their subject’s proposed TEKS standards was that the committee had to unanimously agree on the content (Texas Education Agency, 2011).

In the July 17, 2009, SBOE meeting, the board voted to remind the TEKS standards review committees of their initial instructions and timeline for completion of the TEKS standards. Specifically, the board indicated that the committees should pay attention to the comments from the expert reviewers and the board’s recommendations as well (Texas Education Agency, 2009a). The board also made a motion to invite committee members to the September board meeting. In September, the board discussed two issues raised by Ms. Knight, from her attendance at one of the social studies TEKS standards review committee meetings. It was suggested that the board consider creating criteria for nominating expert reviewers. This issue was discussed at the September board meeting, alongside a discussion regarding the role of the TEKS standards review Committees (Texas Education Agency, 2009b).
In October of 2009, according to the Texas Education Agency (2011) the TEKS standards review Committees submitted their recommendations for revisions to the social studies TEKS standards. On January 13, 2010, the SBOE held another full board meeting in which a public hearing was held, allowing the board to hear public testimony regarding the proposed changes to the social studies TEKS standards. On the following day, the board conducted the first reading and filing authorization of the proposed revisions to the social studies curriculum. During this meeting the board amended numerous social studies TEKS standards, and ultimately decided that the board would continue to consider the social studies TEKS standards on Friday, January 15, 2010, during the next full meeting of the board (Texas Education Agency, 2010b). After additional amendments to the proposed social studies TEKS standards were made, the board adjourned, unanimously deciding to put off the first filing and authorization of the recommended social studies TEKS standards until the March meeting (Texas Education Agency, 2010c).

During the March 10, 2010 (Texas Education Agency, 2010c) the board heard public testimony from numerous groups and individuals regarding the proposed revisions to the social studies TEKS standards, and again, began proposing amendments to the standards provided. The meeting adjourned with the board still considering amendments to social studies TEKS standards. It would take the board three full days of meetings to finally complete proposing amendments to the social studies TEKS standards, and on Friday, March 12, 2010, the board voted to accept the first filing and authorization of the social studies TEKS standards, with the amendments approved by the board (Texas Education Agency, 2010d).

At the May 19, 2010 meeting, the board spent several hours listening to public testimony from multiple individuals and groups, interested in the proposed social studies TEKS standards.
After all of the interested persons were given the opportunity to speak, the board adjourned (Texas Education Agency, 2010e). On the following day, the board approved the proposed social studies TEKS standards for the second filing and final authorization. Motions were made with additional amendments, and votes were taken until the board adjourned at 12:07am (Texas Education Agency, 2010f). Ultimately, the proposed social studies TEKS standards were adopted by the SBOE, after additional motions to amend various portions of the TEKS standards, were made and voted into being (Texas Education Agency, 2010g).

Background of the Texas State Board of Education

According to the Texas Education Agency (2013b) the SBOE is comprised of 15 elected members from single member districts. Together, with the Commissioner of Education, the board administers public education in Texas, using Texas Education Code as the directive. Each of the members of the SBOE brought their unique perspective to the revision process for the proposed social studies TEKS standards. Don McLeroy, a Republican, was first elected to the SBOE in 1998. McLeroy represented District 9 during his tenure on the board. McLeroy was appointed by Governor Rick Perry in 2007 to be the chairman, which is a two year appointment. He was reappointed in 2009, but did not get two/thirds vote required from the Texas Senate to retain his position (Governor Rick Perry, 2009, Feb 6 and Alexander, 2009 April 30). By the time the SBOE was ready to take up the proposed social studies TEKS standards, McLeroy had already earned a reputation for supporting controversial beliefs during the science TEKS standards revision process. McLeroy wrote (2009) in an editorial to the Austin American-Statesman:

The controversy exists because evolutionists, led by academia's far-left, along with the secular elite opinion-makers, have decreed that questioning of evolution is not allowed, that it is only an attempt to inject religion or creationism into the classroom. Even Texas' 20-year-old requirement to teach the scientific strengths and weaknesses of hypotheses
and theories has come under attack. Words that were uncontroversial and perfectly acceptable for nearly two decades are now considered "code words" for intelligent design and are deemed unscientific. The elite fear that "unscientific" weaknesses of evolution will be inserted into the textbooks, leaving students without a good science education and unprepared for the future, compelling businesses to shun "illiterate" Texas.

McLeroy’s staunch support of the proposed changes to the science curriculum cost him the chairmanship of the SBOE, as his re-appointment as chairman was not supported by other Republicans. Republican state senator, Mike Jackson, of LaPorte, indicated that “the confirmation…[was] dead in the water…there [were] too many other important issues to take up on the floor to waste time on a doomed confirmation” (Alexander, 2009).

In addition to McLeroy, the other members of the Texas SBOE included: Rene Nuñez, of District 1. Nuñez, Mary Helen Berlanga, of District 2, Rick Agosto of District 3, Rick Allen of District 4, Ken Mercer of District 5, Terri Leo of District 6, David Bradley of District 7, Barbara Cargill of District 8, Cynthia Dunbar of District 10, Patricia Hardy of District 11, Geraldine Miller of District 12, Mavis Knight of District 13, Gail Lowe of District 14, and Bob Craig of District 15. As table 1.1 shows, each of these board members had political ties and ideological perspectives that put them as supportive of the proposed revisions, moderately supportive, or very much opposed to the suggested changes in the Texas social studies learning standards.

Table 1.1 reflects those board members at the top who demonstrated the most opposition to the proposed social studies revisions. Expanding upon the backgrounds of the fifteen member Texas State Board of Education provides an excellent framework with which to understand the dynamics of a this group. The SBOE has a significant amount of authority and influence in shaping the TEKS standards for students across the state of Texas.
Table 1.1

Background Information on the Texas State Board of Education Members, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Members</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party Affiliation</th>
<th>Prior Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mavis Knight</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Community activist, service in PTA organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Allen Jr.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Houston ISD director of special services; administrator; classroom teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Helen Berlenga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Agosto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>President/CEO sales and marketing firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Nunez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Owns consulting firm; holds real estate license</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hardy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Former social studies teacher, social studies coordinator, and part-time instructional specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bradley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Small business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Mercer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Project manager – technology industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Craig</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbra Cargill</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Former classroom teacher in North Texas; began a science camp with a local Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Leo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Dallas and Garland ISDs – classroom teacher and administrative intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Lowe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Miller</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Reading specialist and real estate broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Dunbar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney; Assistant Professor of Law, Liberty University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don McElroy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Dentist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


History of Social Studies TEKS Standards Revisions

The social studies curriculum revision by the Texas SBOE occurred in the spring of 2010, after the board revised the science curriculum in 2009. In the process of adopting new science learning standards the board garnered national, and in some instances international, attention due to the controversial nature of the debate. *The Revisionaries* (2012) a documentary highlighting this process, reveals the board’s conservative bias in the central focus of their debate regarding science standards: Should the strengths and weaknesses of evolution be taught? Some scholars and board members saw the language requiring the strengths and weaknesses of evolution as a means to get creationism taught through subtly questioning the validity of
evolution as a scientific theory. Although, as Stutz (2010, Jan 9) points out, the conservative member bloc, led by Don McLeroy, former chairman of the Board, ultimately failed to get the weaknesses of evolution in as part of the mandated curriculum, “the group supported compromise language that students study the "sufficiency or insufficiency” of evidence on common ancestry and natural selection of species -- two key tenets of Charles Darwin's work” (para 18). This illustrates the notion of democratic education that Freire (2009) spent significant time and effort fighting against. Instead of allowing all participants to help create curricular standards with accepted language supported by many, the board fought the opinion of most scholars to implement their ideological preference. This argument thrust the Texas SBOE into the national spotlight, drawing attention to the conservative voting bloc’s attempts to ideologically impact the curriculum.

Before the SBOE began the many hours of discussion regarding the new social studies learning standards, the social studies curriculum was already drawing national attention. Cook (2009, Sept 13) was mortified at the obvious conservative bias of the learning standards with seemingly little to no liberal perspective evident. As the discussion of the new social studies learning standards began in the spring of 2010, many scholars and historians closely followed the revisions or attempted revisions the board brought to social studies. Although most of the attention given to the social studies revisions surrounds the history curriculum, the impact of the ideologically divided board is apparent (Stutz, 2010, Jan 16.; Collins, 2012; Erekeson, 2012; Muñoz and Noboa, 2012).
**Table 1.2**

*Timeline of the Social Studies TEKS Standards Revisions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2009 –</td>
<td>TX SBOE discusses social studies revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– January 2010</td>
<td>First presentation of social studies curriculum. Vote is delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010 –</td>
<td>Social studies curriculum considered a second time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– April 2010</td>
<td>Proposed social studies TEKS standards are posted on the <em>Texas Register</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2010 –</td>
<td>Final adoption of the revised social studies TEKS standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Fall 2011</td>
<td>Social studies curriculum goes into effect in Texas classrooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In early January, 2010, before the State Board of Education’s first meeting to discuss the suggested revisions, several chapters of the League of United Latin American Citizens met across Texas in an effort to bring attention to the contributions of Hispanics in Texas (Cavazos, 2010, Jan 8). LULAC representatives argue that Texas, and the board, have misrepresented the history of Texas with the decision to ignore influences of the Spanish, Mexican, *Tejanos* on Texas culture and history. LULAC gained the support of one member, Mary Helen Berlengua, and were optimistic that the curricular revisions would provide an expansion of important Spanish, Mexican, and *Tejano* individuals.

Another significant factor driving the SBOE during the social studies revisions were primary elections in which several Republican members, including McLeroy, faced hotly contested re-election bids (Stutz, 2010, Jan 9). McLeroy did not view this as a mandate from
voters about the work of the board over the previous three years, instead he believed “there's always controversy in education in Texas, but it has intensified the last two years because we've been winning,” (Stutz, 2010, Jan 9, para 8). Not all board members accepted the controversy as a positive thing for public education in Texas. Board member Mavis Knight, a Democrat from the Dallas area, argued that the conservative bloc frequently voted together on issues as a means to get their way in regards to curricular changes that she believed, as Stutz (2010, Jan 9) notes, imposed conservative ideology.

Stutz (2010, Jan 16) explains the conservative shift present in the proposed history curriculum presents a view of history for students in which the Conservative Revolution of the 1980s and 90s is a central focus, while other contributions from minorities, such as the League of United Latin American Citizens, LULAC, are left out of the curriculum. Stutz (2010, Jan 15) pointed out that “Hispanic leaders had noted earlier that only 16 of the 162 historical figures listed in the curriculum were Hispanic” (para 15). Further, the board added Phyllis Schafly and other very conservative figures to the learning standards. There were numerous amendments to the history curriculum, so many that the debate on the learning standards was delayed until the March meeting. Some of the suggested changes include excluding significant minority historical figures, such as Ceasar Chavez and Thurgood Marshall, while adding Christmas back into the curriculum as well as including many conservative groups, The Heritage Foundation, for example, without adding any liberal counterparts.

When the board met once again in March, one of the most vocal members of the conservative bloc, McElroy, lost his bid for primary re-election bid to a moderate Republican (Wall Street Journal, March 4). Despite the small victory for those opposed to many of the board’s conservative leanings, this did not negate the influence of McElroy (Stutz, March 4).
Shortly after his loss, McElroy “promised several more amendments when the 15-member board gets back to work on social studies [in mid-March]” (Stutz, 2010, March 4, paragraph 4). The newly elected members were not sworn in as board members until January 2011. McElroy offered numerous amendments to the recommended history curriculum following his primary election defeat, and still found success in reshaping the history curriculum for millions of students in Texas (Stutz, 2010, March 13).

McElroy’s efforts to ideologically sway the social studies learning standards were not without challenge, both from scholars and fellow board members alike. Despite the objections of several SBOE members, some college professors, and issue groups, such as the Texas Freedom Network, the conservative bloc of the SBOE successfully amended learning standards for Texas students that have a distinct rightward bent (Revisionaries, 2012, Stutz, 2010, March 13). One of the many rejected proposals included requiring students to learn the names of key Tejanos who fought and died in the battle of the Alamo (Stutz, 2010, March 13). Knight suggested that the social conservatives often pushed through clearly ideological amendments into the learning standards by voting together, and occasionally, by securing support from other board members. As Stutz (2010, Jan 9) reports, Knight believes the work of the board has hurt students across Texas.

Ultimately, the final adoption of the social studies curriculum was put off until the May 2010 meeting of the SBOE. This was the second time the board voted to delay a final vote on the social studies standards. In January, the board could not work through a lengthy list of amendments, and decided it best to finish the curriculum changes at their March meeting (Stutz, 2010). After a contentious meeting in March, a preliminary vote approved the new curriculum standards, with final approval for the social studies curriculum expected at the May meeting.
(Birnbaum, 2010). By mid-May, conflict over the new standards had not subsided, but increased. Backlash toward some of the more conservative members of the board was evident. The author of many right-leaning amendments, McLeroy, lost a hotly contested primary election in March. Stutz (2010) reported that another social conservative, Cynthia Dunbar, did not seek re-election, and her chosen candidate lost the primary election. It appeared as though the social conservative’s control might be slipping by January of 2011. However, the conservative SBOE members were intent upon leaving a legacy for the students of Texas.

It would not be without opposition, as the last day of testimony, May 18, 2010, had almost “200 witnesses [signed] up to testify. Scores have already given their opinions in [twenty two] hours of public testimony, and more than [twenty thousand] people have weighed in with e-mails to the board” (Stutz, 2010). Rod Paige, former Secretary of Education under George W. Bush, and former Houston ISD Superintendent, was the second person to testify, asking the board to consider a delay in adopting the new social studies curriculum (Stutz, 2010,). Paige urged the board to consider that “‘[w]hat students are taught should not be the handmaiden of political ideology…I am asking you to not let political ideology and beliefs guide your decisions. We in Texas have a history of this’” (para 7). Paige did not want the SBOE to continue the Texas tradition of allowing ideology to outweigh the influence of sound scholarly work, most notably begun by the Gablers (Martin, 2007). Other notable witnesses before the board included National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) president Benjamin Jealous, State Representative Helen Giddings, and Trey Martinez Fischer, of the Mexican American Legislative Caucus. A common theme among their testimony was that of the “300 changes to the original standards developed by curriculum review teams of teachers and academics” there was
little examination of the changes, and the proposed curriculum set to be adopted was not inclusive of important minority contributions to American culture (Stutz, 2010).

Despite the protests of many, the SBOE approved the new curriculum standards for social studies on Friday, May 22, 2010, with many of the controversial amendments added into the curriculum (Knickerbocker, 2010). The new learning standards will not be revised or reconsidered for ten years.

Data Analysis

Significance

Throughout the pages of the SBOE meeting minutes from the spring of 2010, many significant areas of language used are evident. However, the January 13, March 10, and May 19 minutes demonstrate great significance in language choice. The pages of public testimony provided evidence of the many groups concerned about the content in the revised social studies curricula. The meeting notes list the name and affiliation of each speaker. It is unwise to speculate regarding the content of each person’s testimony, but the organizations and affiliations of the volunteers who freely came to participate in state government provide insight. Table 1.2 lists, in order of appearance, the organizations represented over the meetings in which the board heard public testimony that spring. In the table, a number in parenthesis indicates the number of people who testified from that organization. The people who came to speak were a diverse group. The diversity of speakers, in comparison to a government curriculum lacking diversity, suggests a very strong response to the proposed curricular revisions. All of the people who attended any of these public hearings, most likely desired to influence the revision of the social studies courses for the state of Texas. Many speakers urged the board to reconsider or alter some of the learning standards from one meeting to the next. For example, former Secretary of
Education, Rob Paige, asked the board to reconsider the learning standards before taking a final vote (Michael, 2010). Ben Jealous, the president of the NAACP also spoke at the public hearings. He mentioned concern for the quality of the social studies standards, along with State Representative Helen Giddings, and Representative Trey Fischer Martinez, president of the Mexican American Legislative Caucus (Stutz, 2010).

Another area in which language is significant includes the end of each of the three public hearings. At the conclusion of the January 13 meeting, Mary Helen Berlanga moved to extend public testimony for an additional day. The motion failed, and the chairperson Gail Lowe concluded the meeting. In the March meeting, the language intensifies the significance of the board’s seeming disregard for the concerns of the people that testified. Once the public testimony finished, the board immediately moved into amending social studies TEKS standards. The actions of the board were consistent in the May meetings. The board dutifully heard public testimony late into the evening, but as they reconvened the next day, further amendments of the social studies TEKS standards continued. This is of particular significance, because the phrase “holding elected officials to their word” is actually in the government TEKS standards, yet the board appeared to ignore all of the individuals who came to express concern or interest in the revision of the social studies curricula (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.44 (b) (c) ).

Finally, a telling example of the significance given to specific language emerges from a disagreement between board members as revisions were being proposed to the U.S. history since 1877 course. TEK 113.41 (c) 24 B initially read:

Describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature, such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, hip hop, and country and western music on American society. (2010)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations Represented at SBOE Public Hearings for Proposed Social Studies Curricula</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiral in the Texas Navy (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Community Relations, Greater Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Freedom Network (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamette University Center for Religion, Law, and Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity University Chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurlock Law Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Dallas Area (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State Historical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State Representative (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. P. Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans United for Separation of Church and State (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Rock High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American G.I. Forum (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Education Reform (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary of Disabled Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union, Texas (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Council for Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovejoy ISD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This TEK was first revised in January when McElroy proposed an amendment to strike hip hop from the standard, and replace it with country and western music. The motion was unsuccessful. This did not deter McElroy. He once again proposed, during the March 11 meeting, that hip hop be removed from this standard. Initially, the motion passed, but not all board members were
satisfied with this change. There were four additional changes to this TEK suggested during the March 12 meeting, with two of the four amendments passing. Agosto and Nuñez suggested that the Beat Generation be removed from the standard, while also adding hip hop back in to the TEK. Knight and Hardy voiced their support for the Beat Generation remaining in the TEK. Ultimately, the Beat Generation remained in the TEK, while hip hop was removed. If the intent of the learning standard is for students to learn about important cultural events in art, music, and literature, why would hip hop be excluded? It gives the impression that the culture associated with the hip hop movement was not part of the vision for social studies content held by many on the board. It is yet another example of the exclusion of diversity from the curriculum.

Activities

It is also important to study the activities encouraged by the curriculum (Gee, 2006). It is interesting to note that the language and actions of the board, as documented in the text, do not promote any activities. The verbs used throughout the TEKS standards require cognitive processes, i.e. thinking, analyzing, evaluating, but do not ask students to perform any physical activities. In the government standards, only the generic social studies skills TEKS standards ask students to create a product, but the document is vague concerning the product students must create.

Furthermore, the actions from the board indicate that they will allow citizens to come and testify during the public hearings, but only for a certain length of time. Once enough people voiced their opinions, (as determined by the board chairperson) the board was satisfied. For example, at the January 13 meeting, numerous people came to speak at the public hearing, but at the end of the day, no more additional public testimony was allowed. Overtly, the board’s actions were consistent with the social studies curricula’s directive that students learn about the role of
public officials to be responsive to the people; however, there are no actions within the meeting minute texts to demonstrate that the board addressed the concerns of the people. It seems with each month’s increasing number of people who signed up to testify at the public hearings the board potentially ignored many of the concerns voiced by the people.

**Identities**

The meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE spring of 2010 carefully construct the identity of a citizen for students from attendance and participation in social studies courses. As an illustration, at the January 14 meeting, the first two motions and amendments added the term “good citizens” to several elementary grade level social studies courses. This is important to note because it is a subjective, value-added term. In whose opinion is the basis for what makes a “good citizen”? As I read the minutes from the board’s 2010 spring meetings, it is obvious a majority of the board worked to insert beliefs which they determined make “good citizens.”

The board builds upon the identity of a citizen as an individual who values a strict interpretation of the Constitution, limited authority in the national government, and a preference for a free enterprise economic system. Evidence of the identity under construction is found throughout the meeting minutes. For instance, in several amendments the board voted to add patriotism as an illustrative example of good citizen contributions (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.11 (b) 15 B). Additionally, the board passed three general amendments at the March 10 meeting which removed the phrase “democratic republic” and replaced it with “constitutional republic” in all social studies courses from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Further building upon their Republican Party preferences, the second general amendment replaced “democratic societies” in favor of “societies with representative governments” in all social studies courses. Lastly, the third blanket amendment required that any social studies course that used the term
“free enterprise” mandated an additional sentence be added. The new sentence required that “students identify the role of free enterprise within the parameter of this course and understand that this system may also be referenced as capitalist or free market system” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113. (a)(b)(c)).

The identity of a citizen, constructed from the proposed social studies TEKS standards, includes those who desire a limited national government. A proposed world history TEK illustrates this preference with an example of human rights abuses in other systems of government – the potential consequence of a large national government. Students are asked to “review the record of human rights, such as abuses of human rights abuses of unlimited governments, such as the oppression of Christians in the Sudan” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.18 (b) 11 D). The preference for American exceptionalism is noted in the specific reference to Christians (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). Continuing with the emphasis on the individual in the construction of citizenship identity, the curriculum asks students to “explain the role of significant individuals in the development of self-government,” at the same time, the identity of a citizen also questions the limits of the national government by requiring students to “explain constitutional issues raised by federal government policy changes during times of significant events, including World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, the 1960s, and 9/11” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.20 (b) 20 A; 113.41 (c) 19 B). The Texas SBOE construct of a citizen is found in social studies courses in elementary, middle, and high schools. Repeatedly, a citizen is identified as one who desires a limited national government, values the importance of the individual, and lastly, supports a free enterprise economic system. In the U.S. history since 1877 course, the curriculum requires that students “understand how the free enterprise system drives technological innovation and its application in the marketplace” to
underscore the belief that this particular economic system is the best available (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.41 (c) 27 C).

**Relationships**

The relationship between the government and curriculum built is influenced by the dominant board members, who manipulated the curriculum to reinforce the dominant party’s political beliefs in the public school curriculum. Ten of the fifteen board members, in the spring of 2010, were elected to their positions as Republican Party members. Although some of the board members were more extreme in their political beliefs, the language found throughout the Texas SBOE meeting minutes consistently reveals a preference for Republican Party language and associated values. Several board members voted to approve general, blanket amendments which used language associated with Republican beliefs, such as “societies with representative governments” in place of “democratic societies” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113. (a)(b)(c)).

Moreover, the majority on the board voted in favor of language which emphasized the role of a Judeo-Christian heritage in United States government, along with subtle attempts to subvert the accepted practice of separation of church and state. The Constitution does not actually contain this language. A few board members highlighted this point with a proposed amendment to the government curriculum. Students were asked to “examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America…and compare and contrast this to the phrase ‘separation of church and state’”(Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.44 (c) 7 G). Mr. Craig proposed this particular amendment, but other board members supported the effort. This amendment insinuated that the intent of the Founding Fathers was to embrace Christian principles in government. American exceptionalism further supports the belief that the United States was meant to be governed by Christian principles because many people, including Alexis
de Tocqueville, believed that God favored the people of the United States (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). At the same time, the amendment subtly created doubt as to the constitutionality of the applied principle of separation of church and state in landmark Supreme Court cases. This notion aligns with the stated Republican Party belief that the role of the judicial system in the United States is simply to interpret the law and the Constitution, not create policy from the bench (Republican Party, 2013).

**Politics**

Gee’s (2006) fifth building task, politics, seeks to understand how discourse established political norms for society. Lakshmanan (2011) adds that this task seeks to understand “what is being communicated as to what is taken to be normal, right, and good, appropriate…high or low status” (p. 90). In context, what are the norms for an elevated status in politics in Texas? In this analysis the political norms that emerge are of citizens who hold moral, social, and economic values consistent with the principles espoused by the Republican Party. To illustrate, one U.S. history since 1877(2010) TEK reflects this inclination: “describe the causes and key organizations and individuals of the conservative resurgence of the 1980s and 1990s, including Phyllis Schlafly, the Contract with America, the Heritage Foundation, the Moral Majority, and the National Rifle Association; and” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.41 (c) 10 E).

Additionally, citizens in Texas are portrayed to be individuals who regularly vote, pay taxes, follow the rules, demonstrate patriotism, and embrace a vision of government that desires to uphold the Constitution with a limited national government. This represents both conservatism and American exceptionalism. Conservative ideology would embrace the notion of a strict, or traditional interpretation of the Constitution, while American exceptionalism supports the belief that “Americans created the best of all possible systems – a republican form of government,
democratic institutions, and a free-enterprise economy” (Gutek, 2004, p. 165; de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). For instance, at the last meetings in May, Ms. Dunbar proposed a blanket amendment that would insert a statement into the introduction of all social studies courses that reads: “[s]tudents understand that a constitutional republic is a representative form of government whose representatives derive their authority from the consent of the governed, serve for an established tenure, and are sworn to uphold the Constitution” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113. (a) (b) (c)).

Also noteworthy, is the repeated emphasis on a free enterprise economic system in almost all of the social studies courses. Even the title of the economics course, Economics With Emphasis on the Free Enterprise System and its Benefits, reflects the Republican Party (2013) statement of support that a free enterprise economic system leads to prosperity. Furthermore, board members motioned to add the benefits of a free enterprise economy in numerous TEKS standards, including the requirement that students in elementary grades “explain how government regulations and taxes impact consumer costs (2010, 113.14 (b) 11 A). Seemingly every opportunity in which some of the Republican board members had to include discussion of the free enterprise system was taken full advantage. McElroy found it important to move that students “understand the influence of scientific discoveries, and technological innovations, and the free enterprise system on the standard of living in the United States” so that students would associate scientific and technological innovation with a free enterprise economic system (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.41 (c) 27). In the documents I found only references to the benefits of a free enterprise. There are no instances in which the quality of or disadvantages of the economic system are questioned.
Connections

Through a study of the language in the SBOE meeting minutes, CDA allows for the uncovering of connections between the students and the curriculum (Gee, 2006). The connections among the curriculum and students which exist continue to follow the emerging trend, which reflects a preference for Republican Party ideology. A few board members, such as McElroy, Dunbar, and Miller, who appeared to strictly support conservative social and moral principles, pushed for amendments that removed learning standards which were divergent from their guiding philosophies. For instance, at one of the final May meetings, Knight proposed a change to a learning standard in sociology which would “differentiate between sex, a biological and physical characteristic, and gender, a social construct, and discuss how gender and socialization interact.” The motion failed. This possible change does not align with the conservative paradigm. In conservatism, maintaining traditional social structures is important. The traditional gender structure accepted in conservatism does not support the belief that there could be differences in sex, and was not acceptable to allow in the curriculum (Fishman, 2012). In some instances, when a motion failed, other board members would attempt to revise the failed motion as a compromise, so that some of the wording or changes to the learning standard were accepted, while other words remained out of the standard. In this particular circumstance, the motion simply failed (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.46 (c) 12 A). These actions and word choice help to connect students who support conservative or American exceptionalism ideology; the actions and diction reaffirm those ideological beliefs. At the same time, these actions disconnect many young adults from the social studies learning standards because they identify with other ideological beliefs, such as liberal philosophy. Students who are racial minorities most likely disconnect with the learning standards. It is important to note the absence of racial
diversity in the standards. The people, events, legislation not covered in the curriculum are just as important as those who are. The absence of racial diversity implies that the other stories of American history are not the knowledge worth knowing (Rogers et al, 2005).

Moreover, it is possible that the value-based, subjective statement—such as “good citizenship,” found in several social studies courses disconnects students from the curriculum, regardless of their political party affiliation. As Andolina et al. (2002) report, the notion of citizenship and behavior that is considered consistent with political participation, varies greatly among adults in the United States. Young adults do not share the same views of citizenship and participation held by adults in their mid-thirties and older. Edwards (2009) notes that even with the 2008 presidential election, with President Obama as a very appealing candidate to many 18 - 24 year olds, that age demographic still represented the smallest percentage of voters.

**Signs and Systems of Knowledge**

Finally, the SBOE meeting documents provide an excellent opportunity to determine how the Texas SBOE attempted to influence what students in Texas know and believe (Gee, 2006). The Texas SBOE used social studies course revisions to effect the way students across Texas learn by amending the proposed social studies TEKS standards. The board assigned which standards contained the important content through the use of the word “including” as a designation of required mastery. Equally important are the learning standards which include the words “such as” to indicate potential use. The standards where the board changed the wording from “including” to “such as,” or vice versa, reflect the partiality of several board members for conveying the information worth knowing to students. The standards without either of the previously mentioned phrases do not mandate that students prove mastery or provide a possible
example for teaching purposes. Finally, the remaining standards are noticeably left out, in as much as teachers are pressured to teach, or not teach the content.

Indeed, the majority of the board made motions, and voted for changes to the social studies curricula which produced social studies courses with an obvious preference for conservatism and American exceptionalism (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). The system of knowledge throughout public schools in Texas advocates an educational system in which limited national government, penchant for individual rights, and preference for a capitalist market structure.

Discussion

Analyzing the Texas SBOE meeting minutes from January, March, and May, 2010, was possible through the framework of Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks. As I sought to uncover the reality of citizenship and democratic education created by the text, along with the balance or imbalance of power among participants, three themes emerged. First, a belief in a national government of limited authority is evident. Second, the SBOE meeting texts stress the importance of individual rights over the collective good. Finally, there is a repeated preference apparent for a capitalist market structure. In the conclusion, I more fully discuss these themes.

Conclusion

Educational theorists, such as John Dewey, Paolo Freire, Alfred Bandura, Michael Apple, Bradley Levinson, and Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, provide the current understanding of democratic and citizenship education, and the ways in which these instructional practices should appear in the classroom. James Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks produce the framework of analysis for the CDA, which exposed the power structures imbedded in the meeting minutes of the SBOE. The emergent themes demonstrate the influence of the conservatism and American
exceptionalism evident in all the Texas social studies curricula (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999).

Educational theorists’ construct of democratic education allows for a system in which all participants have the opportunity to determine the curriculum together. There are not top-down power structures (Dewey, 1916; Freire, 2009). Students and teachers are not cast aside in the development of democratic education, but allowed to voice ideas, concerns, and areas of interest. The goal of this collective partnership is twofold: first, democratic education intends to improve the educational experiences of all participants, and second, democratic education involves “communities of practice” (Lave and Wenger, 1991). According to Lave and Wenger, social and intellectual activity work to develop the whole learner and enrich the understanding of the content or subject studied (1991; Bandura, 1993, 1997).

Democratic education is closely associated with the concept of citizenship education. Several educational theorists highlight the need for social learning through a variety of instructional activities that encourage critical thinking, student choice, and permits students to construct meaning from educational experiences (Apple, 2007; Dewey 1916; Freire, 2009; Bandura, 1993). Democratic education accentuates the need for students to use community in the development of the whole person (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

At the same time, citizenship education focuses on the task of maturing students into citizens, who are willing to participate in the current government because they associate civics with problem solving, inquiring into social issues, and attaching personal, meaningful, experiences to the government (Dewey, 1938; Schunk, 2008; and Hyslop-Margison and Strobel, 2008).
The Texas SBOE meeting minutes do not create democratic or citizenship education that would be supported by educational theorists. The meeting minutes reflect the work of conservative board members to infuse the curriculum with conservatism and American exceptionalism (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). Instead of allowing participants a voice in the determination of the knowledge worth knowing, the SBOE dictated the learning standards. The entire process fails to represent democratic or civic educational philosophies. The curriculum is a top-down power structure, there are no examples of theorists’ democratic educational activities in the government curriculum, and several of the board members successfully inserted a bias in favor of American exceptionalism and conservatism in the language of the TEKS standards and board meeting minutes.

In another CDA I conducted using the Texas high school government learning standards, I found very similar findings. The Texas government standards reflect neoliberal and neoconservative interpretations of education (Apple, 2005; 2006). Additionally, the government standards also reflect a preference for conservative, right-wing ideas, emphasis on American exceptionalism, and significant focus on a free enterprise, capitalist market economy (Gutek, 2004; (Fishman, 2012; de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999).

**National Government with Limited Authority**

Democratic and citizenship education is an important component of instruction used globally to reinforce support for existing structures of government (Edwards, Lineberry; Wattenberg, 2008; Wiseman, 2003: Andolina et al., 2002). The Texas SBOE sought to influence the development of young Texans education in the public school system through the curriculum revisions to social studies courses during the spring of 2010. The Texas SBOE reveals subtle
framing of content toward a decidedly conservative bias, and a preference toward American exceptionalism.

The focus of the SBOE meeting minutes on the benefits of a limited national government creates one area in which there is a balance of power among teachers and students. Initially, there is balance in authority between students and teachers as a result of the curricular origins. The state of Texas requires school districts in throughout the state to use the curriculum approved from the Texas Education Agency and SBOE. This places teachers and students equally without power as to the choice and variety of the curriculum. Both groups are subject to the assigned curriculum. Both teachers and students are told the knowledge worth knowing from the state. Neither group has the opportunity to contribute to Freire’s “naming of the world” (2009).

CDA allows for a richer understanding of the ways in which language impacts and controls social situations. The language used by the conservative SBOE members in the Texas government curriculum and SBOE meeting minutes generates an imbalance of power among students. Both the government curriculum and the majority of the SBOE minutes contain words and phrases which slant the curriculum toward conservative beliefs, such as the benefit of a limited national government (Gutek, 2004). This bias creates a set of political norms, as Lakshaman (2011) describes, what is good and right about society. These documents establish a political norm that expects a limited national government. Students who believe the national government should be responsible for administering programs, ensuring equity among groups, and maintain a general concern for the collective good, are left with a sense of isolation or rejection. When students do not view civics courses as relevant to their lives, they are much more likely to disengage from the content, and possibly from political participation (Khane and Sporte, 2008; Khane, Chi; Middaugh, 2006; Andolina et al, 2002; Wiseman, 2003).
Importance of Individual Rights over the Collective Good

A second theme that emerged as a result of the CDA of the meeting minutes from the SBOE is the importance of the individual in democratic and citizenship education. While the notion of democratic education conceptualized by many educational theorists urges a cooperative education system where teachers and students work together, the Texas SBOE developed a curriculum which repeatedly places emphasis on the importance of the individual (Dewey, 1916 and 1938; Bandura, 1997). A majority of the board voted to define democratic education by using the term representative government. The Texas construct of democratic education is a system in which Texas SBOE members are elected to serve the people of Texas by administering and creating education policy (Texas Education Agency, 2013). The implication is that public suggestions are accepted and considered, while other credentialed individuals served on committees to develop educational policy or curriculum. Finally, the TX SBOE acted in a manner that reflected the preferences of their constituents. In practice, once the people of Texas cast their votes for each respective board member, the board member becomes that districts “expert.” The SBOE members are granted, representative authority to determine the knowledge worth knowing for teachers and students in Texas. Democratic education in Texas is more representative, than democratic.

The curriculum excludes those who do not agree with this interpretation of democratic education. Many people, who did not agree with the SBOE curricular changes, were allowed the opportunity to speak at a public hearing, but in the end, the board embraced their trustee role. Many critics from around the state, nation, and parts of the globe, were largely ignored (Stutz, 2010; Stutz, 2010; Stutz, 2010; CNN, 2010; Foner, 2010; Frank, 2010, March 17; Michael, 2010; Henry, 2010).
Free Market Structure Preference

A final theme that emerged from the critical analysis of the SBOE meeting minutes is the obvious preference of a capitalist/free market economic structure. American exceptionalism esteems this economic system as the most beneficial (de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). Capitalist economies are also touted as the economic structure with the most opportunity for prosperity. The support for American exceptionalism is apparent throughout the meeting minutes. The prominence of a capitalist market structure adds to the Texas construct of democratic education. Students and teachers do not have the freedom to discuss and choose the economic systems they might like to study. Teachers and students also do not have the ability to categorize the economic system of the U.S.

Instead, the Texas SBOE inserted the benefits of a capitalist market structure at every perceived opportunity. For example, the U.S. history since 1877 course directs students to relate a capitalist market structure to scientific discoveries and technological innovation as a reason why the standard of living continues to increase in the U.S. To extend this perspective further, a sub-learning standard directs students to “understand how the free enterprise system drives technological innovation and its application in the market place” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.41 (c) 27 C). The majority of the board attempted to imply that in a democracy, the only logical economic system is a capitalist/free market structure. Consumers hold the power of choice in the U.S., as explained in the government curriculum: “students understand the roles played by…governments in…the U.S. free enterprise system…[and] compare the role of government in the U.S. free enterprise system and other economic systems” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 5 C).
The Texas SBOE advocates a capitalist market structure through the way TEKS standards with this economic system are framed. For example, in the sixth grade curriculum the board approved a change to one of the learning standards. This amendment asked students to compare and contrast the benefits of a capitalist market structure to other economic systems. Additionally, McElroy proposed an amendment to the sixth grade curriculum so that students “understand the poor record of collectivist, non-free market economic systems to deliver improved economic development over numerous contemporary and historical societies” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.18 (b) 9 D). This particular TEK does not allow for students and teachers to examine areas in which collectivist economic policies or systems have benefited participants in the policy or economic system. The language used by the conservative board members implies that there are no collective economic policies or systems that benefit people. Even the title of the mandated economics course in Texas explicitly states the bias in the course title: Economics with an emphasis on free enterprise and its benefits. Democratic education in Texas only supports the use of a capitalist market structure.

Citizenship education in Texas promotes that citizens not only accept, but embraces a capitalist market structure. Further, the right-wing majority on the board, attempted to connect the notion of citizenship in Texas directly to the concept of citizenship in Texas. The board left out references to other groups and even suggested that those who do not embrace a capitalist/free market structure were not “good” citizens: The meeting minutes I analyzed contains only references to the benefits of capitalism (Fishman, 2012; de Tocqueville, 2003; Shafer, 1999). There are no instances in which the quality of or disadvantages of the economic system are questioned. The notion of citizenship education in Texas singularly promotes the beneficial components of capitalist market economies. What is not referenced in the SBOE meeting
minutes is that the gap between the rich and the poor has only grown in the 20th century (Slater, 2001). This relates directly back to the second theme, the importance of the individual.

The overwhelming support and consideration for a capitalist market structure excludes many. Notably, any student, or teacher, that supports a socialist economic system is intentionally excluded. During the May meetings of the SBOE, Hardy moved to strike Karl Marx from a learning standard that listed “the importance of various economic theorists, including…Karl Marx”; the amendment passed. Marx was removed from one of the TEKS Standards which requires mastery of the information in the learning standard (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 118.4 (c) 5 E). The majority of the board did not want students to consider Marxist philosophies. This ideology becomes more apparent as McElroy proposed another amendment which explicitly states that superiority of capitalism: students must “explain why communist command economies collapsed in competition with free-market economies at the end of the 20th century” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.42 (c) 18 E). Students or teachers who do not classify the U.S. economy as capitalist or free market are also excluded from the curriculum. Persons who do not accept the notion that a free enterprise economic system is equitable, fair or the best system are also excluded. The economically disenfranchised, socialist, and/or communist economic systems advocates, fair trade supporters, persons interested in altering minimum wage, essentially any people that do not support a capitalist market structure are excluded. These perspectives have little credibility according to the majority of the SBOE.

Finally, the questions of power and imbalances of power between teachers and students, and among students once again depend upon the outlook of each individual in Texas classrooms. Students and teachers, who advocate the superiority of a capitalist system, align with the political and social norms accepted by the majority of the SBOE. This assigns them a place of importance
in the Texas societal hierarchy. These are the people included and accepted in democratic and citizenship education. At the same time, the students and teachers who do not support a free enterprise economic system are relegated to second class citizenry. The language in the documents reveals little, if any support for opposition to a capitalist/free enterprise economy.

The purpose of this CDA was to uncover the hidden power structures imbedded in Texas SBOE meeting minutes. One of my primary concerns involved comprehending what democratic and citizenship education represent in Texas. The meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE demonstrated a minimal commitment to including all students in democratic and citizenship education. The basic structure, function, history, and philosophical influences of the U.S. government are in place. However, I uncovered considerable preference toward conservative, right-wing stances. If the notion of democratic and citizenship education created by educational theorists such as Dewey (1916) Freire (2009), Bandura (1993), Levinson (1999; 2005), Levinson and Brantmeire (2006), and Apple (2005, 2006; 2011) is to be realized, then the politics evident in the revisions process must be addressed. It is imperative that the curriculum be amended to include, at the very minimum, a much more balanced approach to different beliefs in social studies. Those who think, feel, look, and act differently than the majority of the Texas SBOE were under-represented in the meeting minutes, or left out of the revised learning standards completely. Fairclough (1993) would argue that it is not possible to produce bias free policy, but policymakers, teachers, students, and the people of Texas can fashion a more inclusive social studies curriculum that acknowledges the complete past of the U.S.
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APPENDIX A

EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW
Introduction

The Texas State Board of Education’s recent revisions of the social studies curriculum have produced ripple effects across the state, and as some critics worry, these effects could impact social studies curricula in other states (Collins, 2012). During the spring of 2010, the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) met in Austin on multiple occasions to rewrite the existing social studies curriculum. The board, led by a Republican bloc, produced learning standards for the more than five million students in Texas that move the curriculum to an obvious bias toward Republican ideology (Stutz, 2010). The changes have brought Texas critical national attention regarding the new learning standards. Journalists, educators, and liberty interest groups fear the potential impact in classrooms around the nation. Texas is one of the largest consumers of textbooks, and as Henry (2010) reports, many publishers keep content from their largest clients in textbooks marketed to other states.

Defining democratic and citizenship education has proven a controversial task in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The power to decide what democratic education is in schools, along with defining citizenship is such a prominent topic in the culture of the United States that it now permeates the curriculum, particularly in states with diverse and rapidly growing populations, such as Texas. Although the question of citizenship is currently at the center of a very political discussion, it is not a new topic nor is it recent development as an addition to the curriculum. A significant portion of countries around the world use the educational system as a means to accomplish the formation of citizens; usually through a course on the structure, theory, and function of government. Rituals in the education system, such as the pledge of allegiance at school each day, are intended to generate patriotism and nationalism (Edwards, Wattenberg; and Lineberry, 2008).
In the United States the educational focus is on creating democratic citizens during the primary and secondary school years. Although there is noteworthy effort to indoctrinate young students into the political structure of the United States in the primary grades, this study will focus on the effort to assimilate older students in the current political structure, particularly at the high school level. Despite the societal goal to create democratic citizens, a social consensus as to the nature of democratic education does not exist. Even the views about the way in which education should be delivered spark debate amongst scholars. The discussion around democracy in education can be traced throughout the history of the United States following several key educational theorists, such as John Dewey, Albert Bandura, Paolo Freire, Jean Lave, Etienne Wenger, Michael Apple, and Bradley Levinson. These theorists’ work in education continues to influence the conversation on democratic education.

The work of these scholars counteracts the efforts to base public education on a business model (Smith, 1992). This business model of education seeks to obtain proof of learning, in much the same way that businesses report proof of success through profits. In this model, students are treated as a commodity that produces desired results on examinations which in turn become proof of their learning. The current educational model in Texas reflects a national shift toward conservatism in the 1980s. Smith (1992) discusses the changing views of curriculum and the purpose of education as a result of the conservative movement. The author further suggests this paradigm shift in the curriculum is also a response to the emergence of postmodernism. Smith (1992) identifies two dominant perspectives on education: the educationist and the anthropological. He points to the conservative movement, led by President Reagan and his Secretary of Education, as a pivotal moment in the educationist effort. Educationists’ primary concern lies with testing and identifying students who learn and who do not learn. Smith points
to this business model philosophy of education as a catalyst to the prevalence of standardized testing.

The debate regarding control of citizenship and democratic education is not new. However, it has recently reached a fevered pitch since the Texas State Board of Education’s 2009 - 2010 revisions and adoption of new social studies standards, with emphasis on the government model. The SBOE is in charge of curricular content in Texas public schools and the adoption of new textbooks. Every ten years the board reconsiders and revises the curriculum in all subjects offered in public schools (Texas Education Agency, 2012). During the 2009 – 2010 revisions, several board members were accused of having an agenda to add a Republican Party slant to the learning standards (Stutz, 2010).

In an effort to understand the complex idea of citizenship and democratic education it is important to review the roots of democratic education. Additionally, it is important to trace the development of citizenship education, and the ways in which educational theorists’ pictured citizenship and democratic education in the classroom. This examination also includes a discussion of the critiques and debates that encompass citizenship and democratic education. There is not yet a clear consensus among scholars as to which proposed classroom structure creates a satisfactory system of citizenship and democratic education.

Statement of the Problem

The Texas civics curriculum demonstrates the “educationist,” business model philosophy Smith (1992) resulting from the 1980s “conservative revolution.” Apple (2007) argues that the current curriculum reflects the belief that school reform must include high pressure, high stakes testing to demonstrate improved student achievement. This influence manifests in the form of the Texas curriculum standards or Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for government.
The state assigned curriculum includes only four specific content areas with an emphasis on citizenship. The piece of the curriculum that directs students to learn of citizenship specifically references actions taken by individuals. Within this mandated curriculum there is one standard that hints at democratic practices being communal. However, the learning standards continue to emphasize the individual interpreting other perspectives. The Texas Education Agency’s Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (2011) for high school government highlight the individual in the learning standards:

Citizenship. The student understands the importance of the expression of different points of view in a democratic society. The student is expected to:

(A) analyze different points of view of political parties and interest groups on important and contemporary issues;

(B) analyze the importance of free speech and press in a democratic society; and

(C) express and defend a point of view on an issue of contemporary interest in the United States (113.44, 17 A,B; C).

This language, present in a state mandated curriculum, emphasizes the individual, market based structure which currently dominates so much of education. Apple’s (2005) concern is that existing educational programs reinforce the perspective of students as human capital. Students require training as their education in an effort to efficiently produce and reproduce the existing structure. This learning standard mentions nothing in regards to students forming political opinions nor ideas, only that students must understand what is already in place, accept the prevailing thought, and defend the current paradigm.

The belief in democratic education continues to persist as more discussion emerges in the United States about the goals of the public education system. As Apple (2011) writes, more people in the United States are beginning to reject the idea that a high stakes, economic model of education is the only manner in which reform might occur. Instead, many theorists share
Levinson’s (2005) perspective that democratic education in other countries serve as models to help return a sense of social justice and perhaps even equity to American schooling. Despite the growing desire of educational scholars to return a sense of an authentic democracy to education in the United States, the question still remains: what is democratic education? What does this concept look like? How do students engage in the process? The purpose of the study is to describe the current status of democratic education, citizenship education, and the balance of power between teacher and students and among students, as evidenced by the TEKS standards and related Texas State Board of Education minutes in which the adoption of new social studies TEKS standards was discussed.

Purpose of the Study

This study involved a critical discourse analysis, CDA, of the government Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS standards) and the accompanying minutes from the Texas State Board of Education meetings where the current learning standards were adopted. Using critical discourse analysis, CDA, the study uncovered the power structures implicit in both the curriculum and the meetings in which certain Board members sought to push their ideological stance, while claiming to provide a balanced curriculum (Rogers, 2011, Henry, 2010). The language chosen for use in the learning standards and the language present in the minutes from the board meetings revealed the hidden agendas and power structures that exist in these documents.

Research Questions

The research questions that guided this study:

1. How do the government TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE promote democratic education, as defined by educational theorists?
a. How do the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE define democracy?

b. Who and what is included in democratic education according to the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE?

c. Who and what is excluded?

d. How do the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE align with educational theorists’ definition of democratic education?

2. How do the government TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE promote citizenship education, as defined by educational theorists?

a. How does the curriculum and the Texas SBOE define citizenship?

b. Who and what is included in citizenship education by the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE?

c. Who and what is excluded?

d. How do the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE align with educational theorists’ definition of citizenship education?

3. How does the language of the government TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE encourage a balance or imbalance of power amongst students and teachers?

4. How does the language of the government TEKS and the Texas SBOE encourage a balance or imbalance of power among students?

The answers to these research questions will provide an in-depth critique of the current government learning standards. Additionally, the critical analysis will highlight areas of the curriculum and State Board of Education meetings that did not promote the best interests of students in Texas.
Assumptions

The study assumes that the government TEKS are currently in use by public schools throughout the state of Texas, as required by the Texas Education Agency, and Texas Education Code. Additionally, the study assumes that these learning standards hold significance in the instruction of students throughout the state of Texas because state law requires that the standards adopted by the SBOE are required to be used in classrooms across Texas. Further, Texas is a major consumer of textbooks, and textbook companies often use learning standards from larger states, such as Texas. The textbooks in other states occasionally reflect learning standards that are similar to learning standards found in Texas. As such, the Texas standards have the potential to impact a large student population throughout the United States (Collins, 2012). At the same time, the numerous responses to the curriculum’s passage indicate there are problems of equity and power structures within the curriculum and SBOE meetings which merit a critical analysis of the government learning standards and meeting minutes.

Theoretical and Philosophical Rationale

Citizenship education in the twenty-first century requires a paradigm shift. Instead of a curriculum that promotes the individual as the central figure in democratic choices, the curriculum must acknowledge that democracy and learning are social processes. The “communities of practice” Lave and Wenger (1991) promote acknowledge human beings’ social nature and allow them to work together to derive meaning from the world around them. Democratic education must include a social component, or it is not democratic education. Individualism does not promote the unity and equity necessary to develop a shared cultural norm from which students and citizens may operate.
Democratic education must allow for the students, teachers, and other stakeholders in public education to function together as a cohesive unit— not in a top-down power structure in which one party clearly dominates the other. As Apple (2006) illustrates, this power structure strips away the basis of trust in a learning community and does not allow students to think freely and problem solve. Rather, the current educational structure reinforces the existing power organization which leaves many silent because they have no connection or sense of purpose in the educational system. Authentic democratic education encourages students and teachers to work together to determine the curriculum. As Freire (2009) explains, the “naming of the world” must occur as a process where all participants are given equal opportunity to share insight about the world around them (p. 151). A polite, on-going, collective conversation about democratic education is essential in order to adapt to the desires of the people. Democratic education cannot be dictated from above; instead it must be a continuous dialogue among people who recognize their status as equals. The Texas learning standards require the anti-thesis of democratic education. The standards are a top-down mandate that forces teachers to teach specific content without allowing students a voice, and offers teachers minimal choice in the decision regarding instruction of required curriculum standards.

Implementing democratic education into practice requires careful consideration. As Dewey (1938) mentions in *Experience and Education*, it is not necessary to reject everything from a traditional classroom. In fact, Dewey criticizes former students and progressive reformers who seek to eliminate everything from prior models of learning. Allowing students the freedom to dictate their learning with no direction and no guidance creates lazy and ill-prepared students. It is the question of guidance that becomes problematic in describing democratic education (Dewey 1938). The implication is not that guidance from a teacher or mentor should dictate the
curriculum, but this assistance should promote critical thinking skills by asking tough questions, encouraging innovation, and providing students the freedom to respond to the idea of solving authentic problems. Dewey believes “what we need is education pure and simple, and we shall make surer and faster progress when we devote ourselves to finding out just what education is” (p. 90). The goal for education should be the best interests of all participants. Education cannot be considered “good” because it rejects the old methods of instruction, nor can it be considered “good” for embracing new techniques for instruction. Instead, education is authentic when a collective approach is used to work toward the best interest of all participants. Uncovering democratic education cannot be accomplished until the petty, political debates surrounding education are abandoned in favor of a collective desire to find the pure and simple education Dewey advocates (p. 90).

Issues of exclusion must be addressed in order for a system of education to be democratic. A democracy embraces the notion of majority rule with minority rights, which not possible with the exclusion of certain groups from participation (Edwards, Wattenberg; Lineberry, 2008). This issue is of particular importance in Texas, where the state mandated curriculum leaves noticeable contributions of important historical figures out of the curriculum. Key figures and events in American history, such as Gloria Steinem, the Stonewall Riot, and many contributions of Tejanos at the Alamo, are absent from Texas standards (Muñoz and Noboa, 2012; Stutz, 2010, Jan 9). In addition, the roles of men and women are conservative, traditional, and fail to acknowledge many significant contributions of women in government and civic education (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a) (b) (c)). The refusal to recognize the contributions of many Americans to society prevents the curriculum from fulfilling its intended purpose. A democracy in which the majority tries to minimize or eliminate important
contributions from the minority is not a democracy at all. Democratic education in the United States, particularly in Texas, is not possible until the curriculum is inclusive and not only acknowledges, but celebrates the contributions of all members of society equally.

Definition of Key Terms

American exceptionalism: the belief that the United States is an exceptional nation state through the development and use of a republican system of government, democratic practices, and the use of a capitalist economy. Early in American history, this notion was demonstrated through manifest destiny – a belief that God ordained the nation and provided the natural resources for the growth of the United States (Gutek, 2004).

Citizenship education: system of education that seeks to teach children and young adults about the concept of citizenship and patriotism. This is accomplished by instructing students about the history, nature, structure, and function of the current government system and its benefits (Dewey, 1916, 1938; Wiseman, 2003). Most importantly, citizenship education extends beyond the basic structure of government and must include “a clear effort to influence certain human excellences or virtues, the capacities or tendencies to think of the public interest or common good rather than self-interest” (Pratte, 2001, p. 304).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): methodological tool used to highlight relationships in words that are not obviously evident to all. These relationships illustrate the power of words and the influences that language and ideology has on society. Specifically, this analysis seeks to uncover the hidden elements of control using linguistic tools (Fairclough, 1989, p. 5).

Conservatism: ideology which embraces tradition and cultural norms. Those who espouse conservative beliefs seek to maintain the original purpose and intent of governments, organizations, and social norms (Gutek, 2004).
Democratic education: a system of education in which students and teachers share in the learning process by building a community of trust and include all in the decisions about what to learn. This form of education should be responsive to the changing needs of the learners (Lave and Wenger, 1991; Freire, 2009; Apple, 2005; Dewey, 1916).

Liberalism: ideology concerned with seeking progress and change in society. Those who embrace a liberal philosophy support change in society to improve living conditions for people, and desire the protection of personal rights and freedoms (Gutek, 2004).

Neoconservatism: is the ideological preference for tradition. Neoconservatives embrace traditional gender roles, familial structures, and a deference to the past as an example of good societal values (Apple, 2005).

Neoliberalism: is the social and political framework of society which chooses to focus on the economic nature of society. The function of education, in this ideology is to prepare students to be future employees, and so they must acquire the necessary skills to be efficient. Schools are mechanisms for the production of future participants in the economy, and must allocate time, attention, and resources to this task. Neoliberalism tends to advocate free market/capitalist economies as the preferred system (Apple, 2005; 2006).

Political socialization: the process by which young children and adults are introduced to the political process and structure of government from family, schools, and the media (Edwards, Wattenburg, and Lineberry, 2008).

Texas Education Agency (TEA): the state agency responsible for administering public education in Texas. Responsibilities of this agency include overseeing curriculum and textbooks, administering student achievement exams, dispersing state and national monies to schools, and ensuring compliance with federal guidelines in education (Texas Education Agency, 2012a).

Texas State Board of Education (SBOE): governing body for curriculum materials and textbooks in Texas. The Board of Education is made up of 15 elected members from across Texas (Texas Education Agency, 2012c).

*Limitations*

This study seeks to analyze the influence of language in the government curriculum in Texas. The only documents used in this study are public record and readily available for public use. Access was not available to analyze Board of Education members’ notes, or personal copies of the proposed standards to which they added amendments or desired changes. Another limitation of the study is that the critical analysis of the learning standards will show the power structures evident in the document, along with the version of democratic education put forth by the Texas SBOE; this study does not allow for insight into the way in which public schools in Texas teach the curriculum. A noteworthy delimitation of this study is that it does not include a critical analysis of the other social studies courses. During the revision process, the SBOE revised and considered the learning standards for U.S. history, Texas history, world history, economics, psychology, sociology, social studies research methods, and special topics on social studies.

*Significance of the Study*

This study will provide a critical discourse analysis, CDA, of the Texas government curriculum which claims to foster democratic education. The analysis will examine whether the curriculum contradicts leading educational theorists’ perceptions as to how democratic education should function in the classroom. Education policy makers and schools throughout Texas should
review and closely scrutinize the language of the government TEKS standards to highlight power structures which promote conservative ideology over others within the curriculum. Eventually, education policy makers should revise and create new learning standards that reflect equity and a shared sense of ownership from all involved in education.

Summary

Civic education in Texas seeks to perpetuate the notion of a democracy through citizenship and democratic education. The current learning standards found in the Texas government standards, promote the individual over the community and do not consistently back prevailing philosophical views about the nature of citizenship education or democratic education. As the researcher, I will critically analyze the current standards for government. I suspect the CDA will unearth whether or not the curriculum promotes freedom and choice for all. Additionally, the study will provide information about the power structures created by the language of the curriculum and any imbalances of power encouraged by the curriculum.

Literature Review

The idea of citizenship education is complex. It extends beyond instilling patriotism and the basic structure and function of governments. Citizenship education aims to teach students to consider the common good before self-interest (Pratte, 2001). Concern for the common good directly relates to democratic education, an educational structure in which a community of learners work together to define education and the curriculum (Freire, 2009). In democratic education, students, teachers, and administrators use collective experiences to build upon their knowledge and navigate new social situations (Dewey, 1916; Schunk, 2008). The recent revisions to the government curriculum in Texas directly contradict the ideas of citizenship and democratic education. Instead of embracing social learning, the curriculum focuses on the individual
Rather than allowing all participants to communally “name the world,” the Texas SBOE determines the curriculum. Students are required to learn from the pre-determined curriculum (Freire, 2009). The current program of study in Texas does not allow for “communities of practice” which not only allow students to develop as a whole person, but also aid students in understanding the importance of the common good (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

In the following I review the literature of the social studies curriculum revisions from Texas along with leading educational theorists’ construct of democratic education and civic education. Firstly, I discuss significant contributors to the field of democratic education and their conceptions of democratic education in the classroom. Secondly, I discuss the notion of citizenship education, note the responses to the new curriculum, and concerns about students’ education in Texas. The available literature illuminates the breach between citizenship and democratic education and the newly adopted Texas standards.

**Educational Theorists’ Democratic Education**

John Dewey remains a prominent philosopher in any discussion of democratic education. His work in the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago, and his research during his tenure at Colombia University allowed him the opportunity to develop and revise his beliefs about democratic education. Dewey soundly rejects the belief that education is merely preparation for some future career. Dewey envisions education as “[equipping] individuals for full participation in social life, and [believes that] in its finest form it is the result of free and open social interaction” (Chambliss, 1996, p. 151). One of Dewey’s most significant contributions to the idea of democratic education emerges through his work, *Democracy and Education* (1916). Many scholars acclaim this book as his masterpiece. In this work, Dewey explains that education is meant to be an instrument and a practice of democracy. Dewey
recognizes the need for change in educational practices of the twentieth century; this idea is more profoundly obvious in the twenty-first century. No longer sufficient are the methods of transmitting old works of the past to a new generation. Instead, Dewey believes in the vision of education as responsive to the learner thereby helping each student grow and expand.

In an effort to comprehend Dewey’s vision of democratic education it is imperative to include Dewey’s vision of education expressed in his pedagogic creed. Dewey (2009) explains that education is a function of social values and culture. In order for students to learn they must relate their life experiences to the content. Learning cannot take place outside of intrinsic motivation. Students must take ownership of their learning and process the acquired knowledge for education to be successful. The significance of learning cannot be dictated by another person. Democracy, Dewey (1916) claims, refuses to wield power from above and dictate the actions to the community governed. Dewey also notes that democracy is much more than a form of government; it is a lifestyle. People living in a democratic society must develop a sense of community in which there are shared interests to promote dialogue and education (p. 101).

Equally important to democratic education is Albert Bandura’s social learning theory. Bandura (1993) believes “Effective intellectual functioning requires much more than simply understanding the factual knowledge and reason operations for given activities” (p. 117). In this manner, Bandura advocates the need for social learning and imitation as a method for students to develop into democratic practitioners. This learning theory is not only applicable to democratic learning, but other aspects of learning. Bandura notes that self-influences allow learners to construct meaning and recognize their ability to influence change. For example, Bandura (1993) writes regarding the importance of efficacy: “those who have a high sense of efficacy visualize success scenarios that provide positive guides and supports for performance” (p. 118). The
notion of democracy rests in the idea of popular sovereignty. Bandura’s contribution to democratic education relies upon understanding the cognitive process and concepts that intrinsically motivates student participation in their education and society at large. Bandura’s (1997) social learning theory represents a person’s belief in their ability to perform. The author refers to this personal belief as an individual’s sense of efficacy. Further, Bandura asserts that the basis for social change is found in social efficacy.

Schunk (2008) elaborates regarding Bandura’s four necessary components to social learning theory, including: “attention, retention, production, and motivation” (p. 86). In the attention phase, stimuli can cause the observer to pay more or less attention to specific types of behavior. As a learner moves in and through the retention phase, the student will work to organize all that he or she has seen to help make sense of the new information. A student who works to rehearse and code the information will likely store the new concepts in memory. During the rehearsal phase of learning, the modeled image is reproduced, along with a mental review of the information. Finally, for effective modeling to occur, motivation must exist. Motivation is a critical aspect of social learning, because learners are interested in modeling behaviors that are significant to them personally. Bandura (1993) explains that social learning theory and appropriate modes of instruction, “strengthen students’ self-belief that they have what it takes to exercise control over their self-development” (p. 140).

The implications of Bandura’s social learning theory for democratic education are critical. The roots of democratic education include the expectation that decision-making and participation is open and voluntary. Bandura et al. (1996) makes the assertion that students’ desire to participate in their education and in life, due to their sense of self-efficacy. However, self-efficacy requires nurturing through appropriate instructional methods that support students’
personal beliefs and interests. According Bandura, people will model behaviors which they find to be socially acceptable through the use of “social prompts” (Schunk, 2008, p. 85). The absence of social learning activities in the curriculum fosters student apathy, rather than evokes interest in the democratic process.

Democratic education not only requires social interaction amongst the participants, but also entails freedom from dictated power structures. Paulo Freire advocates democratic education through the “pedagogy of the oppressed” (2009, p. 149). Freire implores teachers and administrators to leave the oppressor position in which the structure of education currently places them, and move toward a collective dialogue. Freire suggests that education emerges from all participants communicating and engaging in critical thinking about existing power structures. Without reflective practice, there can be no genuine communication, and in the absence of such, critical thinking is also absent. As a result, Freire’s definition of “true education” does not occur (p. 150).

Democratic education is more than creating a system of government. Instead, democratic education is a system of education in which the powerful are stripped of their control and all people are considered equal. In this paradigm, leaders of the movement for change are not going to the people “to bring them a message of salvation”, but in order to come to know through dialogue with them both their objective situation and their awareness of that situation” (p. 151). Democratic education most likely does not emerge as a top down transition where a leader/teacher or reformer comes to make changes that will improve the educational opportunities.

Freire emphasizes democratic education allows for students to communicate with teachers, administrators, and those in authority to develop a course of study which acknowledges
the needs and instructional desires of all parties. The current system of education in which politicians legislate what is taught in public schools around the United States is perhaps the very anti-thesis of Freire’s vision for education. Perhaps education cannot come from mandates and rigid power structures. Instead, it is reasonable to believe that education must be a collective communication of all parties, as equals, who critically think and converse about the world in which they live. Rote memorization of facts will not provide an education. Freire (2009) argues, “It is to the reality which mediates men and to the perception of reality held by educators and people that we must go to find the program content of education” (p. 151). Democratic education must emerge as a “thematic investigation…a process of search, of knowledge, and thus of creation, it requires the investigators to discover the interpretation of problems, in the linking of meaningful themes” (2009, p. 151).

Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991) advocate “communities of practice” as the way to a more democratic form of education (p. 49). Lave and Wenger insist that learning communities foster the development of the whole person, with a continual focus on the evolution of the world around them. Lave and Wenger (1991) suggest other theorists emphasize cognitive ability in learning. As an alternative, “communities of practice” recognize that learning is a multifaceted social process that employs relationships among learners to develop new meanings about available information. Lave and Wenger (1991), emphasize as the central theme that learning is not merely a social activity, but a renegotiation of identity and the construct of new identities as result of interaction with new information that creates meaning in the world. Learning cannot exist in isolation, rather “these systems arise out of and are reproduced by social communities, which are in part systems of relations among persons” (p. 53). According to Lave and Wenger, democratic education embraces the notion of these social communities implying that learners
work collectively to generate meaning in the democratic process and create identities in the practice of democracy.

Furthermore, a contemporary educational philosopher, Michael Apple, proposes that democratic education is markedly different from the current state of education in the United States. Apple (2005) writes the control of modern education in the United States belongs to neoliberals. Neoliberals assert that virtually everything in modern life is part of a market structure. This view stretches to the public school system where students are human capital and are trained as efficient workers in a larger economy. Thus, the function of education for neoliberals is to produce skilled workers for the market place. Apple argues that “consumer choice” is the foundation for democracy to neoliberals (p. 204). Democratic education, must be a critical education that does not allow for a small group of representatives to make all the decisions. Instead, Apple proposes an education system that is constantly evolving as all participants collectively define education. A democracy encompasses the voices of all, and will lay the necessary foundation for democratic education. The implications for this system of education indicate the necessity of constant scrutiny in the development of schooling. Apple (2007) contends that education should not be linked in any way to the economy or market, but must direct its focus to critical pedagogies that acknowledge the difficulties of individuals to be heard in an oppressive educational climate. Likewise, schools that may be considered democratic have certain qualities, such as a curriculum with time and space for students and teachers to address “authentic problems and issues” (p. 36.). In Apple’s model, students, teachers, and administrators all have a voice in the decision-making process. The curriculum allows and responds to student selections for the curriculum. Apple (2007) suggests that in a democratic school there must be projects, lessons, and space for critical-thinking and intellectual
development. Democratic schools must be absolutely inclusive and diverse. A final feature of
democratic schooling includes administrators who embrace the characteristics necessary for
democratic educational practices.

Democratic and Citizenship Education Associated

Democratic education is closely associated with the concept of citizenship education.
Several educational theorists highlight the need for social learning through a variety of
instructional activities that encourage critical thinking, student choice, and permits students to
construct meaning from educational experiences (Apple, 2007; Dewey 1916; Freire, 2009; and
Bandura, 1993). Democratic education accentuates the need for students to use community in the
development of the whole person (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

At the same time, citizenship education focuses on the task of maturing students into
citizens, who are willing to participate in the current government because they associate civics
with problem solving, inquiring into social issues, and attaching personal, meaningful,
experiences to the government (Dewey, 1938; Schunk, 2008; and Hyslop-Margison and Strobel,
2008).

Citizenship Education

One of the most well-known philosophies of citizenship emerges from the work of John
Dewey both through his work at the University of Chicago and his major works, Democracy in
Education (1916) and Experience and Education (1938). Dewey (1916) suggests that citizenship
education requires development and recognition of socialization within democratic education. A
society “Which is mobile, which is full of channels for the distribution of a change occurring
anywhere, must see to it that its members are educated to personal initiative and adaptability”
(Dewey, 1916, p. 102). A society where students are only taught about the structure, form and
function of their governing system through textbooks and standardized testing cannot hope to reach the objectives of Deweyan education, particularly not in an educational system where “children can barely read or write” (Bernstein, 2008, p. 22).

Dewey (1916) creates the idea of citizenship education as one in which students pursue independent objectives in their course of study (Hyslop-Margison and Strobel, 2008). Dewey states (1916) that it is not the function of the teacher to design the content of education for students. Nor is it the sole responsibility of the teacher to design classroom activities. According to Glassman (2001) Dewey views the teacher as the facilitator of individual inquiry. Importantly, the teacher aids students in the creation of their own learning experiences. In place of a top down classroom structure, Dewey (1916) places a higher value on the experience of learning. The experience of learning permits students to build upon prior knowledge, and adds skills into their social and cognitive abilities. Glassman (2001) writes social learning is necessary because the interactions among students, coupled with the social norms that allow for continuous conversation, are tools in the educational process. The importance of said tools only relates to their utility. Social interaction is tools to aid students as they navigate learning experiences (Glassman, 2001; Dewey, 1916). If, as Dewey (1916) argues, humanity consists of the series of social interactions between and among humans, then social interaction in education is of paramount importance.

Dewey’s learning theory emphasizes the role of public education is to foster mature citizens from immature students. He believed that if immature students were allowed to choose their own educational direction with no insight from a mature adult, it would be pure folly to expect that the outcome would be anything less than a lazy individual instead of the developed desired citizen. At the same time, Dewey emphasizes that traditional schooling where the
curriculum is already rigidly in place and students are “imposed upon from above and outside” is not an effective method of instruction either (Dewey, 1938, p. 21). This method of schooling does not provide the types of experiences upon which students may construct continuity in experiences and learning. Losing the balance between teacher facilitation and guidance versus students having no direction from the teacher loses a key element in the process of education.

Dewey rejects extreme views of education, and instead encourages teachers to understand that in his learning philosophy of education, students must be guided by teachers who possess a vast breadth of knowledge, which creates learning experiences that connect to the present. Dewey insists that all teaching and learning is made up of experiences, and those experiences can be “educative” or “miseducative” (1938). “Educative” experiences are those in which learning was continuous and connected with the present. Dewey argues that when students have a connection to the present those students would ultimately achieve their future goals in the process. To facilitate this process of experiential learning, teachers should guide students in an effort to enhance the learner-centered, experiential approach (1938).

Bandura’s social learning theory is an important aspect to effective use of civics education. Bandura, according to Schunk (2008), believes that individuals learn through watching others act, attempting to imitate the acts of others, and then modeling behaviors that have a perceived reward connected with the behavior. Schunk (2008) further elaborates that Bandura posits there are four necessary pieces present in social learning theory, including: “Attention, retention, production, and motivation” (p. 86). In the attention phase, stimuli can cause the observer to pay more or less attention to specific types of behavior. As a learner moves in and through the retention phase, the student will work to organize all that he or she has seen to help make sense of the new information. A student who works to rehearse and code the
information is most likely to store the new concepts in memory. During the rehearsal phase of learning, the modeled image is reproduced, along with a mental review of the information.

Finally, for effective modeling to occur, motivation must exist (Schunk, 2008). Motivation is a critical aspect of developing citizens because learners are interested in modeling behaviors that are significant to them personally. In the United States, numerous researchers report consistently that young Americans are the least likely to participate in the political process. Kahne and Sporte (2008) report that most young adults in the United States find government and politics irrelevant to their lives because of the way in which these courses are taught. The number of experiential curricular opportunities, forms of lesson delivery, and teaching methods prove to be significant links between students’ civic learning opportunities and future civic participation. Research indicates that social learning settings, such as, “engagement in service learning, and the use of simulations on the one hand, and students’ civic commitment and capacities on the other” have a direct correlation to high school students’ civic awareness (p. 742). A statistically noteworthy link exists between “civic learning opportunities and students’ commitment to civic participation” (p. 751). According to Schunk (2008) “People perform actions they believe will result in rewarding outcomes…persons also act based on their values and perform activities they value and avoid those they find unsatisfying regardless of the consequences” (p. 87-88). According to Bandura, people will model behaviors which they find to be socially acceptable through the use of “social prompts” (p. 85). The implications of Bandura’s social learning theory for the creation of citizens are critical.

On the other hand, and perhaps most notably, serious curricular changes were made to the social studies curriculum standards in the spring of 2010. Williams (2010) writes that prior curriculum revisions moved the social studies course of study from more conservative, Protestant
based standards to a more inclusive, secular curriculum between the early 1960s and the late 1990s. The curricular standards between the 1960s and 1990s removed the emphasis on Protestant Christianity and included more secular world views, along with a more feminist perspective. It should be noted that this curriculum was by far not a truly progressive curriculum; this curriculum was simply less conservative than the one in place in the 1950s. The 2009 revision of Texas social studies standards was controlled by a conservative bloc within the Texas SBOE that want to interject more conservative, religious ideology into the curriculum. Williams (2010) argues that this movement contradicts legal and cultural curricular precedents in the United States. The critical analysis of this change has serious implications for a large number of school children in the United States. As the 2nd largest state in the U.S.A, Texas has a profound influence on textbooks and their content due to its size (Collins, 2012).

Texas public schools have become increasingly more conservative in the adopted curriculum and continue to push for more conservative ideology within the curriculum. This has been at the expense of the contributions of women and minorities, because the current curriculum favors conservative political figures from the 1980s and 1990s. In fact, Foner (2010) writes that the new social studies standards accepted by the Texas Board of Education substantially silenced the voice of minority groups in Texas. Instead, the Board selected a curriculum that focuses a considerable portion of the program of study on traditional gender roles, capitalism, parts of the Constitution, the military, and religion. My aim is to examine the existing civics curriculum standards in Texas and highlight the discrepancies between the theories of civic and democratic education and the practice of civic and democratic education in the Texas curriculum.
Basset (2010) asserts that the Texas curriculum touted the importance of conservative values and their importance which brought about changes through political maneuvering. Subsequently, the addition of key conservative figures in American history and the removal of many important minorities from the state standards will have a tremendous impact on students around the nation. Basset (2010) claims Texas illustrates the larger problem with education in the United States today – politicians determine the curriculum. Politicians have not been willing to listen to the experts, teachers and professors, in regards to important subject matter for the curriculum. Instead, politics determines the course of study, and many underrepresented groups lose any hope toward equality in the process. This directly affects young adults, particularly young minority adults. The curriculum pretends to offer inclusive educational opportunities for all people, but then the governing board of the state works to specifically exclude important historical and cultural figures from United States history. This message is not lost on young adults in classrooms throughout the state. Citizenship and participation is encouraged and expected, if one fits the mold of a citizen.

Moreover, there are numerous scholars and research projects that support a movement away from standardized testing towards more participatory citizenship education. Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006) seek to understand the concept of citizenship. The authors contend that citizenship is not a natural idea and question the emergence of citizenship. The study further inspects the cultural conversations that help form current meanings of citizenship. Their study provides an analysis of fourteen citizenship texts and three state civic curriculum standards from California, New Jersey, and Ohio. In this analysis the authors note seven distinct frameworks for the notion of citizenship. The article further explores two main ideologies: liberal and civil republican. These two frameworks dominate the curriculum of citizenship
among the three state curricula studied. Liberal ideology promotes a broader, inclusive curriculum which they assert allows for a wide-ranging dialogue. The civil republican ideology is much less receptive to open discourse and attempts to manufacture students who share much more classically liberal beliefs about civics. Knight-Abowtiz, and Harnish (2006) conclude that citizenship must be a notion that develops from discourse and discussion over time from many opinions, and not just legislated through the curriculum.

Despite the influence of educationists in policy and practice, through the continual efforts of educational anthropologists, such as Bradley Levinson, research examines the cultural importance of education. Educational anthropologists seek to understand the implications of relationships within education and view schools as places where learning will happen, not just a place where it might happen. Levinson (2005) has done extensive research in secondary schools in Central and South America, as well as the United States, in an effort to resist “the overwhelming [push] to create the economically competent or adaptable worker, not the democratic or intercultural citizen” (p. 329).

Levinson (2005) uses educational discourse, reviews of existing literature, and participant observation, and suggests that cross cultural comparisons could provide new insight into the field of civic and democratic education. In his article “Citizenship, Identity, and Democracy: Engaging the Political in the Anthropology of Education” (2005) Levinson identifies what seems to be his primary concern in educational anthropology which is bringing democracy to education in the United States. He refers to an ethnographic study he conducted in a secondary school in Mexico. Levinson expected to find that the school peer structure reinforced societal inequities from outside of the school; instead, he found a school culture that promoted equality within the school. This shared experience of equality within the school affected the social structure for
these students outside of school as well. Levinson (2005) explains that this particular project “developed ‘citizenship’ in [his] own work” (p. 331). Levinson (2005) poses several important questions that define his work in educational anthropology. How can the use of cross cultural comparisons help bring United States schools back to “public minded” citizenship curriculum and democratic education (p. 337)? How might the practice of democratic education be strengthened in the United States? What lessons for civic education can be learned from other nations? How can lessons from other nations help to acknowledge the cultural identities of immigrants?

Levinson (1999) asserts that educational discourse and its benefits have been largely ignored as a critical component of engaging in participatory citizenship within schools. He suggests that anthropologists in and out of the subfield of educational anthropology do not pay enough attention to the social structures or power hierarchies that exist within schools. Levinson states that to dismiss these important elements of schools in the United States and abroad loses an important concept critical to understanding identity formation in youth. Educators must rethink and reframe the paradigm for educational study so that two main goals could be accomplished: to unify anthropological work and to promote increased democratic practices through an increased awareness of the dynamic relationships between teachers, students, administrators, and policy makers that affect the existence or lack of democratic practices in schools.

In one analysis, Levinson and Brantmeier (2006) sought to better define communities of practice that originated from Lave and Werner in 1991. Levinson and Brantmeier (2006) wanted to assess the useful aspects of communities of practice toward the goal of creating democratic citizens. They also expressed at the beginning of their work that there are serious limitations in
the theory behind this tool and those limitations need to not only be acknowledged, but closely examined by civics teachers.

Levinson and Brantmeier (2006) describe two challenges to the practice: the “Challenge of Authority” and the “Challenge of Authenticity” (p. 326-7). The first deals with the existing power structure between teacher and students in a traditional classroom that does not work well with a true community of practice. The latter discusses the difficulty for educators to create scenarios in the classroom that correspond with authentic issues outside of the classroom. Despite these challenges, in order to create authentic citizens, the curriculum should also have genuine learning experiences.

Further research conducted by Wiseman (2003) reveals that civics instruction, which does not vary greatly across many nations, is insufficient for the development of formal citizenship identities in young adults. Their inclusion in and the opportunity for them to participate in extra-curricular activities that directly relate to civic opportunities fosters the creation of participatory citizens significantly increase the likelihood of participation, while nations that offer more formal instruction, such as learning about voting or other civic activities, do not increase student engagement. This study suggests that the preferred method of civic instruction in Texas does not positively affect or encourage young adults to become participatory citizens. Available opportunities to learn through participating in citizenship formation, appears to be one of the ways in which young adults might become more interested in the democratic process.

Kahne, Chi, and Middaugh (2006) suggest that one reason for this apathetic showing among young adults is the way in which civics education is taught in the U.S. Young adults who are taught about active participation in government and politics through the use of lecture and
worksheets cannot reasonably be expected to then go into society and become active in the political process. Participatory citizenship opportunities within the curriculum indicate a more likely success rate in the desire to develop participatory citizens.

*Concern for Students*

The most important concern for students regarding the social studies curriculum revision was the effect these changes would have on textbook companies across the United States. Holmes (CNN, 2010) reported that out of fifty five million public school students educated in the United States, five million students receive their education in Texas. Texas curriculum often appears in other states’ textbooks because it is the second largest consumer of textbooks in the U.S. This concern was echoed repeatedly by many other media sources. Daniel Ruth, of *The St. Petersburg Times*, (2010) lambasted the Texas curriculum revisions as revisionist history. However, due to the size of the Texas demand for textbooks, there was a possible threat to students across the nation.

Collins (2012) writes that the battle for Texas curriculum standards has been ongoing since the 1960s when Mel and Norma Gabler first brought up a long list of curricular objections they had to the State Board of Education. The Gabler’s interest in the content of textbooks first arose over objectionable material in their children’s school books (Martin, 2007). At the start of the mid-twentieth century curriculum controversy, Norma Gabler testified at many textbook hearings and suggested many conservative ideas needed to be more predominantly emphasized in the curriculum. She advocated moral, a free enterprise economic system, and wanted to undermine the theory of evolution. The Gablers expanded their influence beyond textbook hearings when they began to publish a list that noted every factual inaccuracy found in Texas history books (Martin, 2007). Once outside groups, such as the Gablers, became interested in
influencing the content of Texas public school textbooks, the State Board of Education’s revision
process for learning standards in Texas curriculum became more politicized. Notably, the most
recent curriculum revisions were highly political, and featured the conservative bloc’s success at
passing amendments that advance a conservative viewpoint. The concern for students is that the
ideological stance evident in the curriculum will be spread, en mass, across the nation. Collins
(2012) explains that other scholars have found disturbing numbers as to the extent of the
curricular influence from Texas:

Keith Erekson, director of the Center for History Teaching and Learning at the University
of Texas El Paso…says he’s seen estimates that the proportion of social studies textbooks
sold containing the basic Texas-approved narrative range from about half to 80 percent.
(p. 111)

The curriculum standards that will most likely affect a significant number of students
across the United States, did not just anger moderates or liberals. As a concession to make the
standards appear less biased, textbook companies often use generic language to soften the
influence of one side over another. The result, according to Collins (2012) is textbooks which are
general, vague, and largely uninspiring. One of the most distressing consequences of the
textbook battles is that “‘current history textbooks … have lost their compelling narrative’”
(Shorto, 2012, p. 116). One of the most distressing consequences of the fight for ideological
control of the social studies curriculum is that textbook companies, in order to make a profit, and
satisfy all clients, have reduced important subjects for the development of the common good,
such as history, to boring and mundane subjects. Students are not interested in learning about
vague historical events with which they cannot find a true connection. Instead, students suffer
through these courses and miss out on the opportunity for understanding the messy, complicated,
and beautiful tapestry that is the history of the United States.
Scholars and educators are not only concerned about the Texas standards because of the influence Texas has in the textbook industry, but there are concerns for Texas students about the education which they receive under these new learning standards. Ruth’s (2010) concern for students includes the probability that the new standards will produce students that “are more delusional about their country’s history than North Korea’s Kim Jong Il” (p. 15A). While Ruth’s position may seem a bit extreme, other scholars, such as Keith Erekson (2012) suggest the most important concern for students was overlooked through the media circus that surrounded the Board of Education meetings. Erkeson’s (2012) primary concern for students in Texas is that “[s]kills necessary for success in college and careers were ignored” (p. 4). Further, Erekeson (2012) points out other problems created for students by the new standards. One such problem is the size of the new curriculum standards increased significantly. If teachers had any difficulty finding adequate time to cover all the material listed in the previous standards, that problem has not been alleviated in the new curriculum.

Other sources of concern for students include the manner in which ideology has been inserted into the curriculum. Ereksen (2012) explains the increase in the length of the curriculum is directly tied to the insertion of various ideological preferences. The resulting standards are unbalanced in the portrayal of social studies content in Texas. For example, “the free enterprise system” has only benefits, while the Great Society, Title IX, and affirmative action have only “unintended consequences” (p. 12). Throughout the learning standards there exists a “complete lack of context” for specific people, ethnic groups, and events (p. 13). One example of this lack of context is that the learning standards teach civil disobedience as a means to fight against taxes, or other unwelcome aspects of government control, while civil disobedience is not taught as a means to method in which students could demonstrate their disapproval of war or social issue
policies (p. 13). These inconsistencies within the curriculum do not provide Texas students with a sound social studies education that is reflective of the diverse, multidimensional, twenty-first century world in which they live. Instead, it presents an ideologically slanted, hodgepodge version of social studies education, which will most likely confuse students once they enter a different educational environment.

The area of greatest concern, Erekson (2012) argues, should be that students subject to these learning standards will be grossly unprepared for universities or careers post-graduation. The standards include various lists of names, dates, and/or terms which students are likely to learn, usually through memorization. This does not support the more widely acknowledged goals for education that embrace “the expectation that students learn to read, think, solve problems, and communicate” (p. 13). Living in the twenty-first century demands that education become more responsive to change, as society must constantly adapt to changing technology, information, and accommodate new ideas. Memorization, defining terms, and recalling important dates does not equip students with the tools necessary for success in an environment that demands critical thinking skills.

Muñoz and Noboa (2012) write about their experience while working on the eleventh grade U.S. History course revisions that highlight a much larger problem with the social studies curriculum revision. The ideology, vision, and desire to include “people like me,” prevented the committee from creating a set of learning standards that would most benefit students throughout the state of Texas (p. 53). Any curriculum written should seek to promote critical thinking, reasoning, and also allow for the diversity that constitutes American society in the twenty-first century. Allowing personal preference for any particular subject or person to dominate the
discussion of what students should learn takes away from the best interests of the students. As Muñoz and Noboa (2012) assert:

This emphasis on “who’s missing” prevented us from building a set of standards that reflected the college readiness goals of interdisciplinarity, diversity of experience, global interdependence, cognitive development, and effective communication. Instead of focusing on the broad goals of social studies, our committee conversations disintegrated into battles over promoting one kind of history over another rather than creating a set of standards that could allow multiple perspectives or a multifaceted history to emerge. (p. 54)

Responses to the New Curriculum

Responses to the new curriculum standards were almost immediate. Criticism emerged before the Board took the first vote to approve or reject the curriculum. The New York Times published several letters from around the nation criticizing the Texas standards in early March. Most authors’ primary concern was the intentional ideological stance that emanated from the proposed standards. These standards reveal that Texas public education is undemocratic and exclusive (Wall Street Journal, 2010). Not only were the standards garnering attention from across the United States, but criticisms of the standards emerged internationally as well. Whittell (2010) of The Times, in London, wrote that the Board intended to eliminate or reduce the role of FDR and New Deal Legislation in American history; “watershed achievements for Democratic governance in the 20th century” (p. 43). The Weekend Australian (2010) also reported the controversy in Texas education, and included that Texas was one of only two states to opt out of nationally proposed standards in order to maintain control of content taught in Texas schools. Frank (2010) wrote that the “liberal world has watched in horror as Texas State Board of Education’s dominant conservative faction “ rewrote the history of the United States, and other social studies courses to reflect a partisan, ideological version of history (p. 19).
Ben Jealous, CEO and president of the NAACP, not only spoke at one of the hearings of the State Board of Education, but also responded to the work of the Board on CNN’s *Saturday Morning News*, in which he lambasted the Board for throwing out the recommendations of teachers and educators work on the curriculum standards and replaced their suggestions with partisan ideology. Jealous suggested that the Board’s conservative members wanted to create a version of United States history in which the most difficult portions to teach, to remember, and to study, such as the history of racial discrimination in the United States, were removed (CNN, 2010). Further, Jealous argued, the conservative bloc attempted to downplay slavery as an important component to many key events in U.S. history. For example, the board did not want the curriculum to assert that slavery was the main cause of the United States Civil War. Jealous asserted that, essentially, some members of the board brought in a conservative think tank to throw out the contributions of educators and scholars, and instead replace the curriculum with a curriculum with a conservative bias that reflected the views of the social conservative voting bloc. It should be noted, however, that Jealous did admit that he had not read the proposed curriculum on the day he spoke to the board in Austin, nor had he read the curriculum completely on the day he served as a panelist for CNN (Erekson, 2012; CNN, 2012).

Several responses elicited from the work of the State Board of Education attempted to present a neutral perspective on the new Texas curriculum, while pointing out the factual inaccuracies created by those with an ideological agenda. Dan Harris, of *Nightline*, reported an interview with Don McElroy about the curricular changes and the motivation from McElroy in pursuing specific amendments. Harris (2010) noted that McElroy remains confident that his work in “correcting what he sees as liberal bias in American textbooks” was important and necessary (1). During the interview, McElroy further explained his position:
To me, it's just providing accurate history, and my observation is the left doesn't even know they have biased it because they just think that's what it is. All we've done in Texas, by adding in Newt Gingrich, the conservative movement is the fact that - and the resurgence right there with Ronald Reagan, all we are doing is reflecting what's actually happened in the country. (Harris, 2010, 1)

United States Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, released a statement regarding the Texas social studies curricula in which he said “setting curriculum is a local issue and we should keep politics out of it. Curricula should be written by educators who know the subject matter” (CNN, 2010). Duncan further stated that an attempt to influence students with political and ideological standpoint was a great injury to the public school children for whom the curriculum authors claimed to serve.

Not all of the criticism of the social studies curriculum emerged from the left, nor were all of the critiques accurate. The Texas Education Agency (2010, March 10) responded to claims made by a program on the Fox News network that Texas history books were removing important historical figures, such as Abraham Lincoln and George Washington. Moreover, the Texas Education Agency replied to other erroneous claims made by Fox that included that the SBOE was selecting textbooks, when actually, the board was in the process of revising curriculum standards. Also, Fox charged the state removed Independence and Veteran’s Days from the curriculum, and indicated that Christmas was no longer included in a list of important religious days for world religions. Stutz (2010) reported that Steve Doocy, of the Fox News Channel’s Fox and Friends, attempted to fix their reporting errors by suggesting the incorrect information reported on Fox and Friends were only suggestions, not statements of fact. The network did not clear up any of the other misinformation regarding the curriculum standards. Additionally, the show once again referred to the process in Texas as textbook adoption as opposed to curriculum revision. This controversy highlights the nature of response the proposed and then later, adopted
standards received from all sides. The SBOE made very few happy and the resulting notoriety negatively impacted the credibility of Texas public education among liberals and conservatives.

Responses from those who agreed with inserting more conservative ideology into the curriculum and supported the curricular changes were limited and hard to locate. Josh Levs, CNN correspondent on Saturday Morning News, indicated that the news network believed it was important to present both sides in a balanced manner, and yet viewer response was “about 90% of [the response]… is slamming the decision in Texas. So if you're someone out there who agrees with it, we certainly want to hear from you, too. We want to hear all sides of this” (para 125).

One of the most vocal supporters of the new curriculum standards was Jonathan Saenz, of the Liberty Institute, a conservative think tank, who also appeared on CNN’s Saturday Morning News. Saenz (CNN, 2010) embraced the curriculum changes in Texas as increasing diversity within the course of study. For instance, the new standards included Wallace Jefferson, along with Sonia Sotomayor. Both figures represent diversity in ethnic and gender groups for the state and federal court systems. Saenz further argued that the Texas curriculum was widely supported by many teachers, university professors, and citizens in Texas. Saenz did not offer the names or specific references to any educators or citizens that supported the newly adopted standards. The controversy, according to Saenz, evolved because many who criticized the standards had not read them. If the critics had read the standards, then Saenz believed much of the controversy surrounding the curriculum would evaporate.

Another supporter of the revised standards included one of the board members, Bob Craig. Gulick (2010) writes that Craig felt the standards that the Social Studies TEKS standards created after months of debate and almost three hundred proposed amendments were “pretty good” (para 2). Despite the criticism from across the nation, and internationally as well, Craig
argued the new TEKS standards included a more diverse group of historical figures than prior curricula in Texas. The new curriculum standards did add in new minority faces, such as Wallace B. Jefferson, while ignoring others, such as Betty Friedan (Muñoz and Noboa, 2012). Craig sidestepped the ongoing debate regarding the curriculum, stating “you always would like to have more over here or something worded a little differently over there, but this is a good result” (Gullick, 2010).

**Summary of Chapter 2**

Democratic education is difficult to conceptualize. However, leading educational theorists, including John Dewey, Paulo Freire, Michael Apple, Albert Bandura have provided a frame of reference from which to start crafting democratic and citizenship education. One of the most important characteristics of citizenship and democratic education is that there must be a general agreement among participants. Each individual must be allowed to contribute to “naming the world” in their education so that it has meaning and power (Freire, 2009, p. 151). The current social studies standards; particularly the government TEKS standards, ignores the ideas of these scholars in favor of imputing personal ideological views in the program of study.

In addition, the manner in which the social studies courses were revised through the spring of 2010 demonstrates a process dominated by members clinging to a specific agenda. Requests by outside groups, such as LULAC, for the creation of a more inclusive set of learning standards were ignored. Instead, a majority of the SBOE, pushed through numerous amendments and curricular changes with the intent of correcting the liberal bias in the curriculum (Harris, 2010, 10). Despite protests from citizens, scholars, activists, and social studies professionals, the new curriculum standards were adopted in May of 2010.
Response to the passage of the new standards was swift. Many criticisms were offered of the new curriculum, not only from Texas and the United States. Texas also gathered international attention in the wake of the new curriculum standards. Authors from Jerusalem, Sydney, and London rejected the new program of study as ideological and unfair. Ultimately, the consequences of these revisions lie with the teachers and students subject to these learning standards for the next ten years. Scholars fear that the new standards will produce students, perhaps from more states than just Texas, with a slanted view of social studies, unprepared for the realities they will face in college or life (Collins, 2012; Erekson, 2012; Ruth, 2010, May 28).

History of the Social Studies TEKS Standards Revisions 2009 – 2010

The social studies curriculum revision by the Texas State Board of Education occurred in the spring of 2010, after the board revised the science curriculum in 2009. In the process of adopting new science learning standards the Board garnered national, and in some instances international, attention due to the controversial nature of the debate. *The Revisionaries* (2012) a documentary highlighting this process, reveals the Board’s conservative bias in the central focus of their debate regarding science standards: Should the strengths and weaknesses of evolution be taught? Some scholars and Board members saw the language requiring the strengths and weaknesses of evolution as a means to get creationism taught through subtly questioning the validity of evolution as a scientific theory. Although, as Stutz (2010) points out, the conservative member bloc, led by Don McLeroy, former chairman of the Board, ultimately failed to get the weaknesses of evolution in as part of the mandated curriculum, “the group supported compromise language that students study the "sufficiency or insufficiency” of evidence on common ancestry and natural selection of species -- two key tenets of Charles Darwin's work” (para 18). This illustrates the notion of democratic education that Freire (2009) spent significant
time and effort fighting against. Instead of allowing all participants to help create curricular standards with accepted language supported by many, the Board of Education fought the opinion of most scholars to implement their ideological preference. This argument thrust the Texas SBOE into the national spotlight, drawing attention to the conservative voting bloc’s attempts to ideologically impact the curriculum.

Before the SBOE began the many hours of debates and discussion regarding the new social studies learning standards, the social studies curriculum was already drawing national attention. Cook (2009, Sept 13) was mortified at the obvious conservative bias of the learning standards with seemingly little to no liberal perspective evident. As the discussion of the new social studies learning standards began in the spring of 2010, many scholars and historians closely followed the revisions or attempted revisions the Board brought to social studies. Although most of the attention given to the social studies revisions surrounds the history curriculum, the impact of the ideologically divided Board is apparent in the civics curriculum as well (Stutz, 2010; Collins, 2012; Erekeson, 2012; Muñoz and Noboa, 2012).

In early January, 2010, before the State Board of Education’s first meeting to discuss the suggested revisions, several chapters of the League of United Latin American Citizens met across Texas in an effort to bring attention to the contributions of Hispanics in Texas (Cavazos, 2010). LULAC representatives argue that Texas, and the board, have misrepresented the history of Texas with the decision to ignore influences of the Spanish, Mexican, Tejanos on Texas culture and history. LULAC gained the support of one member, Mary Helen Berlengua, and were optimistic that the curricular revisions would provide an expansion of important Spanish, Mexican, and Tejano individuals.
Another significant factor driving the Board of Education during the spring debates of the social studies curricula revisions were primary elections in which several Republican members, including Don McLeroy, faced hotly contested re-election bids (Stutz, 2010). McLeroy did not view this as a mandate from voters about the work of the Board over the previous three years, instead he believed “there's always controversy in education in Texas, but it has intensified the last two years because we've been winning,” (Stutz, 2010). Not all Board members accepted the controversy as a positive thing for public education in Texas. Board member Mavis Knight, a Democrat from the Dallas area, argued that the conservative bloc frequently voted together on issues as a means to get their way in regards to curricular changes that she believed, as Stutz (2010) notes, imposed the conservative ideology in the Texas learning standards.

Table A.1

*Timeline of the Social Studies TEKS Standards Revisions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>TX SBOE discusses social studies revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Social studies curriculum considered a second time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Final adoption of the revised social studies TEKS standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>First presentation of social studies curriculum. Vote is delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>Proposed social studies TEKS standards are posted on the <em>Texas Register</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Social studies curriculum goes into effect in Texas classrooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stutz (2010) explains the conservative shift present in the proposed history curriculum presents a view of history for students in which the Conservative Revolution of the 1980s and 90s is a central focus, while other contributions from minorities, such as the League of United Latin American Citizens, LULAC, are left out of the curriculum. Stutz (2010) pointed out that “Hispanic leaders had noted earlier that only 16 of the 162 historical figures listed in the curriculum were Hispanic” (para 15). Further, the Board added Phyllis Schafly and other very conservative figures to the learning standards. There were numerous amendments to the history curriculum, so many that the debate on the learning standards was delayed until the March meeting. Some of the suggested changes include excluding significant minority historical figures, such as Ceasar Chavez and Thurgood Marshall, while adding Christmas back into the curriculum as well as including many conservative groups, The Heritage Foundation, for example, without adding any liberal counterparts.

When the Board met once again in March, one of the most vocal members of the conservative bloc on the Board of Education, Don McElroy, lost his bid for primary re-election bid to a moderate Republican (Wall Street Journal, 2010). Despite the small victory for those opposed to many of the Board’s conservative leanings, this did not negate the influence of McElroy on the social studies curriculum revisions (Stutz, 2010). Shortly after his loss, McElroy “promised several more amendments when the 15-member board gets back to work on social studies [in mid March]” (Stutz, 2010). The newly elected members were not sworn in as board members until January 2011. McElroy offered numerous amendments to the recommended history curriculum following his primary election defeat, and still found success in reshaping the history curriculum for millions of students in Texas (Stutz, 2010).
McElroy’s efforts to ideologically sway the social studies learning standards were not without challenge, both from scholars and fellow board members alike. Despite the objections of several Board members, some college professors, and issue groups, such as the Texas Freedom Network, the conservative bloc on the Board successfully passed learning standards for Texas students that have a distinct rightward bent (Revisionaries, 2012, Stutz, 2010). One of the many rejected proposals included requiring students to learn the names of key Tejanos who fought and died in the battle of the Alamo (Stutz, 2010). Mavis Knight suggested that the social conservatives on the Board often pushed through clearly ideological amendments into the learning standards by voting together, and occasionally, by securing support from other Board members. As Stutz (2010) reports, Knight believes the work of the Board has hurt students across Texas, and she looks forward to the day when social conservatives don’t maintain such a strong voting bloc.

Ultimately, the final adoption of the social studies curriculum was put off until the May 2010 meeting of the Board of Education. This was the second time the Board voted to delay a final vote on the social studies curriculum. In January, the Board could not work through a lengthy list of amendments, and decided it best to finish the curriculum changes at their March meeting (Stutz, 2010). After a contentious meeting in March, a preliminary vote approved the new curriculum standards, with final approval for the social studies curriculum expected at the May meeting (Birnbaum, 2010). By mid-May, conflict over the new standards had not subsided, but increased. Backlash toward some of the more conservative members of the Board was evident. The author of many right-leaning amendments, Don McLeroy, lost a hotly contested primary election in March. Stutz (2010) reported that another social conservative, Cynthia Dunbar, had not sought re-election to the Board and her selected candidate lost the primary
election. It appeared as though the social conservative’s control might be slipping by January of 2011. Social conservatives were intent upon leaving a legacy for the students of Texas over the next ten years.

It would not be without opposition, as the last day of testimony, May 18, 2010, had almost “200 witnesses [signed] up to testify. Scores have already given their opinions in [twenty two] hours of public testimony, and more than [twenty thousand] people have weighed in with e-mails to the board” (Stutz, 2010). Rod Paige, former Secretary of Education under George W. Bush, and former Houston ISD Superintendent, was the second person to testify, asking the Board to consider a delay in adopting the new social studies curriculum (Stutz, 2010). Paige urged the Board to consider that “‘[w]hat students are taught should not be the handmaiden of political ideology…I am asking you to not let political ideology and beliefs guide your decisions. We in Texas have a history of this’” (para 7). Paige did not want the State Board of Education to continue the Texas tradition of allowing ideology to outweigh the influence of sound scholarly work, most notably begun by the Gablers (Martin, 2007). Other notable witnesses before the Board included National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP president Benjamin Jealous, Representative Helen Giddings, and Trey Martinez Fischer, of the Mexican American Legislative Caucus. A common theme among their testimony was that of the “300 changes to the original standards developed by curriculum review teams of teachers and academics” there was little examination of the changes, and the proposed curriculum set to be adopted was not inclusive of important minority contributions to American culture (Stutz, 2010).

Despite the protests of many, the State Board of Education passed the new curriculum standards for social studies on Friday, May 22, 2010, with many of the controversial
amendments added into the curriculum (Knickerbocker, 2010). The new curriculum implemented will not be revised or reconsidered for ten years.
APPENDIX B

DETAILED METHODOLOGY
Research Methodology

This chapter describes the research methodology used in the study. Critical discourse analysis, CDA, provided an excellent fit for me to analyze the government curriculum due to its focus on the power of language. James Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks were used as the framework for the analysis. Rogers (2011) argues that any “critical approaches to discourse analysis recognize that inquiry into meaning making is always also an exploration into power” (p. 1). Frequently, people are unaware of the power which language encompasses and fail to realize the ways in which language represents a controlling tool in society. CDA is a form of qualitative research that may best be described as “[emphasizing] the role of language as a power resource that is related to ideology and social-cultural change” (Bryman, p. 508). Further, this method uses the study of related texts to disseminate, regulate, and interpret social reality. CDA helps researchers identify organizational and structural changes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to conduct a CDA of the government TEKS standards and the accompanying minutes from the Texas SBOE meetings in which the current learning standards were adopted. Using CDA I uncovered the power structures implicit in the curriculum and the meetings. (Rogers, 2011). Language in the learning standards and the minutes from the board meetings revealed hidden agendas and power structures created by these documents.

Research Design

The research design for this study is a CDA. Rogers (2011) explains that CDA is research method which provides the necessary tools to explore and address issues of power and inequality in the modern world. Blommaert and Blucaen (2000) list several key topics that are the focus of many CDA studies. These include: politics, ideology, racism, economics, advertisements, media,
gender, intuitional language, education, and literacy. CDA examines issues of power, inequality, and other issues of rights and freedoms. Moreover, CDA functions to reveal meaning behind text and is a way for scholars to reveal meaning and power struggles from text (Bryman, 2008; McGregor, 2004).

Importantly, CDA uncovers some of the many language uses which allow the researcher the opportunity to expose inequality and the ways in which inequality is reproduced through language. Van Dijk (1993b) emphasizes that use of critical discourse analysis, CDA, as not only a research method to expose inequality, but a way in which the status quo is challenged. Fairclough (2008) argues “one ‘good thing’ about language…use[d] to generalize about large numbers of separate events…while discounting differences irrelevant for the purposes at hand” (p. 813). Farelly (2010) advocates the use of CDA because “CDA can focus analysis on the order of discourse” (p. 103). CDA is a useful methodological tool as a means to illustrate the order of thought, connection of ideas, and thus can help uncover the power structures evident in the writing (p. 103). CDA highlights these complicated relationships that exist among language and power structures. Social interactions are instrumental to understanding how all of this control fits together as pieces of a complicated and constantly evolving social fabric. Through the process of CDA scholars can not only highlight these interwoven relationships, but also attempt to fight these structures for the cause of change and social justice (Poole, 2010, p. 137-8). Finally, Rogers et al. (2005) support the use of CDA due to the perception among scholars who utilize CDA that other discourse analyses do not stretch as far. Non-critical discourse analyses merely describe and interpret language, whereas CDA scholars begin the goal of identifying areas of inequality and social injustice, created through the written word. Once identified, the
purpose behind CDA is to “transfor[m] conditions of inequality” (p. 369). This distinction separates CDA from non-critical discourse analysis.

Critiques

*Criticisms of Critical Discourse Analysis*

In order to address some of the criticisms of critical discourse analysis, CDA, the data analysis used to examine the adopted government TEKS standards and SBOE meeting minutes will include James Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks. One disadvantage of CDA is that the method has not been written for and geared toward the general public. Fairclough (2008) further suggests that in an effort to help fight inequity and unfair power arrangements CDA scholars should remove some of the “technical jargon” from the work produced by scholars. Fairclough (2008) asserts that CDA scholars must view their work as a responsibility to bring so called scholarly work into conversations with the public as a whole, not only in academia (p. 811). However, Fairclough also reinforces the need for scholarly work still persists if scholars are to fight against the elite and politicians that control many power configurations. Billig’s criticisms suggest that scholars who use CDA are guilty of the same language abuses that they seek to identify and change.

Scholars that use CDA often insert their own biases into the interpretation of the documents they analyze. Critics of CDA also suggest that this research method, while it seeks to “locate and confront issues of power, privilege, and hegemony” also reproduces power structures and some scholars offer that CDA creates its own truth from the interpretation of the researcher administering a CDA (Rogers et al., 2005, p. 368). Fairclough (2008) disagrees –CDA is a research method in which the validity of the work is a matter of using language appropriately to convey meaning easily, not removing the tool of language as way to identify and fight against
hegemonic power structures. Fairclough (2008) promotes CDA as a tool to identify existing power structures in society and through the use of this tool; scholars can identify the phrases and/or patterns of language use that undermine the opportunity for those people who are oppressed in society to achieve equality. Fairclough (2008) warns that researchers must be aware of their own biases as they use this tool, and if aware, then CDA should not be discounted as an effective tool for use in fighting the hegemony. CDA is an effective research method for countering the influence and dominance of traditional power structures, only if the researcher is aware of their own personal biases. Scholars must acknowledge preconceived notions about their work, and perhaps other people groups involved or affected by the analysis. To ensure the validity of their work, Bryman (2008) explains, researchers must address their own worldview.

Fairclough (2008) warns that CDA can include instances of overgeneralization from researchers which could have serious ramifications. Scholars might overlook or obscure differences that are indeed most important. Also, researchers could use verbiage that is full of scholarly or scientific jargon, and once more leave people unfamiliar with the vocabulary out of the discussion. Farrelly (2010) asserts that another negative implication for the use of CDA is due to the fact that critical discourse analysis is never finished. In social discourse, the conversation among people and/or groups is a continual process. Despite the many inequities and power struggles in society, these conversations do not have a formal conclusion. Farrelly (2010) contends that “because it is part of the open system that is our social and political world we can never completely or fully analyze it” (p. 99). Although Farrelly offers a relevant criticism to CDA, this study provides an analysis of a small portion of a much larger discussion of inequity in society. The government standards are in place for ten years, as mandated by Texas Education Code (2011) and the meeting minutes from the SBOE are primary source documents that
constitute fragments of educational history. The analysis of these documents can be considered complete, while the ongoing social conversation regarding power and inequity is not.

One important disadvantage to the use of CDA, as noted by Stenner and Marshall (1995), is that if a scholar reads more into the meaning of one word than is actually intended, the potential exists for the author to leave out or exclude that word’s many additional meanings, uses, or perspectives. If a researcher were to become entangled with an emphasis on one specific word, the entire CDA could be lacking significant analysis and interpretation from other steps in the process of conducting a CDA due to the misconception and interpretation of singular word choices.

Alternatively, critics of CDA assert that analysts read political and social ideologies into the text they are analyzing, when what is read into the text may not be present. Secondly, critics of this method claim that the paradigm lacks a balance between social theory and scientific methodology in the process of conducting a CDA. Finally, critics argue that CDA is often removed from applicable social contexts and that there must be a more systematic and rigorous standard created for creating CDA (Rogers et al., 2005).

**Benefits of Critical Discourse Analysis**

Although there are criticisms of CDA, this research method is an important tool for researchers in education, As Rogers et al (2005) explain “[e]ducational researchers turned to discourse analysis as a way to make sense of the ways in which people make meaning in educational contexts” (p. 366). This is a point of particular significance in my attempt to analyze the Texas government curriculum, and also the meaning the SBOE members tried to make of the standards, as they revised the curriculum and proposed numerous changes before adopting a final curriculum. Additionally, CDA is useful for research questions in which questions of critical
social theory and discourse analysis would be useful as tools to study and interpret the social structures created, or reaffirmed, through written language, such as curriculum.

Equally significant, CDA is according to van Dijk (1993b) “the role of discourse in the [reproduction] and challenge of dominance” (p. 249). Van Dijk clarifies that those in dominance include any group or entity that promotes or extends social inequity among gender, race, class, or cultures. CDA does not view the study of obvious power structures as adequate for determining the reproduction of power struggle in society. Rather, van Dijk (1993b) asserts that it is through the careful consideration of the exact words in use and the thought behind the words that reproduce societal power structures. In the same way, it is important to consider the meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE in my analysis of the government curriculum, so that the diction and emphasis of various board members might illuminate the societal power structures being created through the curriculum. As a result, it is of primary importance for scholars to think about the language in use. The absence of this critical component is to the detriment of most other critical theorists and discourse analyses (van Dijk, 1993b).

Finally, Fairclough (2000) offers the assertion that CDA is an excellent method to use in research situations of struggle, in particular the struggle against the neo-liberal and neo-conservative movements that seek to understand and frame the world in the context of economic ideals. Neo-liberalism is a political and economic movement which seeks to promote global growth of capitalism and market based power structures (Fairclough, 2000). The Texas government curriculum specifically includes economic strands, in which the term free enterprise is used frequently. This tool of CDA enriches the analysis of the language in the curriculum and SBOE meeting minutes.
Equally important, Neo-conservatism views education as an opportunity to create students that will be efficient, productive workers in a global, market economy. Neo-conservatives desire to maintain strict control over social, moral issues from a very traditional, sometimes Protestant based point of view. Both movements gained dominance in the 1980s, with a particular surge of influence in the latter 1990s. The neo-liberal and neo-conservative ideologies seek to reshape global and societal power structures through the focus of globalization and capitalism, which they believe will promote economic growth and prosperity for those individuals who are willing to work hard for their success. Fairclough (2000) suggests that CDA is a means to fight against both movements. CDA promotes tension in the analysis of discourse by pitting different individuals biases (the author and the researcher) against one another in an effort to arrive a neutral interpretation of the document because “it does not isolate language but addresses the shifting network of practices in a way which produces…clearer understanding of how language figures in hegemonic struggles around neo-liberalism” (p. 112). Not only will CDA enlighten scholars in regards to understanding the ways in which language reproduces the hegemony, but will also highlight the neo-liberal and neo-conservative influence present in the curriculum and SBOE meeting minutes.

Research Questions

The research questions that will guide the study are as follows:

1. How do the government TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE promote democratic education, as defined by educational theorists?
   a. How do the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE define democracy?
   b. Who and what is included in democratic education according to the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE?
c. Who and what is excluded?

d. How do the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE align with educational theorists’ definition of democratic education?

1. How do the government TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE promote citizenship education, as defined by educational theorists?
   a. How do the curriculum and the Texas SBOE define citizenship?
   b. Who and what is included in citizenship education by the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE?
   c. Who and what is excluded?
   d. How do the TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE align with educational theorists’ definition of citizenship education?

2. How does the language of the government TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE encourage a balance or imbalance of power amongst students and teachers?

3. How does the language of the government TEKS standards and the Texas SBOE encourage a balance or imbalance of power among students?

Data Analysis

The government TEKS standards and State Board of Education meeting minutes will be analyzed using Gee’s (2011) seven building tasks. These tools for CDA include significance, activities or practices, identities, relationships, politics, connections, and sign, systems and knowledge. Gee (2011) suggests that “language-in-use is a tool, not just for saying and doing things…to build things in the world” (p. 30). The frame for this analysis is limited to the government TEKS standards and State Board of Education meeting minutes (Lakshmanan, 2011). To critically analyze the government TEKS standards and board meeting minutes, first I
must look at the significance of the language used in the learning standards and meeting minutes of the SBOE. Language use creates “social practice” (Rogers et al., 2005, p. 369). Social practice, according to CDA scholars, is the process by which language produces social interactions among people. Rogers et al (2005) therefore point out that “language cannot be treated as neutral, because it is caught up in political, social, racial, economic, religious, and cultural formations” (p. 369). Therefore, all of Gee’s (2006) building tasks and the language in the texts represent the process of building the power structures for control of the political and educational discourse in Texas. As I read through the texts of the documents, I must look for the “social practice” created by the texts and the relationships that build an identity of democratic participants in education (p. 369). This process will help to make meaning of the impact on education these curricular standards will have in Texas (Rogers et al, 2005).

The document analysis focused on answering the seven questions Gee (2006) asks in relation to the seven building tasks.

1. Significance: How is language used to denote significance or insignificance of aspects of the curriculum? What words or phrases are used to indicate significance in the documents?

2. Activities: How does the language used encourage actions (Gee, 2006, p. 11)?

3. Identities: What identities of students and citizens are being constructed from the language used in the learning standards?

4. Relationships: What relationships between the government and the curriculum are the documents seeking to create?

5. Politics: “What perspective on social goods (public goods, available resources for all people) is this piece of language communicating”? For example, Lakshmanan (2011)
suggests this implies “what is being communicated as to what is taken to be normal, right, and good, appropriate…high or low status” (p. 90).

6. Connections: How do the learning standards connect or disconnect students to the curriculum?

7. Signs and systems knowledge: How do these documents create “different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief” (Gee, 2006, p. 13)?

The application of these questions will allow me to determine the “dominant Discourse” in the board meetings and government learning standards regarding the aims of the government to promote democracy and freedom of choice for all. The study will provide insight into the idea of democratic education and revealing the board’s agenda as far as freedom of choice for all (Lakshmanan, 2011, p. 73). Additionally, my analysis will help disclose the relationships between students and the curriculum and an imbalance of power for those who do not share the same ideological stance evident in the curriculum. Activities encouraged by the SBOE through the production of the current learning standards attempt to motivate those with similar ideological views to become active in government and to dissuade others who do not share the same views from action.

Research in Context

The state of Texas administers its public education system using the Texas Education Agency. TEA is responsible for the administration and enforcement of laws passed by the state legislature concerning education in Texas (Texas Education Agency, 2013a). The authority of the TEA is shared by the Commissioner of Education, who serves a four year term, concurrently to the governor’s term, and the SBOE. The SBOE is comprised of fifteen members. Each board member is elected from a single member district. Terms are four years long, and terms are
staggered so that not every place on the board is up for re-election at the same time (Texas Education Code, Chapter 7, Section 7.104 b, 2011). Texas Education Code designates that the SBOE is responsible for “[adopting] rules to carry out the curriculum required or authorized under Section 28.002 (Texas Education Code, Chapter 7, Section 7.102 11, 2011).

The responsibility of selecting and approving the curriculum for public schools in Texas gives the SBOE a great deal of power and influence in regards to what school children in Texas are accountable for learning. The extent of this influence became apparent during the 2009 – 2010 work of the SBOE in which the newly revised curriculum standards for science and social studies courses were up for approval by the SBOE (Stutz, 2010, Jan 9; Stutz 2010, May 17).

Texas Education Code states that “the Texas State Board of Education, with the direct participation of educators, parents, business and industry representatives, and employers shall by rule identify the essential knowledge and skills of each subject of the required curriculum that all student should be able to demonstrate” (Texas Education Code, Subtitle F. Curriculum, Programs, and Services, Chapter 28, Section 28.002 c, 2011). The SBOE chose to implement this statute through a process which allowed educators, and other committee members, to revise the TEKS standards. Then, the expert reviewers appointed by the board would review the TEKS standards, the committees would be allowed the opportunity for revision, and then the board would read the TEKS standards, and propose amendments, as members believed were necessary (Texas Education Agency, 2011).

To initiate this process, SBOE members were allowed to select an individual to participate in one of the committees formed to write the initial draft of each social studies TEKS standards. The courses were divided up into the following committees: Kindergarten – Grade 5, Grade 6 – Grade 8, Economics, Psychology, Social Studies Research Methods, Sociology,
Special Topics in Social Studies, United States Government, United States History Since
Reconstruction, World Geography Studies, and World History Studies (Texas Education
Agency, 2011). Not all board members elected to nominate a representative to sit on any of the
TEKS standards Review Committees, including members Rick Agosto, Lawrence Allen Jr.,
Cynthia Dunbar, Terri Leo, and Ken Mercer (Texas Education Agency, 2009c and 2009d). Once
the TEKS standards Review Committees were in place, the Texas Education Agency, directed by
the SBOE, gave the committees the process in which they would review the existing TEKS
standards in order to create new learning standards. The committees had to complete the first
draft of the new TEKS standards by July of 2009 for the board’s consideration. One of the
requirements for the committees to submit their subject’s proposed TEKS standards was that the
committee had to unanimously agree on the content (Texas Education Agency, 2011).

In the July 17, 2009, SBOE meeting, the board voted to remind the TEKS standards
review committees of their initial instructions and timeline for completion of the TEKS
standards. Specifically, the board indicated that the committees should pay attention to the
comments from the expert reviewers and the board’s recommendations as well (Texas Education
Agency, 2009a). The board also made a motion to invite committee members to the September
board meeting. In September, the board discussed two issues raised by Ms. Knight, from her
attendance at one of the social studies TEKS standards review committee meetings. It was
suggested that the board consider creating criteria for nominating expert reviewers. This issue
was discussed at the September board meeting, alongside a discussion regarding the role of the
TEKS standards review Committees (Texas Education Agency, 2009b).

In October of 2009, according to the Texas Education Agency (2011) the TEKS
standards review Committees submitted their recommendations for revisions to the social studies
TEKS standards. On January 13, 2010, the SBOE held another full board meeting in which a public hearing was held, allowing the board to hear public testimony regarding the proposed changes to the social studies TEKS standards. On the following day, the board conducted the first reading and filing authorization of the proposed revisions to the social studies curriculum. During this meeting the board amended numerous social studies TEKS standards, and ultimately decided that the board would continue to consider the social studies TEKS standards on Friday, January 15, 2010, during the next full meeting of the board (Texas Education Agency, 2010b). After additional amendments to the proposed social studies TEKS standards were made, the board adjourned, unanimously deciding to put off the first filing and authorization of the recommended social studies TEKS standards until the March meeting (Texas Education Agency, 2010c).

During the March 10, 2010 (Texas Education Agency, 2010c) the board heard public testimony from numerous groups and individuals regarding the proposed revisions to the social studies TEKS standards, and again, began proposing amendments to the standards provided. The meeting adjourned with the board still considering amendments to social studies TEKS standards. It would take the board three full days of meetings to finally complete proposing amendments to the social studies TEKS standards, and on Friday, March 12, 2010, the board voted to accept the first filing and authorization of the social studies TEKS standards, with the amendments approved by the board (Texas Education Agency, 2010d).

At the May 19, 2010 meeting, the board spent several hours listening to public testimony from multiple individuals and groups, interested in the proposed social studies TEKS standards. After all of the interested persons were given the opportunity to speak, the board adjourned (Texas Education Agency, 2010e). On the following day, the board approved the proposed social
studies TEKS standards for the second filing and final authorization. Motions were made with additional amendments, and votes were taken until the board adjourned at 12:07 am (Texas Education Agency, 2010f). Ultimately, the proposed social studies TEKS standards were adopted by the SBOE, after additional motions to amend various portions of the TEKS standards, were made and voted into being (Texas Education Agency, 2010g).

Background of the Texas State Board of Education

According to the Texas Education Agency (2013b) the SBOE is comprised of 15 elected members from single member districts. Together, with the Commissioner of Education, the board administers public education in Texas, using Texas Education Code as the directive. Each of the members of the SBOE brought their unique perspective to the revision process for the proposed social studies TEKS standards. Don McLeroy, a Republican, was first elected to the SBOE in 1998. McLeroy represented District 9 during his tenure on the board. McLeroy was appointed by Governor Rick Perry in 2007 to be the chairman, which is a two year appointment. He was reappointed in 2009, but did not get two/thirds vote required from the Texas Senate to retain his position (Governor Rick Perry, 2009, Feb 6 and Alexander, 2009 April 30). By the time the SBOE was ready to take up the proposed social studies TEKS standards, McLeroy had already earned a reputation for supporting controversial beliefs during the science TEKS standards revision process. McLeroy wrote (2009, March 25) in an editorial to the Austin American-Statesman:

The controversy exists because evolutionists, led by academia's far-left, along with the secular elite opinion-makers, have decreed that questioning of evolution is not allowed, that it is only an attempt to inject religion or creationism into the classroom. Even Texas' 20-year-old requirement to teach the scientific strengths and weaknesses of hypotheses and theories has come under attack. Words that were uncontroversial and perfectly acceptable for nearly two decades are now considered "code words" for intelligent design and are deemed unscientific. The elite fear that "unscientific" weaknesses of evolution
will be inserted into the textbooks, leaving students without a good science education and unprepared for the future, compelling businesses to shun "illiterate" Texas.

McLeroy’s staunch support of the proposed changes to the science curriculum cost him the chairmanship of the SBOE, as his re-appointment as chairman was not supported by other Republicans. Republican state senator, Mike Jackson, of LaPorte, indicated that “the confirmation…[was] dead in the water…there [were] too many other important issues to take up on the floor to waste time on a doomed confirmation” (Alexander, 2009, April 30, paras 1 and 3).

In addition to Don McLeroy, the other members of the Texas State Board of Education included Rene Nuñez, of District 1. Nuñez, a Democrat from El Paso, was first elected to the SBOE in 1988 and served twenty-two years on the board (Smith, 2011). Professionally, Nuñez owns a consulting firm, Rene Nuñez and Associates. Nuñez also holds a real estate license (Texas State Directory, 2013). Mary Helen Berlanga, a Democrat from south Texas, served on the SBOE for the people in District 2 for thirty years. She was first elected in 1982 and served on the board until her retirement in December of 2012. Professionally, Berlanga is a practicing attorney in Corpus Christi (Project Vote Smart, 2013a).Serving District 3, Rick Agosto, a Democrat, was elected in 2006 for two, two-terms. His professional background included the role as president and CEO of a sales and marketing firm (Rick Agosto, 2007). Also serving on the SBOE, was Lawrence A. Allen Jr., a Democrat. Allen was first elected in 2004, and has been continuously re-elected to this position since. Allen serves on the board as the representative from District 4 (Texas Education Agency, 2013c). Allen’s professional service is in the Houston Independent School District as the director of special projects. Previously, he served in administrative positions, and as a classroom teacher.
The representative for District 5, Ken Mercer, still serves on the SBOE. Mercer is a Republican, by party affiliation. His political experience also includes service as a former member of the Texas House of Representatives. He has served on the board since 2006. Professionally, Mercer works in the technology industry as a project manager (Texas Education Agency, 2013d). Terri Leo, a Republican elected to represent District 6, first joined the board in 2002. Leo’s professional expertise is in education. She served in both Garland ISD and Dallas ISD for several years as a teacher and an administrative intern (Terri Leo, 2012). Leo lost her re-election bid in November 2012. Another conservative member of the board, David Bradley, is the representative from District 7. Bradley’s service on the board began in 1996 and he has continued to win re-election to District 7 since his first term in the mid-1990s. Politically, Bradley is a Republican who also owns his own business, along with real estate and insurance licenses (Texas Education Agency, 2013d). Additionally, Barbra Cargill currently serves as the chairman of the SBOE. She was appointed to this position in 2011, and then re-appointed in 2013. Professionally Cargill worked as a science teacher in North Texas before moving to the Woodlands. After moving, she started a science camp for students in partnership with a Methodist church in her area. Cargill is a Republican serving District 8 (Texas Education Agency, 2013d).

One of the board members considered to be a part of the more controversial conservatives included Cynthia Dunbar, a Republican serving District 10. Dunbar became one of the more well known, and controversial members of the board. Dunbar is an attorney, and currently works as an assistant professor in Liberty University’s law school (Liberty University, 2013). Dunbar garnered national attention during the revision process for her indictment of public education’s lack of Christian perspective evident in social studies courses. Many critics claim that Dunbar
had a hidden agenda in the revision of many social studies courses: “On the face of it some of the changes are innocuous but critics say that closer scrutiny reveals a not-so-hidden agenda…students are now to be required to study documents…which instill the idea of America being founded as a Christian fundamentalist nation (McGreal, 2010 May 16, para 21).

Districts 11 – 13 are currently represented by the same individuals that were on the board at the time of the social studies TEKS standards revisions. These three representatives are unique in that they were either somewhat moderate, or liberal in their attitudes towards the social studies revisions. Additionally, all three of these individuals represent a part of North Texas. Patricia Hardy, more frequently known as Pat, is the Republican representative serving District 11. Hardy was first elected to the board in 2002 and has continuously held that position for the last eleven years. Hardy’s professional experience as a classroom social studies teacher, social studies coordinator, and part-time instructional specialist, brought a unique perspective to the social studies revisions (Texas Education Agency, 2013d). One of Hardy’s counterparts, also from the North Texas area, is Geraldine Miller. Miller is a Republican from the Dallas area who returned to service on the board, representing District 12, in 2013. She first served on the board from 1984 until 2012. Miller’s professional experience is as a reading specialist for Scottish Rite Hospital and as a real estate broker (Texas Education Agency, 2013d). One of the most vocal critics of the revision process was representative Mavis Knight, a Democrat, from District 13. Knight has been quite active in education through community organizations, such as the PTA. Knight’s service to the board began in 2002 (Texas Education Agency, 2013d). Knight characterized the process as the more conservative members being “very smooth at excluding the contributions of minorities into the curriculum. It is as if they want to render minority groups totally invisible. I think it's racist. I really do” (McGreal, 2010, May 16, para 27).
Gail Lowe represented District 13 during this process. Lowe has since lost her seat on the board in the Republican primary for the seat in the 2012 races. One issue considered to be a serious factor in Lowe’s failed re-election bid surrounded her position on the teaching of evolution and creationism in schools (Gragg, 2013). Lowe only served on the board from 2008 to 2012. Professionally, Lowe’s experience is in publishing (Project Vote Smart, 2013b). Another conservative board member, Bob Craig, decided to retire from the board in 2011. Craig, a Republican who represented District 15 for ten years, indicated that he would continue to volunteer in education, just not in an elected position. Craig earned much praise from school districts for his efforts as a board member. Craig earned a reputation for collaboration with fellow board members during his tenure (Gulick, 2011). Professionally, Craig works as an attorney in the Lubbock area.

Expanding upon the backgrounds of the fifteen member Texas State Board of Education provides an excellent framework with which to understand the dynamics of this group. The SBOE has a significant amount of authority and influence in shaping the TEKS standards for students across the state of Texas.

Projected Outcome Based on Prior Experiences

CDA is a complicated qualitative research method. It is an important research method to consider when the research proposal includes issues of social justice, inequality, and the power of language to manipulate and control others. Despite the challenges associated with CDA this research method seems to be a good fit within the framework of my own research. A CDA of the government Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills will require copious amounts of time and effort to fully uncover the power structures embedded in the curriculum, and also to discover
what words were left out from the curriculum in an effort to frame a general theme for students in Texas.

The implications of this research could be quite far reaching, as Texas learning standards tend to impact other states throughout the United States due to the large consumption of textbooks Texas requires from textbook companies. Use of CDA in relation to the Texas standards will be most enlightening. Based upon prior experiences and the review of the literature, it is hypothesized that the curriculum does not promote democracy in the freedom of choice and expression for all. Instead the curriculum promotes the ideologies of conservatism and American exceptionalism, and seeks to minimize other ideological perspectives (Gutek, 2004).
APPENDIX C

UNABRIDGED RESULTS
The purpose of CDA is to uncover hidden power structures and inequality (Rogers, 2011). I have used James Gee’s (2011) seven building tasks to examine the government curriculum and unveil hidden power structures. Each building task poses a question regarding the discourse under consideration. The seven questions used for this analysis are:

1. How is language used to denote significance or insignificance of aspects of the curriculum?
2. How does the language encourage actions (Gee, 2011)?
3. What identities of students and citizens are being constructed from the language used in the learning standards?
4. What relationships between government and the curriculum are the documents seeking to create?
5. “What perspective on social goods (public goods, available resources for all people) is this piece of language communicating” (Lakshmanan, 2011, p. 90)?
6. How do the learning standards connect or disconnect students to use the curriculum?
7. How do these documents create “different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief” (Gee, 2006, p. 13)?

To answer each question, I read through the government curriculum several times, in order to become familiar with the content of the document. Next, I read the document carefully considering each question, and looking for language which would provide answers to the questions posed. For instance, as I read through the curriculum, considering the first question of significance, I looked for words that appeared to be important through repetition, placement in
the text, or verb usage. Verbs were important in the analysis because they imply action necessary from students or teachers. After reading for answers to each of the seven building tasks, I made notes, jotted down what seem to be key words, and wrote down emerging themes or patterns. Eventually, I returned to my research questions, and using the notes, themes, and observations collected, began to form answers to each research question, from each of the seven building tasks analyses. Once I put together an outline of results, I began to review the data and develop emerging themes.

*Analysis of State Board of Education Meeting Minutes*

The minutes for the Texas SBOE required a different approach to analysis than the TEKS standards. Each meeting had numerous agenda items listed, some which had nothing to do with the proposed social studies courses. To address the research questions, I analyzed each meeting minutes. I only studied the portions of each meeting which dealt with the social studies curriculum. The most valuable information I found involved board members proposing amendments to the submitted course content. The meeting minutes incorporated in this analysis include: January 13, 14, and 15, March 10 and 12, and May 19, 20, and 21, 2010.

Despite the slight difference in approach to data examination of the Texas SBOE meeting minutes, the framework of analysis is the same. Using Gee’s (2011) seven building tasks, I read through each section of the minutes germane to the proposed social studies curriculum. To answer each question, I explored the curriculum in detail. Next, I read the document, considering each question, while searching for language which would provide answers to the research problems. For instance, as I read through the March 10, 2010 meeting, where frequent motions were made to change numerous aspects of multiple social studies courses, considering the first question of significance, I looked for words that appeared to be important through repetition,
placement in the text, or replacement of existing words in the meeting minutes. After reading the
documents, I made notes and wrote down emerging themes. Finally, I returned to my research
questions, and answered the research questions. This exercise helped me discover emerging
themes or patterns.

The SBOE held meetings on March 10, 11, and 12, 2010. The Texas Education Agency
only posted the minutes for March 10 and 12. The meeting records from March 12, note that the
March 11 included numerous changes to the proposed curriculum. Additionally, all amendments
were attached to the Friday meeting minutes. To determine the date on which each amendment
was made, I returned to the March 10 minutes, and recorded each proposed amendment with the
TEKS standards number. Second, I reviewed the amendments discussed and voted on during the
March 12 meeting. Third, I looked at the attachment of amendments at the end of the minutes
from March 12. I reviewed all of the amendments, listed by content area, and determined which
amendments were not made on March 10 or March 12. This analysis helped me determine which
amendments were made on each of the three meeting dates in March. I used the same data
analysis method for all of the meeting minutes.

Analysis Results of the Government TEKS Standards

Summary of the Government Curriculum

The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for government is divided up into eight parts,
or strands, as described in the TEKS standards. At the beginning of the curriculum, there is a
seven part introduction to the learning standards, which offers an explanation of the course. The
purpose of the course introduction is to offer some rationale for the course, explain the
assumption that students enter this course with broad content knowledge in civics and other
social studies content, and finally, explicitly states the knowledge a majority of board members believe students in Texas should know about government.

A final component of the introduction includes a section regarding “Celebrate Freedom Week” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44, (c) 7). According to the TEKS standards, this week is a celebration of significant events in U.S. history and government. Participation is required by federal laws and Texas Education Code. This particular section holds two interesting interpretations of United States history. The first, espouses the belief in the connection of the Declaration of Independence to the rich diversity of the United States. The curriculum further suggests that the ideas in the Declaration of Independence are the genesis for many significant changes in U.S. society. Two notable events this curriculum ties directly to the beliefs encapsulated in the Declaration are “the abolitionist movement, which led to the Emancipation Proclamation, and the women’s suffrage movement” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44, (c) 7 A). This is not a common interpretation of those events, and only appears to view this part of United States history through a wildly optimistic perspective. This viewpoint implies that the goal of equality found in the Declaration was achieved as a result of these events. The text does not provide room for questioning the concept of equality found on paper, versus reality for formerly enslaved people after the Emancipation Proclamation. At the same time, the struggle for equality and suffrage for women is also not considered.

The second piece of this mandatory, weeklong celebration is the requirement that “students in Grades 3 – 12 must study and recite” the first lines of the Declaration of Independence (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44, 7 B). The required text ends with the phrase “That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed.” It is noteworthy that the curriculum introduces the
notion that a government has authority from the people. It is a theme which is reiterated throughout the document. The last sentence of the introduction requires students to evaluate the success or failures of all governments in the United States at living up to the values found in early American government documents, such as the Declaration of Independence.

After the introduction, the curriculum breaks down the information students should attain during the course. There are eight strands which include: history, geography, economics, government, citizenship, science and technology, and social studies skills. Each strand has learning statements describing the information and skills students should be able to demonstrate. There are twenty two standards encompassed in the curriculum. These learning statements are also broken down into sub-strands. There are eighty one sub-strands. The main learning statements are numbered from one to twenty two, while each sub-strand is linked to the numbered learning statement as alphabetic character. The government course contains two history strands, two geography strands, two in economics, six strands categorized as government, four labeled as citizenship, one designated culture, two listed a science and technology, and three referred to as social studies skills.

Significance

Using Gee’s (2006) building tasks as the framework for the analysis of the Texas government curriculum, the first component identified is significant language present in the curriculum. The Texas government TEKS standards are broken down into eight strands of knowledge. Each of these strands covers an important social studies concept. These strands include content in history, geography, economics, government, citizenship, science and technology, and social studies skills. In the introduction to the course, the curriculum identifies the knowledge that assigns significance through the use of the words “including” and “such as”
(Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44(b) 2 C). The curriculum explicitly states that “[s]tatements that contain the word ‘including’ reference content that must be mastered.” This language directs teachers and students to place importance on content standards where they read the word including (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44(b) 2 C). This emphasis on mastery directs teachers to ensure that students thoroughly understand the information contained in one of these learning standards, while other learning standards may be used to provide examples, or are overlooked in favor of emphasis on the standards in which mastery is expected. Texas Education Agency (2011) explains that TEKS standards “containing the phrase ‘such as’ are…possible illustrative examples” (113.44 (b) 2 C ). This further delineates the importance of certain learning standards. Learning standards with “such as” are worth considering as a potential example; the implication is these ideas are worth considering.

Moreover, the learning standards that contain the word “including” use language that is similar to that used by the Republican Party, as found on the summation of party beliefs, Our Party, (2013). Important issues are described in Table 5.1. Additionally, the beliefs of the Democratic Party are also listed, as found in the summation of party beliefs, Issues (2013). The bias of the curriculum becomes evident through careful examination of the TEKS standards which contain the word “including.” These are the 12 learning standards which must be mastered as a result of a student’s participation in this course. The language present in these standards fits within the paradigm of the Republican Party. As Table 5.1 lists, Republican Party beliefs support freedom of choice, the rights of the individual, and limiting the authority of the national government. For instance, the TEKS standards which require mastery contain several words and phrases which demonstrate a preference for limiting the authority of government: “the law’s [sic]
of nature and nature’s God, unalienable rights, the rights of resistance to illegitimate government, and separation of powers” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44. (c) 1 A, B, 7 D).

Table C.1

**Summation of Democratic and Republican Party Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democratic Party</th>
<th>Republican Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil rights</strong> – support the current movements to end discrimination in areas of race, gender, and sexual orientation</td>
<td><strong>Economy</strong> – support the idea and practice of a free market economy with limited government regulations in the marketplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education – emphasis on student loan legislation, along with reforming <em>No Child Left Behind</em>, but importantly notes that accountability of teachers is a priority.</td>
<td>National defense – support the ability of the United States to defend itself, claims to follow the “peace through strength” foreign policy approach used by President Regan. Additionally, acknowledges the need for working with other nations to achieve success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy independence – interested in pursuing all natural resources to move away from dependence on foreign energy.</td>
<td>Healthcare – support healthcare reform to lower costs, eliminate lawsuit abuses, but does not support government run healthcare programs. Support choice in healthcare for patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare – Affordable Healthcare Act will expand coverage, reduce health care discrimination, end insurance abuse, and reduce Medicare/Medicaid fraud. Immigration reform – support immigration reform with provisions for border security, people living in the U.S. illegally can a path to citizenship, and impose penalties on businesses which employ undocumented workers.</td>
<td>Education – support quality education programs for all students. Believe in school choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/economy – believe the economy will improve and jobs will be created through ending corporate tax loopholes, and cutting taxes on small businesses.</td>
<td>Energy – support an all-encompassing approach to energy, using all energy sources available to power the United States. Oppose a national energy tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security – prevent terrorist acts and activities through information, intelligence, and international cooperation.</td>
<td>Courts – support the belief that judges are to interpret the law, nothing more. Judges should use the Constitution to interpret the law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open government – the U.S. government should have open, clear lines of communication with the people. Lobbyists should not have as much influence, and more accountability in national spending.</td>
<td>Science and technology – support this through expanding college access programs, such as through student lending, stem cell research, and emphasis in school in science and math.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and technology – support this through expanding college access programs, such as through student lending, stem cell research, and emphasis in school in science and math.</td>
<td>Retirement security – believe social security is a major instrument of retirement security, strengthening Medicare is important, and the government should provide a system in which Americans may have “pension portability” (Democrats, 2013).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the Democratic Party Platform and the Republican Party Platforms.
Furthermore, a bias towards Republican beliefs appears with the continual focus on the rights and responsibilities of the individual. Language choice reaffirming the importance of the individual is present in many of the government TEKS standards, but specifically those requiring mastery, use “individual rights…identify the individuals…voluntary individual participation…issues of liberty, rights, and responsibilities of individuals” to imply that government is a collective effort of many individuals making separate decisions about the way in which the government may act for a single person’s benefit (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 1 A, B, C, F, 7 D).

Equally important, is the frequent appearance of Republican or conservative historical figures in the TEKS standards, than Democratic. To illustrate, one of the 12 required TEKS Standards directs students “to identify significant individuals in the field of government and politics, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Ronald Regan” (Texas Education Agency, 113.44 (c) 1 F). All of these historical figures contributed to U.S. history, but only two represent the Democratic Party, while three represent the Republican Party. Initially, this seems of little consequence. Considering the amount of information contained in the government curriculum, even seemingly small discrepancies represent a larger agenda.

Conversely, any ideas or issues supported by the Democratic Party are found in the learning standards which contain the phrase “such as.” This is significant because these learning standards are not part of the standards the board intended students to master. They are separated to signify a level of importance not afforded to the learning standards without “including” or “such as,” and yet, these TEKS standards are stated to be “possible illustrative examples” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a)(b) 3 c). To illustrate, some of the noteworthy topics
addressed ask students to consider the impact of important court cases, such as *Baker v. Carr*, *Hernandez v. Texas*, and *Grutter v. Bollinger*. These potential examples address concerns of equity, a notable portion of the liberal ideology in the United States (Gutek, 2004). Government policies and interest groups that seek the expansion of voting rights, equity, and embrace the notion of a collective good in governance are present in the Texas government curriculum. However, these standards are also categorized as potential examples, and students are not required or expected to leave the course with a mastery of these policies and groups, namely, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, the League of Latin American Citizens, or the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 3 C, 16 A, 17 A, B). The distinction in word choice and the emphasis for what students must learn versus information that may be used as an example demonstrates a preference for conservative values and the support for American exceptionalism embedded within the curriculum.

**Activities**

A second building task that Gee (2006) highlights, is activities. Specifically, what kinds of action does the language in the curriculum promote? The TEKS standards for government ask for only three non-cognitive activities in the curriculum. In the introduction, it states that students should recite the preamble to the Declaration of Independence during the required “Celebrate Freedom” week. The second and third instances of action urged are found at the end of the curriculum in the learning standards labeled “social studies skills.” The standards suggest that students demonstrate the ability to transfer information as part of a presentation on a social studies topic, while also asking students to create a product to use in conjunction with their presentation (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 22 A, B). Moreover, the other verbs at
use in the curriculum direct students to perform cognitive activities as part of the consumption of new information. The introduction to the course refers to government as a culmination of knowledge students’ gain throughout their schooling, asserting that the expectation is that students are both reviewing and learning new information. The curriculum reinforces this notion as students are asked to understand, identify, explain, evaluate, examine, analyze, give examples, compare, and describe, repeatedly throughout the course. The government standards do not promote social interaction, group dialogue, or collaborative work. Instead the emphasis is on individual comprehension and individual tasks.

Identities

The examination of the identities constructed by the curriculum for students and citizens is the third building task emphasized by Gee (2006). The identity of a student/citizen the curriculum promotes is an individual who embraces a free market structure in the economy, a republican form of government, and one who questions the authority of government. The government TEKS standards suggest students “analyze historical and contemporary conflicts over the respective roles of national and state governments” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 9 C). In addition, the curriculum constructs an identity of a person who also continually questions the authority of the government and its place in their life, for the most part on a daily basis. It is necessary that students “understand the roles of limited government and the rule of law in the protection of individual rights” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 A). Finally, the citizen produced through the curriculum is one who professes a belief, either through moral support, or religious faith, in the importance of the Bible and biblical teaching in the history of the United States. Some of the moral teachings of the Bible are overtly reinforced
through the emphasis of the role of Moses and the Ten Commandments as an influence on the United States Constitution (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 1 A).

Relationships

Another important topic for consideration is the relationship formed between the curriculum and government. The government standards emphasize the importance of republicanism, and federalism, particularly the notion of shared powers. The text also highlights the limits on the government through checks and balances, the distinction of separate powers, and the rights of individuals. Using the latter, the curriculum builds an underlying theme of questioning the authority of the national government. One way this is accomplished is through repeatedly stressing the limited authority of the national government. Students are directed to “identify the freedoms and rights guaranteed by each amendment in the Bill of Rights” as an understated method of accentuating the boundaries of the national government’s ability to restrict individual liberties (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 C). Placing a great regard for the rights of the individual and the protection of individual rights creates a relationship that implies distrust and almost an expectation that the government will betray the people, if the people are not diligently monitoring the government’s power.

This wariness of the national government produces the perception that a contract exists between the people and the government. The curriculum, then, is a tool useful for teaching students how to navigate the current system of government. Much of the language is used to describe the tasks students must complete as part of the curriculum. Students are encouraged to continually analyze the authority of the national government (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c)). At the same time, the course reinforces the idea of accepting the current system of government and history of the nation. To illustrate, the introduction to government states that a
large portion of the “course is on the U.S. Constitution, its underlying principles and ideas, and
the form of government it created” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 1). The
relationship between the curriculum and government forms the foundation of support for the
existing government structure. This relationship dictates, in a top down manner, the knowledge
worth knowing is prearranged for teachers and students alike, from the combined effort of the
Texas Education Agency and the SBOE, and the curriculum is a means for acceptance of the
status quo.

Politics

Discovery of the ways in which societal norms in politics cultivate serves as Gee’s (2006)
fifth building task. The Texas government curriculum produces political norms through the use
of mostly cognitive verbs in the learning standards. These verbs reflect a preference for critical
thinking, where students are asked to evaluate and analyze information presented to them, and
then make determinations regarding the validity or acceptability of the material. However, the
cognitive verbs ask for no action or changes to the curriculum, but simply directs students to
understand the existing system. The expectations of the curriculum indicate the political norms
include patriotism, a free enterprise economic system, and an appreciation of basic democratic
values, such as popular sovereignty, election of public officials, and elected officials that abide
by the wishes of the people (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a)(b) 5).

Moreover, the curriculum explicitly expresses Republican beliefs in the learning
standards. A Republican philosophy, such as “evaluat[ing] how the federal government serves
the purposes set forth in the Preamble to the U.S. Constitution” expresses an underlying mistrust
of the national government obtaining too much authority (Texas Education Agency, 2011,
113.44 (c) 8). Additionally, references in the TEKS standards, to the foundation of the United
States embrace the past as crucial in the continuity of the current government structure. This TEK indicates a belief that is in-line with a strict, constitutionalist perspective. The curriculum also demonstrates a belief in the importance of the Judeo-Christian faith, and that religious freedom is evident in the Constitution, while the notion of separation of church and state is not (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 7 G). The influence of Christianity in American government is referenced in the first learning standard. Students are directed to understand how the creation of American government was affected by biblical law. The learning standards specifically mention the impact of Moses and the Ten Commandments. At the same time, students are, in another standard, asked to “examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America and guaranteed its free exercise” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 7 G). Immediately after students are instructed to identify why Congress cannot establish a national religion or deny people the ability to freely exercise a religion, students are required to “compare and contrast this to the phrase “‘separation of church and state’” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 7 G).

The curriculum also addresses the issue of the size and scope of the national government through overtly and subtly suggesting the appropriate size of the national government should be small and its authority, as granted by the Constitution, is limited. To illustrate, refer to TEKS standards 9 A – D, in which the emphasis of the main learning standard, and the four sub-standards, is to note the division of power in the national government. Students are asked to examine how this political structure is different from other forms of government, while at the same time, students are directed to “understand the limits on the national and state governments in the U.S. federal system of government” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 9 D). The preference for small national government is also evident in the portion of the curriculum that
guides students to analyze judicial activism. This word choice is important to note because judicial activism is a term used to express displeasure at the role judges assume in their rulings and interpretations of the law. Instead of asking students to consider the ways in which court rulings have enforced, protected, or implemented civil rights and liberties, students are only required to study the role of the courts from the perspective that judges occasionally step beyond their sphere of influence to create policy, rather than interpret laws to ensure they agree with the Constitution.

Furthermore, the curriculum encourages students to identify opportunities for people to participate in government. There is not a suggestion that students begin to participate, only that they learn of the opportunities for participation. Toward the middle of the curriculum, in the citizenship strands, it is explicitly stated that “the roles of limited government…in the protection of individual rights” are important for students to appreciate (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 A).

Finally, it is worth noting that all suggestions or illustrative examples for participation in government reflect activities that can be linked to the interests and concerns of the Republican Party. As an example, TEK 14 C, part of the citizenship strands, asks students to learn about the tasks associated with citizenship, “such as being well informed about civic affairs, serving in the military, voting, serving on a jury, observing the laws, paying taxes…” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c)). The relationship between the curriculum and the government develops a notion of politics which is representative of many Republican Party issues, embraces the status quo, and reinforces the idea that fundamentally, the United States government was created with concern for individuals and the desire for a small national government.
Connections with the Curriculum

As previously mentioned, there are numerous studies that find young adults are the least engaged in political activities (Andolina, et al., 2002; Khane, Chi and Middaugh, 2006; Khane and Sporte, 2008; Knight, Abowitz and Harnish, 2006). One way in which researchers can uncover more of the reasoning behind this trend is to search for the connections or disconnections that are created between the government curriculum and students (Gee, 2006). The Texas government curriculum creates a top-down power structure, which likely disconnects students from the content. Dewey (1916) and Freire (2009) both discuss the need for all participants in education to choose the knowledge worth knowing, “the naming of the world” and allow for civic education to be a democratic practice. A required curriculum does not represent democratic education.

Equally significant are conservative and American exceptionalism philosophies evident throughout the curriculum. Edwards, Wattenburg, and Lineberry (2008) explain that the strongest influence in the political socialization of young adults is the family. In Texas, government is generally taught at the senior level. Students arrive in a class at age seventeen or eighteen, and by that time, whether they recognize it or not, have generally aligned their political beliefs. Students who do not identify with conservative and American exceptionalist beliefs could easily disconnect from a curriculum filled with obvious or indirect preference for these ideological perspectives.

Furthermore, the TEKS standards directly mention the influence of the Judeo-Christian faith in the curriculum. Students are required to “identify major intellectual, philosophical, political, and religious traditions that informed the American founding, including Judeo-Christian (especially biblical law)” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 1 B). This is
noteworthy due to the fact that only mentioning one major religion possibly alienates students other faiths or no faith at all. Nevertheless, this learning standard is one of the 12 which students are required to master throughout the course. This TEK also highlights the conservative ideological preference in the Texas learning standards. Conservatism seek to preserve tradition, maintain the status quo in institutions, and advocates the “transmitting of beliefs about knowledge and values from one generation…to the next” (Gutek, 2004, p. 198).

Similarly, the curriculum disconnects students through the insinuation that questioning the current government structure is discouraged. The curriculum implies that there is nothing further for students to contribute. Their civic duty is to embrace the current structure, which in many aspects, does not represent them. The TEKS standards do not allow or acknowledge the passion and interests of students, nor do the TEKS standards draw current events into the content. For example, despite the fact that this curriculum was written and adopted in 2009 – 2010, there is no mention of President Obama. Further, there is an assumption at the beginning of the curriculum that all students have an equal knowledge base of social studies concepts. The introduction to the government standards explains, “Throughout social studies in Kindergarten-Grade 12, students build a foundation in … economics; government; citizenship; and social studies skills. The content…enables students to understand the importance of patriotism, function in a free enterprise society, and appreciate the basic democratic values of our state” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.(c) 5 and nation as referenced in the Texas Education Code (TEC), §28.002(B).

Students are expected to be able to “focus…on the U.S. Constitution, its underlying principles and ideas…students identify the role of government in the free enterprise system” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a) (b) 1). Students without the prior knowledge will
disconnect from the curriculum, as it will not be relevant information. Dewey (1916) advocates allowing students to build from their common experiences, so that learners form connections and assign meaning to their education.

The curriculum excludes references to people and groups who believe, act, and in some instances, look differently than the majority of the board members. To illustrate, there are only five references to minority groups or past areas of discrimination in the government TEKS standards. The only references to the civil rights movement found in the government curriculum gloss over the abuses of African Americans civil rights and liberties, in fact they are hardly even referenced: “recall the conditions that produced the 14th Amendment and describe subsequent efforts to selectively extend some of the Bill of Rights to the states…evaluate a U.S. government policy or court decision…affected a particular racial…group, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 F, 17 A).

Lastly, the government course promotes patriotism and equity, and yet does not ask students to find examples of these concepts in current society. The TEKS standards also do not ask students to consider how the government affects them. Furthermore, there is no acknowledgement of students’ changing perceptions of government. In its place is the expectation that students recognize the benefits of the current system, while also encouraging students to embrace a small national government as best (Andolina et al, 2002).

Signs and Systems of Knowledge

After careful review and consideration of the government curriculum, one of the most important ideas to consider is the TEKS standards attempt to influence what students know and believe (Gee, 2006). The curriculum represents required information that students must study and demonstrate successful completion of in order to receive a diploma in Texas (Texas
Education Agency, 2013). Due to the state of the curriculum as a mandate from above, the knowledge worth knowing—what is important to learn about government, is pre-determined for teachers and students.

As a result, the Texas SBOE distinguished the ideas that are most important using “including” as a signal to teachers and students that those learning standards require mastery. Government TEKS standards include many ideas embraced by the Republican Party. The board, comprised at the time of ten Republicans and five Democrats, interjected many implicit and explicit values of limited government, rights of the individual, and the benefits of a free enterprise economic system. At the same time, the curriculum lacks any significant mention of diversity or the role of government in the expansion of civil rights or civil liberties for many underrepresented groups in the United States.

The phrase “such as” reflects another way in which the board attempts to exert influence over student beliefs. The learning standards which contain this phrase propose that the information after “such as” could be considered important in the context as a meaningful example. There are few examples of diversity, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, these learning standards are described as “possible illustrative examples,” infer that the information is not substantial enough to require mastery (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (a) (b) 3). The most significant repercussion is that Republican Party values are emphasized. What, then, of the other learning standards? If those TEKS standards contain neither required information nor potential teaching examples, then what value is associated with those parts of the curriculum? Is that information worth considering?
Summary of the SBOE Minutes

January Meetings

January 13, 2010 was the first meeting of the committee of the full board listed for the Texas SBOE in the spring of 2010. Fourteen members of the board were present; Cynthia Dunbar was absent. During that meeting, there were five items on the agenda the board addressed before considering items related to the revision of social studies courses. Throughout the rest of the meeting, board members heard public testimony in regards to the proposed social studies course revisions. According to the meeting minutes, seventy-three people testified before the board. These individuals represented themselves, independent school districts in Texas, or other organizations and interest groups with a vital interest in the curricular revisions. At the conclusion of the meeting, Mary Helen Berlanga made a motion to continue public testimony the following day. The motion failed, and the meeting was adjourned by chairperson, Gail Lowe.

The next morning, the committee of the full board reconvened with all members present. The board’s agenda included four items prior to resuming deliberation of social studies course revisions. Anita Givens, associate commissioner for standards and programs, gave a brief explanation of binders distributed to each member that showed the TEKS standards review committee’s recommended changes. Immediately after Ms. Given’s finished, the board began to make amendments to the proposed social studies TEKS standards. During the remainder of the meeting, one hundred and twelve amendments were proposed. Mr. Craig moved late in the evening that the all additional items left on the agenda be tabled until the following day, and the board recess until Friday morning. The motion passed, and chairperson Gail Lowe adjourned the meeting at 10:43pm.
Friday morning, January 15, 2010, the Texas SBOE committee of the full board once again returned to the work of addressing the proposed social studies curricula. Chairperson Gail Lowe began the meeting with an explanation that the board was resuming work from the previous day. Ms. Givens reintroduced the suggested social studies courses. After Ms. Givens concluded her remarks, the board began discussion of the United States history course from 1877. Fifty one amendments to the United States history course were voted on in the Friday meeting. Mr. Craig moved that the board should postpone further work until the March meetings. The motion easily passed and the board adjourned at 2:28 pm.

March Meetings

The March 10, 2010 meeting of the committee of the full board began with a presentation from Anita Givens. The first item on the agenda was to have been public testimony regarding the proposed changes to the English Language Arts curricula, however, Ms. Givens explained that no one signed up to testify. The public testimony was closed, and the board moved to the next item on their agenda, the second reading and final adoption of the proposed English Language Arts curricula. The board voted to adopt the new curricula.

The third item on the agenda was public testimony regarding the proposed social studies course revisions. The board heard testimony from forty five individuals representing themselves, independent school districts in Texas, or organizations and interest groups, concerned with the revisions to Texas social studies courses. Once the public testimony concluded, Ms. Hardy, and Dr. McElroy made motions to amend the proposed social studies curricula. Once again, the board spent the day suggesting fifty seven. The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

The committee of the full board met on March 11, 2010, but there is no official meeting minutes found on the Texas Education Agency’s website. All of the other meeting minutes are
located on TEA’s website. Instead, the content of that meeting is addressed in the March 12, 2010 meeting minutes.

The Texas SBOE meeting on March 12, 2010 was designated as SBOE General Meeting. All board members were present, and the meeting started with a performance of students from Klein ISD. Following the performance, an invocation was given, the pledge recited, and the meeting minutes from January 15, 2010 were approved. One individual then provided public testimony concerning graduation requirements. Next, the board took action on six items before resuming deliberation of the proposed social studies curricula. The first item discussed were the amendments made to the courses from March 10 – 12, 2010. The March 12 minutes explain that the board worked until late in the evening on March 11, and made multiple amendments to the proposed social studies courses without completing revisions. Additionally, the board decided to continue social studies course changes the following day. However, the board left at such a late hour that the March 11 minutes did not have an accurate record of all proposed amendments. To address this concern, the March 12 minutes have an attachment with all proposed amendments, listed by course.

During the March 12 meeting, Dr. McElroy motioned for the board to approve the proposed social studies curricula for the first reading and filing. Before that vote was officially taken, the board members once again began to suggest amendments to various social studies courses, but the bulk of amendments were to high school courses. There were only fourteen amendments offered on March 12, and the board did accept the amended social studies courses for the first reading and filing authorization. Eighteen other items were discussed before the board adjourned at 3:10pm.
May Meetings

In May, the board reconvened from May 18 – 21, 2010. The social studies courses were not discussed in the May 18 meeting. On the 19th, the first item on the agenda included public testimony of the proposed social studies courses. The remainder of the meeting was allocated to the one hundred and twenty individuals who testified. Participants who testified included former Secretary of Education, Ron Paige, members of the Texas House of Representatives, individuals representing themselves, people representing independent school districts, interest groups, and other organizations. The meeting adjourned at 11:58pm.

The next morning, the board began with a discussion of parliamentary procedures, listened to the Commissioner of Education and the Deputy Associate Commissioner, and then returned to the work of the proposed social studies courses. The tentative social studies curricula finally made it to the second reading and adoption phase of the process. Mr. Bradley suggested that the board vote on the second reading and final adoption of the courses. Before the vote on second reading and final adoption could be taken, Mrs. Knight moved to amend additional TEKS standards. The board considered fifty five additional changes to the proposed social studies courses on May 20. They did not take a final vote on the second reading and final adoption of the social studies curricula. The last item on the board’s agenda was moved to the next day, and the board adjourned at 12:07am.

Friday, May 21, 2010 was a SBOE General meeting. The morning began with another student performance, from Hurst-Euless-Bedford ISD show choir, followed by an invocation, pledge of allegiance, and approval of the minutes from the March 12, 2010 meeting. Public testimony was allowed from two individuals, seeking to address access to education and areas of
concern with the State Board for Educator Certification. Five additional items were attended to before the proposed revisions to social studies courses were the next item considered.

Chairperson Gail Lowe explained that the board worked through the night on May 20, but only finished discussion through 8th grade. As such, the board decided to continue revising the high school courses. Ms. Lowe also pointed out where to locate the complete list of amendments made the previous day. The proposed revisions to the high school courses had seventy four amendments offered before the board finally voted to adopt the amended social studies TEKS standards, to become effective in the 2011 – 2012 school year. The SBOE considered fourteen additional agenda items before adjourning at 7:20 that evening.

Significance

Throughout the pages of the SBOE meeting minutes from the spring of 2010, many significant areas of language use are evident. However, the January 13, March 10, and May 19 minutes demonstrate great significance in language choice. The pages of public testimony provide evidence of the many groups concerned about the content in the revised social studies curricula. The meeting notes list the name and affiliation of each speaker. It is unwise to speculate regarding the content of each person’s testimony, but the organizations and affiliations of the volunteers who freely came to participate in state government provide insight. Table 5.2 lists, in order of appearance, the organizations represented over the meetings in which the board heard public testimony that spring.

Any organizations or groups which have a number in parenthesis next to the name, represents the number of representatives who spoke at any of the three public hearings. The people who came to speak were a diverse group. The diversity of speakers, in comparison to a government curriculum lacking diversity, suggests a very strong response to the proposed
curricular revisions. All of the people who attended any of these public hearings, most likely desired to influence the revision of the social studies courses for the state of Texas.

Table C.2

Organizations Represented at SBOE Public Hearings for Proposed Social Studies Curricula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Represented Organization Name</th>
<th>Other Organization Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admiral in the Texas Navy (2)</td>
<td>Multicultural Alliance for Social Studies Advocacy</td>
<td>Liberty Institute (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Community Relations, Greater Dallas (2)</td>
<td>Constitution Society (2)</td>
<td>Fair Park Bible Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Freedom Network (2)</td>
<td>America’s Last Patrol</td>
<td>Southern Methodist University, Dept of Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamette University Center for Religion, Law, and Democracy</td>
<td>La Union del Pueblo Entero</td>
<td>National Japanese Memorial Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity University Chaplain Retired Educator</td>
<td>Proyo Azteca, City of San Juan</td>
<td>UT El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Public Library</td>
<td>League of United Latin American Citizens (7)</td>
<td>Texas Navy Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurlock Law Firm</td>
<td>Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Azteca</td>
<td>Japanese-American Citizens League (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Teacher National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Dallas Area (4)</td>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
<td>Center for Islamic Pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State Historical Association</td>
<td>Bexar County Czech Heritage Society</td>
<td>Palestinians for Peace and Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State Representative (14)</td>
<td>Texas State University</td>
<td>Texas State Teachers Association (National Education Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. P. Properties</td>
<td>Texas Indigenous Council</td>
<td>Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays PFLAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans United for Separation of Church and State (2)</td>
<td>Texas Family of Incarcerated Youth</td>
<td>Midlothian ISD Project CaSh (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Rock High School</td>
<td>Texas Holocaust and Genocide Commission</td>
<td>Palestinian-American Cultural Center – Houtson (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American G.I. Forum (4)</td>
<td>UT/US Latino WWII Oral History Project</td>
<td>Equality Texas Foundation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Education Reform (3)</td>
<td>Sikh Coalition (2)</td>
<td>Turtle Clan – Payaya Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary of Disabled Veterans</td>
<td>National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (4)</td>
<td>Austin ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union, Texas (2)</td>
<td>Carrizo-Comecrudo Tribe of Texas (2)</td>
<td>Texas Eagle Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Council for Social Studies</td>
<td>Hindu-American Foundation</td>
<td>A+ Writers and Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovejoy ISD</td>
<td>Texas AFT (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many speakers urged the board to reconsider or alter some of the learning standards from one meeting to the next. For example, former Secretary of Education, Rob Paige, asked the board to reconsider the learning standards before taking a final vote (Michael, 2010). Ben Jealous, the
president of the NAACP also spoke at the public hearings. He mentioned concern for the quality of the social studies standards, along with State Representative Helen Giddings, and Representative Trey Fischer Martinez, president of the Mexican American Legislative Caucus (Stutz, 2010).

Another area in which language is significant includes the end of each of the three public hearings. At the conclusion of the January 13 meeting, Mary Helen Berlanga moved to extend public testimony for an additional day. The motion failed, and the chairperson Gail Lowe concluded the meeting. In the March meeting, the language intensifies the significance of the board’s seeming disregard for the concerns of the people that testified. Once the public testimony finished, the board immediately moved into amending social studies TEKS standards. The actions of the board were consistent in the May meetings. The board dutifully heard public testimony late into the evening, but as they reconvened the next day, further amendments of the social studies TEKS standards continued. This is of particular significance, because the phrase “holding elected officials to their word” is actually in the government TEKS standards, yet the board appeared to ignore all of the individuals who came to express concern or interest in the revision of the social studies curricula (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.44 (b) (c) ).

Finally, a telling example of the significance given to specific language emerges from a disagreement between board members as revisions were being proposed to the U.S. history since 1877 course. TEK 113.41 (c) 24 B initially read:

Describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature, such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, hip hop, and country and western music on American society. (2010)

This TEK was first revised in January when Dr. McElroy proposed an amendment to strike hip hop from the standard, and replace it with country and western music. The motion was
unsuccessful. This did not deter Dr. McElroy. He once again proposed, during the March 11 meeting, that hip hop be removed from this standard. Initially, the motion passed, but not all board members were satisfied with this change. There were four additional changes to this TEK suggested during the March 12 meeting, with two of the four amendments passing. Mr. Agosto and Mr. Nunez suggested that the Beat Generation be removed from the standard, while also adding hip hop back in to the TEK. Ms. Knight and Ms. Hardy voiced their support for the Beat Generation remaining in the TEK. Ultimately, the Beat Generation remained in the TEK, while hip hop was removed. If the intent of the learning standard is for students to learn about important cultural events in art, music, and literature, why would hip hop be excluded? It gives the impression that the culture associated with the hip hop movement was not part of the vision for social studies content held by many on the board. It is yet another example of the exclusion of diversity from the curriculum.

Activities

It is also important to study the activities encouraged by the curriculum (Gee, 2006). It is interesting to note that the language and actions of the board, as documented in the text, do not promote any activities. The verbs used throughout the TEKS standards require cognitive processes, i.e. thinking, analyzing, evaluating, but do not ask students to perform any physical activities. In the government standards, only the generic social studies skills TEKS standards ask students to create a product, but the document is vague concerning the product students must create.

Furthermore, the actions from the board indicate that they will allow citizens to come and testify during the public hearings, but only for a certain length of time. Once enough people voiced their opinions, (as determined by the board chairperson) the board was satisfied. For
example, at the January 13 meeting, numerous people came to speak at the public hearing, but at the end of the day, no more additional public testimony was allowed. Overtly, the board’s actions were consistent with the social studies curricula’s directive that students learn about the role of public officials to be responsive to the people; however, there are no actions within the meeting minute texts to demonstrate that the board addressed the concerns of the people. It seems with each month’s increasing number of people who signed up to testify at the public hearings the board potentially ignored many of the concerns voiced by the people.

Identities

The meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE spring of 2010 carefully construct the identity of a citizen for students from attendance and participation in social studies courses. As an illustration, at the January 14 meeting, the first two motions and amendments added the term “good citizens” to several elementary grade level social studies courses. This is important to note because it is a subjective, value-added term. In whose opinion is the basis for what makes a “good citizen”? As I read the minutes from the board’s 2010 spring meetings, it is obvious a majority of the board worked to insert beliefs which they determined make “good citizens.”

The board builds upon the identity of a citizen as individuals who value a strict interpretation of the Constitution, limited authority in the national government, and a preference for a free enterprise economic system. Evidence of the identity under construction is found throughout the meeting minutes. For instance, in several amendments the board voted to add patriotism as an illustrative example of good citizen contributions (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.11 (b) 15 B). Additionally, the board passed three general amendments at the March 10 meeting which removed the phrase “democratic republic” and replaced it with “constitutional republic” in all social studies courses from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Further building
upon their Republican Party preferences, the second general amendment replaced “democratic societies” in favor of “societies with representative governments” in all social studies courses. Lastly, the third blanket amendment required that any social studies course that used the term “free enterprise” mandated an additional sentence be added. The new sentence required that “students identify the role of free enterprise within the parameter of this course and understand that this system may also be referenced as capitalist or free market system” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113. (a)(b)(c)).

The identity of a citizen, constructed from the proposed social studies TEKS standards, supports those who desire a limited national government. A proposed world history TEK illustrates this preference with an example of human rights abuses in other systems of government – the potential consequence of a large national government. Students are asked to “review the record of human rights, such as abuses of human rights abuses of unlimited governments, such as the oppression of Christians in the Sudan” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.18 (b) 11 D). The preference for American Exceptionalism is noted in the specific reference to Christians (Gutek, 2004). Continuing with the emphasis on the individual in the construction of citizenship identity, the curriculum asks students to “explain the role of significant individuals in the development of self-government,” at the same time, the identity of a citizen also questions the limits of the national government by requiring students to “explain constitutional issues raised by federal government policy changes during times of significant events, including World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, the 1960s, and 9/11” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.20 (b) 20 A; 113.41 (c) 19 B). Evidence of the kind of citizen constructed by the proceedings exist in social studies courses in elementary, middle, and high schools. Repeatedly, a citizen is identified as one who desires a limited national government,
values the importance of the individual, and lastly, supports a free enterprise economic system.
In the U.S. history since 1877 course, the curriculum requires that students “understand how the free enterprise system drives technological innovation and its application in the marketplace” to underscore the belief that this particular economic system is the best available (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.41 (c) 27 C).

Relationships

The relationship between the government and curriculum built is influenced by the dominant board members, who manipulated the curriculum to reinforce the dominant party’s political beliefs in the public school curriculum. Ten of the fifteen board members, in the spring of 2010, were elected to their positions as Republican Party members. Though some of the board members were more extreme in their political beliefs, the language found throughout the Texas SBOE meeting minutes consistently reveals a preference for Republican Party language and associated values. Several board members voted to approve general, blanket amendments which used language associated with Republican beliefs, such as “societies with representative governments” in place of “democratic societies” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113. (a)(b)(c)).

Moreover, the majority on the board voted in favor of language which emphasized the role of a Judeo-Christian heritage in United States government, along with subtle attempts to subvert the accepted practice of separation of church and state. The Constitution does not actually contain this language. A few board members highlighted this point with a proposed amendment to the government curriculum. Students were asked to “examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America…and compare and contrast this to the phrase ‘separation of church and state’”(Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.44 (c) 7 G). Mr. Craig proposed this particular amendment, but other board members supported the effort. This
amendment insinuated that the intent of the Founding Fathers was to embrace Christian principles in government. American exceptionalism further supports the belief that the United States was meant to be governed by Christian principles because many people, including Alexis de Tocqueville, believed that God favored the people of the United States (Gutek, 2004). At the same time, the amendment subtly created doubt as to the constitutionality of the applied principle of separation of church and state in landmark Supreme Court cases. This notion aligns with the stated Republican Party belief that the role of the judicial system in the United States is simply to interpret the law and the Constitution, not create policy from the bench (Republican Party, 2013).

Politics

Gee’s (2006) fifth building task seeks to understand how discourse established political norms for society. Lakshmanan (2011) adds that this task seeks to understand “what is being communicated as to what is taken to be normal, right, and good, appropriate…high or low status” (p. 90). In context, what are the norms for an elevated status in politics in Texas? In this analysis the political norms that emerge are of citizens who hold moral, social, and economic values consistent with the principles espoused by the Republican Party. To illustrate, one U.S. history since 1877 (2010) TEK reflects this inclination: “describe the causes and key organizations and individuals of the conservative resurgence of the 1980s and 1990s, including Phyllis Schlafly, the Contract with America, the Heritage Foundation, the Moral Majority, and the National Rifle Association; and” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.41 (c) 10 E).

Additionally, citizens in Texas are portrayed to be individuals who regularly vote, pay taxes, follow the rules, demonstrate patriotism, and embrace a vision of government that desires to uphold the Constitution with a limited national government. This represents both conservatism and American exceptionalism. Conservative ideology would embrace the notion of a strict, or
traditional interpretation of the Constitution, while American exceptionalism supports the belief that “Americans created the best of all possible systems – a republican form of government, democratic institutions, and a free-enterprise economy” (Gutek, 2004, p. 165). For instance, at the last meetings in May, Ms. Dunbar proposed a blanket amendment that would insert a statement into the introduction of all social studies courses that reads: “[s]tudents understand that a constitutional republic is a representative form of government whose representatives derive their authority from the consent of the governed, serve for an established tenure, and are sworn to uphold the Constitution” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113. (a) (b) (c)).

Also noteworthy, is the repeated emphasis on a free enterprise economic system in almost all of the social studies courses. Even the title of the economics course, Economics With Emphasis on the Free Enterprise System and its Benefits, reflects the Republican Party (2013) statement of support that a free enterprise economic system leads to prosperity. Furthermore, board members motioned to add the benefits of a free enterprise economy in numerous TEKS standards, including the requirement that students in elementary grades “explain how government regulations and taxes impact consumer costs (2010, 113.14 (b) 11 A). Seemingly every opportunity in which some of the Republican board members had to include discussion of the free enterprise system was taken full advantage. McElroy found it important to move that students “understand the influence of scientific discoveries, and technological innovations, and the free enterprise system on the standard of living in the United States” so that students would associate scientific and technological innovation with a free enterprise economic system (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.41 (c) 27). In the documents I found only references to the benefits of a free enterprise. There are no instances in which the quality of or disadvantages of the economic system are questioned.
Connections

As a study of the language in the SBOE meeting minutes, it is important to uncover connections between the students and the curriculum through CDA (Gee, 2006). The connections among the curriculum and students which exist continue to follow the emerging trend, which reflects a preference for Republican Party ideology. A few board members, such as Dr. McElroy, Ms. Dunbar, and Ms. Miller, who appeared to strictly support conservative social and moral principles, pushed for amendments that removed learning standards which were divergent from their guiding philosophies. For instance, at one of the final May meetings, Ms. Knight proposed a change to a learning standard in sociology which would “differentiate between sex, a biological and physical characteristic, and gender, a social construct, and discuss how gender and socialization interact.” The motion failed. This possible change does not align with the conservative paradigm. In conservatism, maintaining traditional social structures is important. The traditional gender structure accepted in conservatism does not support the belief that there could be differences in sex, and was not acceptable to allow in the curriculum (Gutek, 2004).

In some instances, when a motion failed, other board members would attempt to revise the failed motion as a compromise, so that some of the wording or changes to the learning standard were accepted, while other words remained out of the standard. In this particular circumstance, the motion simply failed (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.46 (c) 12 A). These actions and word choice help to connect students who support conservative or American exceptionalism ideology; the actions and diction reaffirm those ideological beliefs. At the same time, these actions disconnect many young adults from the social studies learning standards because they identify with other ideological beliefs, such as liberal philosophy. Students who are racial minorities most likely disconnect with the learning standards. It is important to note the
absence of racial diversity in the standards. The people, events, legislation not covered in the curriculum are just as important as those who are. The absence of racial diversity implies that the other stories of American history are not the knowledge worth knowing (Rogers et al, 2005).

Moreover, it is possible that the value-based, subjective statements of “good citizenship” found in several social studies courses disconnects students from the curriculum, regardless of their political party affiliation. As Andolina et al. (2002) report, the notion of citizenship and behavior that is considered consistent with political participation, varies greatly among adults in the United States. Young adults do not share the same views of citizenship and participation held by adults in their mid-thirties and older. Edwards (2009) notes that even with the 2008 presidential election, with President Obama as a very appealing candidate to many 18-24 year olds, that age demographic still represented the smallest percentage of voters.

Signs and Systems of Knowledge

Finally, the SBOE meeting documents provide an excellent opportunity to determine how the Texas SBOE attempted to influence what students in Texas know and believe (Gee, 2006). The Texas SBOE used social studies course revisions to effect what way students across Texas learn by amending the proposed social studies TEKS standards. The board assigned which standards contained the important content through the use of the word “including” as a designation of required mastery. Equally important are the learning standards which include the words “such as” to indicate potential use. The standards where the board changed the wording from “including” to “such as,” or vice versa, reflect the partiality of several board members for conveying the information worth knowing to students. The standards without either of the previously mentioned phrases do not mandate that students prove mastery or provide a possible
example for teaching purposes. Finally, the remaining standards are noticeably left out, in as much as teachers are pressured to teach, or not teach the content.

Indeed, the majority of the board made motions, and voted for changes to the social studies curricula which produced social studies courses with an obvious preference for conservatism and American exceptionalism (Gutek, 2004). The system of knowledge throughout public schools in Texas advocates an educational system in which limited national government, penchant for individual rights, and preference for a capitalist market structure.

Emerging Themes from Critical Discourse Analysis

Analyzing the Texas government TEKS standards and the SBOE meeting minutes from January, March, and May, 2010, was possible through the framework of Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks. As I sought to uncover the reality of citizenship and democratic education created by the text, along with the balance or imbalance of power among participants, three themes emerged. First, a belief in a national government of limited authority is evident in the curriculum. Second, the TEKS standards and SBOE meeting texts stress the importance of individual rights over the collective good. Finally, there is an emphasis on a free enterprise economic system as best. These themes will be fully discussed in the next chapter.

Conclusion

On the whole, CDA has uncovered a distinct partiality for conservatism and American exceptionalism, in both the Texas government curriculum and the meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE. As a result, three important themes emerged from this CDA. The analysis reveals a belief in a national government of limited authority, the importance of individual rights over the collective good, and the emphasis of a capitalist market structure. These themes emerged as a result of using James Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks to discover the dominant discourse from
the documents analyzed. The use of CDA allowed me to uncover the contradiction that exists between educational theorists’ constructs of democratic and citizenship education, and the existing curriculum, as amended and approved by the Texas SBOE in May of 2010. The power structures I exposed through this study help to address issues of inequality within the Texas curriculum (Rogers, et al, 2005).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to conduct a CDA of the government TEKS standards and the accompanying minutes from the Texas SBOE meetings. I sought to unearth power structures implicit in the curriculum and the board meetings in which certain members pursued an agenda to insert their ideological beliefs into the Texas social studies curricula, while at the same time, claimed to provide balance in the curriculum (Rogers, 2011, Henry, 2010, Aug. 22). Language in the learning standards and the meeting minutes from the board meetings revealed hidden agendas and power structures in these documents.

Educational theorists, such as John Dewey, Paolo Freire, Alfred Bandura, Michael Apple, Bradley Levinson, and Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, provide the current understanding of democratic and citizenship education, and the ways in which these instructional practices should appear in the classroom. James Gee’s (2006) seven building tasks produce the framework of analysis for the CDA, which exposed the power structures imbedded in the Texas government TEKS standards and the meeting minutes of the SBOE. The emergent themes demonstrate the influence of the conservatism and American exceptionalism evident in all the Texas social studies curricula.

Educational theorists’ construct of democratic education allows for a system in which all participants have the opportunity to determine the curriculum together. There are not top-down
power structures (Dewey, 1916; Freire, 2009). Students and teachers are not cast aside in the
development of democratic education, but allowed to voice ideas, concerns, and areas of interest.
The goal of this collective partnership is twofold: first, democratic education intends to improve
the educational experiences of all participants, and second, democratic education involves
“communities of practice” (Lave and Wenger, 1991). According to Lave and Wenger, social and
intellectual activity work to develop the whole learner and enrich the understanding of the
content or subject studied (1991; Bandura, 1993, 1997).

Democratic education is closely associated with the concept of citizenship education.
Several educational theorists highlight the need for social learning through a variety of
instructional activities that encourage critical thinking, student choice, and permits students to
construct meaning from educational experiences (Apple, 2007; Dewey 1916; Freire, 2009; and
Bandura, 1993). Democratic education accentuates the need for students to use community in the
development of the whole person (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

At the same time, citizenship education focuses on the task of maturing students into
citizens, who are willing to participate in the current government because they associate civics
with problem solving, inquiring into social issues, and attaching personal, meaningful,
experiences to the government (Dewey, 1938; Schunk, 2008; and Hyslop-Margison and Strobel,
2008).

The revision and subsequent adoption of the Texas government learning standards, and
the Texas SBOE meeting minutes do not construct democratic or citizenship education that
would be supported by educational theorists. The TEKS standards and meeting minutes reflect
the work of conservative board members to infuse the curriculum with conservatism and
American exceptionalism (Gutek, 2004). Instead of allowing participants a voice in the
determination of the knowledge worth knowing, the SBOE dictated the learning standards. The entire process fails to represent democratic or civic education ideas. The curriculum is a top-down power structure, there are no examples of theorists’ democratic educational activities in the government curriculum, and several of the board members successfully inserted a bias in favor of American exceptionalism and conservatism in the language of the TEKS standards and board meeting minutes.

Political culture in Texas is dominated by the Republican Party. This study discloses the ways in which several SBOE members worked to duplicate their political inclinations across the public education system in Texas, despite the numerous individuals, organizations, and groups who voiced their concern with the ideological bias in the proposed learning standards. This is of particular importance in public education across the United States due to the size of Texas, and the way in which textbook companies redistribute Texas mandated curriculum to other states through textbooks (Collins, 2012).

National Government with Limited Authority

Democratic and citizenship education is an important component of instruction used globally to reinforce support for existing structures of government (Edwards, Lineberry; Wattenberg, 2008; Wiseman, 2003: Andolina et al, 2002). The Texas SBOE sought to influence the development of young Texans education in the public school system through the curriculum revisions to social studies courses during the spring of 2010. Both the government curriculum and the meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE reveal subtle framing of content toward a decidedly conservative bias, and a preference toward American exceptionalism. In the government curriculum, the notion of democratic education is not democratic at all. Democratic education seeks to have teachers and students equally responsible for the content learned, and is
education that responds to the needs of the learners (Dewey, 1916, 1938; Freire, 2009; Lave and Wenger; 2001; Levinson, 1999). In Texas, civic education is characterized by learning about the positive aspects of United States history, paying particular attention the Framers or Founding Fathers, and the ways in which a Judeo-Christian world view influenced the Constitutional government created. Furthermore, civic education is supported by learning of the existing structure of government, how it operates, which people or institutions are responsible for various tasks, and the main purpose of the national government: protecting the rights of individuals.

Persons included in the curriculum mostly represent a republican government, with great support for a small national government of limited authority. The learning standards in the Texas government course promote limiting the power of the national the government in the best interest of the people. The implication is that that the larger the national government becomes, the more abuses of the people are possible. It is only through controlling the authority of the national government that the safety of the population can be assured (Texas Education Agency, 113.18, 19, 41; 118.4).

Moreover, the Texas construct of civic education also questions the authority of the national government. Students are directed to celebrate patriotism, good citizenship, and at the same time, the curriculum undermines the national government’s authority by implying that a limited national government is a critical component of the existing structure. Citizens, by definition of the Texas government curriculum, are individuals who express their patriotic pride, embrace Judeo-Christian values, and support a literal interpretation of the Constitution.

Finally, and perhaps the most shocking, is the way in which the history of America and American government are portrayed in such an optimistic perspective. Historical references are limited to the Founding Fathers, a few, selected, prominent U.S. presidents, and the
philosophical arguments that influenced the framing of the Constitution. While some may argue
that a historical study of past discrimination is not necessarily required, I think this to be a
foolish argument. Even the history courses gloss over the civil rights movement, and past
discrimination of minority groups. There are numerous reasons why this is substantial, but I
consider the most noteworthy issue, is that if the curriculum does not acknowledge
discrimination from the past, it most certainly ignores areas of inequity in the present. As Apple
(2011) notes “education is deeply connected to the social context in which it exists…education
[is] as a set of institutions that are not necessarily neutral, as implicated in the reproduction and
contestation if relations of dominance and subordination” (p. 25). The public education system
already reinforces social structures which overlook certain socioeconomic and racial
demographics in society. The relatively insignificant coverage given to past discrimination not
only reflects the conservative ideological desire to maintain tradition, but also represents the
glossed over version of the past embraced by American exceptionalism (Gutek, 2004). There is a
notable absence of contributions from Americans who support the role of the national
government to provide or enforce equity through the courts, presidential authority, or
government programs. In instances where the curriculum addresses these people or programs,
students are always asked to consider the merits and problems associated with the expansion of
the national government’s authority. The emphasis remains on the negative effects of a larger
national government (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113. 12, 13, 14, 15 18, 19, 41).

The focus of the curriculum and SBOE meeting minutes on the benefits of a limited
national government creates one area in which there is a balance of power among teachers and
students. Initially, there is balance in authority between students and teachers as a result of the
curricular origins. The state of Texas requires school districts in throughout the state to use the
curriculum approved from the Texas Education Agency and SBOE. This places teachers and students equally without power as to the choice and variety of the curriculum. Both groups are subject to the assigned curriculum. Both teachers and students are told the knowledge worth knowing from the state. Neither group has the opportunity to contribute to Freire’s “naming of the world” (2009).

Unfortunately, the balance of power between teachers and students is far less prominent than the imbalance of power. Teachers retain more power in the classroom for several reasons. The teacher has the ability to determine the way in which the information is delivered to students. The teacher also has the discretion to select the primary and secondary sources used by students. The capacity to control the presentation and selection of information puts students at a direct disadvantage, especially if they are unaware or unfamiliar with how to locate opposing viewpoints in order to have a better understanding of complex issues. Instructors may also control the flow of information to students with the control of selecting current issues, determining the products students must create, and the authority to evaluate student products. Essentially, students are subject to their teacher’s interpretation of the curriculum. Khane and Sporte (2008) report this influence of the teacher is significant because the way in which civics courses are taught encourages or discourages student participation in the political process.

At the same time, teachers are also at a distinct disadvantage with respect to the power to choose or design the curriculum. Dewey’s (1916) argument in support of democratic education requires that all stakeholders be participants in the creation of educational experiences. The mandated curriculum standards teachers must cover reflects a mistrust of the teaching profession. Although teachers are licensed professionals, they are not given the freedom to facilitate the learning of their students. Dewey specifically argues against a top-down power structure in
democratic education. Instead, he argues that democratic education must be a collective and inclusive experience.

CDA allows for a richer understanding of the ways in which language impacts and controls social situations. The language used by the conservative SBOE members in the Texas government curriculum and SBOE meeting minutes generates an imbalance of power among students. Both the government curriculum and the majority of the SBOE minutes contain words and phrases which slant the curriculum toward conservative beliefs, such as the benefit of a limited national government. This bias creates a set of political norms, as Lakshaman (2011) describes, what is good and right about society. These documents establish a political norm that expects a limited national government. Students who believe the national government should be responsible for administering programs, ensuring equity among groups, and maintain a general concern for the collective good, are left with a sense of isolation or rejection. When students do not view civics courses as relevant to their lives, they are much more likely to disengage from the content, and possibly from political participation (Khane and Sporte, 2008; Khane, Chi; and Middaugh, 2006; Andolina et al., 2002; Wiseman, 2003).

*Importance of Individual Rights over the Collective Good*

A second theme that emerged as a result of the CDA of the government TEKS standards and meeting minutes from the SBOE is the importance of the individual in democratic and citizenship education. While the notion of democratic education conceptualized by many educational theorists urges a cooperative education system where teachers and students work together, the Texas SBOE developed a curriculum which repeatedly places emphasis on the importance of the individual (Dewey, 1916 and 1938; Bandura, 1997). A majority of the board voted to define democratic education by using the term representative government. The Texas
construct of democratic education is a system in which Texas SBOE members are elected to serve the people of Texas by administering and creating education policy (Texas Education Agency, 2013). The implication being that suggestions for representation of the public are accepted, while other individuals, with proper credentials, will serve on committees to develop educational policy or curriculum and the board will act in a manner that reflects the preferences of their constituents. In practice, once the people of Texas cast their votes for each respective board member, the board member becomes that districts “expert.” The SBOE members are granted, representative authority to determine the knowledge worth knowing for teachers and students in Texas. Democratic education in Texas is more representative, than democratic.

The curriculum excludes those who do not agree with this interpretation of democratic education. Many people, who did not agree with the SBOE curricular changes, were allowed the opportunity to speak at a public hearing, but in the end, the board embraced their trustee role. Many critics from around the state, nation, and parts of the globe, were largely ignored (Stutz, 2010; Stutz, 2010; Stutz, 2010; CNN, 2010; Foner, 2010; Frank, 2010; Michael, 2010; Henry, 2010).

Citizenship education in Texas views political participation as a personal decision. As the Texas government curriculum instructs, “student[s] understand the importance of voluntary individual political participation” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 15). The highly personal decision to participate is important to individuals who are concerned with protecting their rights. The government curriculum references individuals or individual rights twelve times, but only once asks students to “evaluate whether and/or when the obligation of citizenship requires that personal desires and interests be subordinated to the public good” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 14 B). Texas citizenship education promotes individual rights and the
protection of those rights as supreme over the state of the collective good, which directly contrasts other notions of citizenship education. Pratte (2001) explains that citizenship education requires more than just teaching students about the structure and function of government. This form of education ought to include “the capacities or tendencies to think of the public interests or common good rather than self-interest” (p. 304).

Citizens, as noted in the Texas government curriculum and SBOE meeting minutes, are students who are keen to embrace the rights of individuals in American political society, and work to continue a system of government which protects individual rights and freedoms. Included in the notion of citizenship education is the “impact of individuals…the importance of voluntary participation in a constitutional republic” as a means to protect the rights of individuals (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 9 (a) 1). Citizenship in Texas also includes the requirement that students learn to distinguish “between personal and civic responsibilities” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 14). Students must decide if and when there are any circumstances in which personal interests should secondary to the collective good. Also, the curriculum describes citizenship as those individuals who are “well informed about civic affairs, [service] in the military, voting, serving on a jury, observing laws, and paying taxes” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 14 C).

Citizenship education in Texas excludes any real, in-depth consideration of past discrimination in citizenship. The government curriculum only alludes to slavery in the U.S. by asking students to “recall conditions that produced the 14th Amendment” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 13 F). The U.S. civil rights movement, a period of great historical significance in the 20th century, allowed for more of the ideas expressed in founding documents to be fulfilled as the U.S. government enacted policies which began to provide more equality of
access and opportunity for minorities in the U.S. However, once more, this area of historical and political significance is all but excluded from the curriculum. The single reference to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is located in a “culture” learning standard of the government curriculum. The curriculum only asks students to “evaluate a U.S. government policy or court decision that has affected a particular racial, ethnic, or religious group, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 17A).

Further, the language found in the documents creates an imbalance of power among students. The notion of individual rights is pervasive throughout the curriculum and meeting minutes. This theme is so prominent that it is clearly framed as the correct way to view the role of the national government-as protector of individual liberties. Students that support the concept of the supremacy of individual rights over the collective good, embrace the inferred superiority from the curriculum. Students with a political view which embraces the idea of citizenship education’s purpose to teach about the responsibility of other to the collective good, note the second class status assigned to them, particularly with the minimal attention given to events and policies that included more Americans in the political process.

Emphasis on a Capitalist Market Structure

A final theme that emerged as a result of the CDA of the government and Texas SBOE meeting minutes is the overwhelming emphasis of a capitalist market structure as best. The idea of American exceptionalism esteems this economic system as the method in which the most people benefit. Capitalist economies are also touted as the economic structure with the most opportunity for prosperity. The support for American exceptionalism is apparent in the government standards and throughout the meeting minutes. The prominence on a capitalist market structure adds to the Texas construct of democratic education. Students and teachers do
not have the freedom to discuss and choose the economic systems they might like to study. Teachers and students also do not have the ability to categorize the economic system of the U.S.

Instead, the Texas SBOE inserted the benefits of a capitalist market structure at every perceived opportunity. For example, the U.S. history since 1877 course directs students to relate the capitalist market structure to scientific discoveries and technological innovation as a reason why the standard of living continues to increase in the U.S. To extend this perspective further, a sub-learning standard directs students to “understand how the free enterprise system drives technological innovation and its application in the market place” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.41 (c) 27 C). The majority of the board attempted to imply that in a democracy, the only logical economic system is a capitalist/ free market structure. Consumers hold the power of choice in the U.S., as explained in the government curriculum: “students understand the roles played by…governments in…the U.S. free enterprise system…[and] compare the role of government in the U.S. free enterprise system and other economic systems” (Texas Education Agency, 2011, 113.44 (c) 5 C).

The Texas SBOE and curriculum advocate a capitalist market structure through the way TEKS standards with this economic system are framed. For example, in the sixth grade curriculum the board approved a change to one of the learning standards. This amendment asked students to compare and contrast the benefits of a capitalist market structure to other economic systems. Additionally, McElroy proposed an amendment to the sixth grade curriculum so that students “understand the poor record of collectivist, non-free market economic systems to deliver improved economic development over numerous contemporary and historical societies” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.18 (b) 9 D). This particular TEK does not allow for students and teachers to examine areas in which collectivist economic policies or systems have benefited
participants in the policy or economic system. The language used by the conservative board members implies that there are no collective economic policies or systems that benefit people. Even the title of the mandated economics course in Texas explicitly states the bias in the course title: Economics with an emphasis on free enterprise and its benefits. Democratic education in Texas only supports the use of a capitalist market structure.

Citizenship education in Texas promotes that citizens not only accept, but embraces a capitalist market structure. The documents I analyzed contain only references to the benefits of a free enterprise. There are no instances in which the quality of or disadvantages of the economic system are questioned. The notion of citizenship education in Texas singularly promotes the beneficial components of capitalist market economies. What is left out of the government curriculum and not referenced in the SBOE meeting minutes is that the division of wealth and inequity in economic opportunity is a much wider gap now, than at the start of the 20th century (Slater, 2001). This relates directly back to the second theme, the importance of the individual. A capitalist market structure is characterized by the freedom of individuals to act in their own best interest. The idea, as noted by Adam Smith, is that when businesses or individuals act in their own self-interest, scarce economic resources are used most efficiently, and the work of the “invisible hand” benefits the marketplace as a whole (Smith, 1776).

The overwhelming support and consideration for a capitalist market structure excludes many. Notably, any student, or teacher, that supports a Marxist economic system is intentionally excluded. During the May meetings of the SBOE, Hardy moved to strike Karl Marx from a learning standard that listed “the importance of various economic theorists, including…Karl Marx”; the amendment passed. Marx was removed from one of the TEKS standards which requires mastery of the information in the learning standard (Texas Education Agency, 2010,
118.4 (c) 5 E). The majority of the board did not want students to consider Marxist philosophies. This ideology becomes more apparent as McElroy proposed another amendment which explicitly states that superiority of capitalism: students must “explain why communist command economies collapsed in competition with free-market economies at the end of the 20th century” (Texas Education Agency, 2010, 113.42 (c) 18 E). Students or teachers who do not classify the U.S. as economy as a capitalist or free market are also excluded from the curriculum. Persons who do not accept the notion that a free enterprise economic system is equitable, fair or the best system are also excluded. The economically disenfranchised, socialist, and/or communist economic systems advocates, fair trade supporters, persons interested in altering minimum wage, essentially any people that do not support a capitalist market structure are excluded. These perspectives have little credibility according to the majority of the SBOE and the curriculum.

Finally, the questions of power and imbalances of power between teachers and students, and among students once again depend upon the outlook of each individual in Texas classrooms. Students and teachers, who advocate the superiority of a free enterprise system, align with the political and social norms accepted by the majority of the SBOE in the curriculum. This assigns them a place of importance in the Texas societal hierarchy. These are the people included and accepted in democratic and citizenship education. At the same time, the students and teachers who do not support a free enterprise economic system are relegated to second class citizenry. The language in the documents reveals little, if any support for opposition to a free enterprise economy. Persons with views differing from the dominant discourse in the government curriculum and meeting minutes from the SBOE find themselves on the fringe of the Texas construct of democratic and citizenship education.
Limitations of the Study

Although there is ample evidence to support the emergent themes from the CDA, it is equally important to note the limitations of this analysis. This study examined only the Texas government curriculum and the meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE. It is not within the scope of this study to determine how teachers in Texas teach social studies courses. Teachers have the ability to neutralize the presentation of these learning standards, or present material to students that is much more favorable to liberal ideology.

Additionally, there are over 1,200 independent school districts throughout the state of Texas. Each school district is governed by a board of Trustees, along with a superintendent. This leadership is allowed the opportunity to provide curricular resources, content specialists, or supplemental curriculum that provides students with a more balanced instructional approach to social studies courses.

Implications for Future Research

While this study examines the power structures and hidden agendas within the Texas government curriculum and the meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE, it only provides insight into the way in which language can promote educational theorists’ constructs of democratic and citizenship education, or contradict educational theorists’ constructs of democratic and citizenship education. It would be important to expand the study by entering into Texas government classes around the state to directly observe the way in which teachers, and subsequently their students, interact with the government curriculum. Furthermore, it is important to observe and examine the instructional tools teachers use to engage their students in democratic and citizenship education. Moreover, interviewing government teachers would help to understand how closely teachers align their lesson plans with the government TEKS standards.
Concluding Thoughts

The purpose of this study was to conduct a CDA with the intention to uncover the hidden power structures imbedded in Texas political thought. One of my primary concerns involves comprehending what democratic and citizenship education represent in Texas. The government curriculum and meeting minutes from the Texas SBOE demonstrate a minimal commitment to including all students in democratic and citizenship education. The basic structure, function, history, and philosophical influences of the U.S. government are in place. However, I uncovered considerable preference toward Republican Party positions. If the notion of democratic and citizenship education created by educational theorists such as Dewey (1916) Freire (2009), Bandura (1993), Levinson (1999; 2005), Levinson and Brantmeire (2006), and Apple (2005, 2006; 2011) is to be realized, then the curriculum must be more inclusive of teacher and student opinions. It is imperative that the curriculum be revised to include, at the very minimum, a much more balanced approach to different creeds in U.S. politics. Fairclough (1993) would argue that it is not possible to produce a bias free curriculum, but policymakers, teachers, students, and the people of Texas can fashion a more inclusive curriculum that acknowledges the complete past of the U.S, the accomplishments made toward fulfilling the ideas espoused in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and most importantly, the areas in which we still lack equity.
APPENDIX D

TEXAS GOVERNMENT TEKS STANDARDS
§113.40. Implementation of Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, High School, Beginning with School Year 2011-2012.

The provisions of §§113.41-113.48 of this subchapter shall be implemented by school districts beginning with the 2011-2012 school year.

Source: The provisions of this §113.40 adopted to be effective August 23, 2010, 35 TexReg 7232; amended to be effective October 17, 2011, 36 TexReg 6946.

§113.44. United States Government (One-Half Credit), Beginning with School Year 2011-2012.

(a) General requirements. Students shall be awarded one-half unit of credit for successful completion of this course.

(b) Introduction.

(1) In United States Government, the focus is on the principles and beliefs upon which the United States was founded and on the structure, functions, and powers of government at the national, state, and local levels. This course is the culmination of the civic and governmental content and concepts studied from Kindergarten through required secondary courses. Students learn major political ideas and forms of government in history. A significant focus of the course is on the U.S. Constitution, its underlying principles and ideas, and the form of government it created. Students analyze major concepts of republicanism, federalism, checks and balances, separation of powers,
popular sovereignty, and individual rights and compare the U.S. system of government with other political systems. Students identify the role of government in the U.S. free enterprise system and examine the strategic importance of places to the United States. Students analyze the impact of individuals, political parties, interest groups, and the media on the American political system, evaluate the importance of voluntary individual participation in a constitutional republic, and analyze the rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. Students examine the relationship between governmental policies and the culture of the United States. Students identify examples of government policies that encourage scientific research and use critical-thinking skills to create a product on a contemporary government issue.

(2) To support the teaching of the essential knowledge and skills, the use of a variety of rich primary and secondary source material such as the complete text of the U.S. Constitution, selected Federalist Papers, landmark cases of the U.S. Supreme Court (such as those studied in Grade 8 and U.S. History Since 1877), biographies, autobiographies, memoirs, speeches, letters, and periodicals that feature analyses of political issues and events is encouraged.

(3) The eight strands of the essential knowledge and skills for social studies are intended to be integrated for instructional purposes. Skills listed in the social studies skills strand in subsection (c) of this section should be incorporated into the teaching of all essential knowledge and skills for social studies. A greater depth of understanding of complex content material can be attained when integrated social studies content from the various disciplines and critical-thinking skills are taught together. Statements that contain the
word "including" reference content that must be mastered, while those containing the phrase "such as" are intended as possible illustrative examples.

(4) Students identify the role of the U.S. free enterprise system within the parameters of this course and understand that this system may also be referenced as capitalism or the free market system.

(5) Throughout social studies in Kindergarten-Grade 12, students build a foundation in history; geography; economics; government; citizenship; culture; science, technology, and society; and social studies skills. The content, as appropriate for the grade level or course, enables students to understand the importance of patriotism, function in a free enterprise society, and appreciate the basic democratic values of our state and nation as referenced in the Texas Education Code (TEC), §28.002(h).

(6) Students understand that a constitutional republic is a representative form of government whose representatives derive their authority from the consent of the governed, serve for an established tenure, and are sworn to uphold the constitution.

(7) State and federal laws mandate a variety of celebrations and observances, including Celebrate Freedom Week.

(A) Each social studies class shall include, during Celebrate Freedom Week as provided under the TEC, §29.907, or during another full school week as determined by the board of trustees of a school district, appropriate instruction concerning the intent, meaning, and importance of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution, including the Bill of Rights, in their historical contexts. The study of the Declaration of Independence must include the study of the relationship of the ideas expressed in that document to subsequent American history, including the relationship of its ideas to the rich diversity
of our people as a nation of immigrants, the American Revolution, the formulation of the U.S. Constitution, and the abolitionist movement, which led to the Emancipation Proclamation and the women's suffrage movement.

(B) Each school district shall require that, during Celebrate Freedom Week or other week of instruction prescribed under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, students in Grades 3-12 study and recite the following text: "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness--That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed."

(8) Students identify and discuss how the actions of U.S. citizens and the local, state, and federal governments have either met or failed to meet the ideals espoused in the founding documents.

(c) Knowledge and skills.

(1) History. The student understands how constitutional government, as developed in America and expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the U.S. Constitution, has been influenced by ideas, people, and historical documents. The student is expected to:

(A) explain major political ideas in history, including the laws of nature and nature's God, unalienable rights, divine right of kings, social contract theory, and the rights of resistance to illegitimate government;

(B) identify major intellectual, philosophical, political, and religious traditions that informed the American founding, including Judeo-Christian (especially
biblical law), English common law and constitutionalism, Enlightenment, and republicanism, as they address issues of liberty, rights, and responsibilities of individuals;

(C) identify the individuals whose principles of laws and government institutions informed the American founding documents, including those of Moses, William Blackstone, John Locke, and Charles de Montesquieu;

(D) identify the contributions of the political philosophies of the Founding Fathers, including John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Jay, George Mason, Roger Sherman, and James Wilson, on the development of the U.S. government;

(E) examine debates and compromises that impacted the creation of the founding documents; and


(2) History. The student understands the roles played by individuals, political parties, interest groups, and the media in the U.S. political system, past and present. The student is expected to:

(A) give examples of the processes used by individuals, political parties, interest groups, or the media to affect public policy; and

(B) analyze the impact of political changes brought about by individuals, political parties, interest groups, or the media, past and present.
(3) Geography. The student understands how geography can influence U.S. political
divisions and policies. The student is expected to:

(A) understand how population shifts affect voting patterns;

(B) examine political boundaries to make inferences regarding the distribution of
political power; and

(C) explain how political divisions are crafted and how they are affected by
Supreme Court decisions such as Baker v. Carr.

(4) Geography. The student understands why certain places or regions are important to
the United States. The student is expected to:

(A) identify the significance to the United States of the location and key natural
resources of selected global places or regions; and

(B) analyze how U.S. foreign policy affects selected places and regions.

(5) Economics. The student understands the roles played by local, state, and national
governments in both the public and private sectors of the U.S. free enterprise
system. The student is expected to:

(A) explain how government fiscal, monetary, and regulatory policies influence
the economy at the local, state, and national levels;

(B) identify the sources of revenue and expenditures of the U.S. government and
analyze their impact on the U.S. economy;

(C) compare the role of government in the U.S. free enterprise system and other
economic systems; and

(D) understand how government taxation and regulation can serve as restrictions
to private enterprise.
(6) Economics. The student understands the relationship between U.S. government policies and the economy. The student is expected to:

(A) examine how the U.S. government uses economic resources in foreign policy; and

(B) understand the roles of the executive and legislative branches in setting international trade and fiscal policies.

(7) Government. The student understands the American beliefs and principles reflected in the U.S. Constitution and why these are significant. The student is expected to:

(A) explain the importance of a written constitution;

(B) evaluate how the federal government serves the purposes set forth in the Preamble to the U.S. Constitution;

(C) analyze how the Federalist Papers such as Number 10, Number 39, and Number 51 explain the principles of the American constitutional system of government;

(D) evaluate constitutional provisions for limiting the role of government, including republicanism, checks and balances, federalism, separation of powers, popular sovereignty, and individual rights;

(E) describe the constitutionally prescribed procedures by which the U.S. Constitution can be changed and analyze the role of the amendment process in a constitutional government;

(F) identify how the American beliefs and principles reflected in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution contribute to both a national identity and federal identity and are embodied in the United States today; and
(G) examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America and guaranteed its free exercise by saying that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and compare and contrast this to the phrase, "separation of church and state."

(8) Government. The student understands the structure and functions of the government created by the U.S. Constitution. The student is expected to:

(A) analyze the structure and functions of the legislative branch of government, including the bicameral structure of Congress, the role of committees, and the procedure for enacting laws;

(B) analyze the structure and functions of the executive branch of government, including the constitutional powers of the president, the growth of presidential power, and the role of the Cabinet and executive departments;

(C) analyze the structure and functions of the judicial branch of government, including the federal court system, types of jurisdiction, and judicial review;

(D) identify the purpose of selected independent executive agencies, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and regulatory commissions, including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and Federal Communications Commission (FCC);

(E) explain how certain provisions of the U.S. Constitution provide for checks and balances among the three branches of government;

(F) analyze selected issues raised by judicial activism and judicial restraint;
(G) explain the major responsibilities of the federal government for domestic and foreign policy such as national defense; and

(H) compare the structures, functions, and processes of national, state, and local governments in the U.S. federal system.

(9) Government. The student understands the concept of federalism. The student is expected to:

(A) explain why the Founding Fathers created a distinctly new form of federalism and adopted a federal system of government instead of a unitary system;

(B) categorize government powers as national, state, or shared;

(C) analyze historical and contemporary conflicts over the respective roles of national and state governments; and

(D) understand the limits on the national and state governments in the U.S. federal system of government.

(10) Government. The student understands the processes for filling public offices in the U.S. system of government. The student is expected to:

(A) compare different methods of filling public offices, including elected and appointed offices at the local, state, and national levels;

(B) explain the process of electing the president of the United States and analyze the Electoral College; and

(C) analyze the impact of the passage of the 17th Amendment.

(11) Government. The student understands the role of political parties in the U.S. system of government. The student is expected to:
(A) analyze the functions of political parties and their role in the electoral process at local, state, and national levels;
(B) explain the two-party system and evaluate the role of third parties in the United States; and
(C) identify opportunities for citizens to participate in political party activities at local, state, and national levels.

(12) Government. The student understands the similarities and differences that exist among the U.S. system of government and other political systems. The student is expected to:
(A) compare the U.S. constitutional republic to historical and contemporary forms of government such as monarchy, a classical republic, authoritarian, socialist, direct democracy, theocracy, tribal, and other republics;
(B) analyze advantages and disadvantages of federal, confederate, and unitary systems of government; and
(C) analyze advantages and disadvantages of presidential and parliamentary systems of government.

(13) Citizenship. The student understands rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. The student is expected to:
(A) understand the roles of limited government and the rule of law in the protection of individual rights;
(B) identify and define the unalienable rights;
(C) identify the freedoms and rights guaranteed by each amendment in the Bill of Rights;
(D) analyze U.S. Supreme Court interpretations of rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution in selected cases, including Engel v. Vitale, Schenck v. United States, Texas v. Johnson, Miranda v. Arizona, Gideon v. Wainwright, Mapp v. Ohio, and Roe v. Wade;

(E) explain the importance of due process rights to the protection of individual rights and in limiting the powers of government; and

(F) recall the conditions that produced the 14th Amendment and describe subsequent efforts to selectively extend some of the Bill of Rights to the states, including the Blaine Amendment and U.S. Supreme Court rulings, and analyze the impact on the scope of fundamental rights and federalism.

(14) Citizenship. The student understands the difference between personal and civic responsibilities. The student is expected to:

(A) explain the difference between personal and civic responsibilities;

(B) evaluate whether and/or when the obligation of citizenship requires that personal desires and interests be subordinated to the public good;

(C) understand the responsibilities, duties, and obligations of citizenship such as being well informed about civic affairs, serving in the military, voting, serving on a jury, observing the laws, paying taxes, and serving the public good; and

(D) understand the voter registration process and the criteria for voting in elections.

(15) Citizenship. The student understands the importance of voluntary individual participation in the U.S. constitutional republic. The student is expected to:
(A) analyze the effectiveness of various methods of participation in the political process at local, state, and national levels;

(B) analyze historical and contemporary examples of citizen movements to bring about political change or to maintain continuity; and

(C) understand the factors that influence an individual's political attitudes and actions.

(16) Citizenship. The student understands the importance of the expression of different points of view in a constitutional republic. The student is expected to:

(A) examine different points of view of political parties and interest groups such as the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the National Rifle Association (NRA), and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) on important contemporary issues; and

(B) analyze the importance of the First Amendment rights of petition, assembly, speech, and press and the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms.

(17) Culture. The student understands the relationship between government policies and the culture of the United States. The student is expected to:

(A) evaluate a U.S. government policy or court decision that has affected a particular racial, ethnic, or religious group such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the U.S. Supreme Court cases of Hernandez v. Texas and Grutter v. Bollinger; and

(B) explain changes in American culture brought about by government policies such as voting rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill of
Rights), the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, affirmative action, and racial integration.

(18) Science, technology, and society. The student understands the role the government plays in developing policies and establishing conditions that influence scientific discoveries and technological innovations. The student is expected to:

(A) understand how U.S. constitutional protections such as patents have fostered competition and entrepreneurship; and

(B) identify examples of government-assisted research that, when shared with the private sector, have resulted in improved consumer products such as computer and communication technologies.

(19) Science, technology, and society. The student understands the impact of advances in science and technology on government and society. The student is expected to:

(A) understand the potential impact on society of recent scientific discoveries and technological innovations; and

(B) evaluate the impact of the Internet and other electronic information on the political process.

(20) Social studies skills. The student applies critical-thinking skills to organize and use information acquired from a variety of valid sources, including electronic technology. The student is expected to:

(A) analyze information by sequencing, categorizing, identifying cause-and-effect relationships, comparing, contrasting, finding the main idea, summarizing, making generalizations and predictions, and drawing inferences and conclusions;
(B) create a product on a contemporary government issue or topic using critical methods of inquiry;

(C) analyze and defend a point of view on a current political issue;

(D) analyze and evaluate the validity of information, arguments, and counterarguments from primary and secondary sources for bias, propaganda, point of view, and frame of reference;

(E) evaluate government data using charts, tables, graphs, and maps; and

(F) use appropriate mathematical skills to interpret social studies information such as maps and graphs.

(21) Social studies skills. The student communicates in written, oral, and visual forms.

The student is expected to:

(A) use social studies terminology correctly;

(B) use standard grammar, spelling, sentence structure, and punctuation;

(C) transfer information from one medium to another, including written to visual and statistical to written or visual, using computer software as appropriate; and

(D) create written, oral, and visual presentations of social studies information.

(22) Social studies skills. The student uses problem-solving and decision-making skills, working independently and with others, in a variety of settings. The student is expected to:

(A) use a problem-solving process to identify a problem, gather information, list and consider options, consider advantages and disadvantages, choose and implement a solution, and evaluate the effectiveness of the solution; and
(B) use a decision-making process to identify a situation that requires a decision, gather information, identify options, predict consequences, and take action to implement a decision.

Source: The provisions of this §113.44 adopted to be effective August 23, 2010, 35 TexReg 7232.
APPENDIX E

MINUTES FROM THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETINGS
Report of the State Board of Education
Committee of the Full Board
January 13, 2010
The State Board of Education Committee of the Full Board met at 9:07 a.m. on Wednesday, January 13, 2010, in the State Board of Education Room, #1-104, of the William B. Travis Building, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas. The following members of the committee were present:
Presiding: Gail Lowe, chair; Rick Agosto, Lawrence A. Allen, Jr., Mary Helen Berlanga, David Bradley, Barbara Cargill, Bob Craig, Pat Hardy, Mavis B. Knight, Terri Leo, Don McLeroy, Ken Mercer, Geraldine Miller, Rene Núñez
Absent: Cynthia Dunbar
DISCUSSION ITEM
1. Commissioner’s Comments Regarding the SBOE Agenda
   (Board agenda page I-241)
   No comments were provided by Commissioner of Education Robert Scott.
CONSENT ITEM
2. Approval of Nominees to Recommend to the Governor for Service on
   the Board of Trustees of the Teacher Retirement System of Texas
   (Board agenda page I-1)
   [Consent agenda item #1]
   MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried unanimously to recommend that the State Board of Education submit to the Governor the list of three nominees--H. Keith Wallace, John W. Osborn, and Christophe Sloan Moss, for consideration for appointment to the board of trustees of the Teacher Retirement System of Texas, to fill a term ending on August 31, 2015.
ACTION ITEMS
   (First Reading and Filing Authorization)
   (Board agenda page I-3)
   [Official agenda item #3]
   Christopher Maska, ethics advisor, highlighted the amendments that resulted from the November board meeting. Board members discussed the limit on the value of certain gifts in 19 TAC section 33.5 (n)(2)(F).
   MOTION AND VOTE: It was carried unanimously by the Committee of the Full Board to recommend that the State Board of Education approve for first reading and filing authorization the proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.5, Code of Ethics.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and carried unanimously to reconsider the proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.5, Code of Ethics.

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend 19 TAC §33.5(k) as follows: “No SBOE Member shall solicit or receive a campaign contribution [support] on behalf of any SBOE political candidate, political party, or political committee from a PSF Service Provider or any PSF manager, consultant, or staff member.” Mr. Bradley withdrew his motion without objection.

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)
[Official agenda item #4]

Holland Timmins, executive administrator and chief investment officer, introduced this item. He stated that the amendment to TAC Chapter 33 adds section §33.2 relating to the distributions to the Available School Fund. He further stated that based on the Texas Attorney General’s opinion, each year, the State Board of Education (SBOE) shall determine whether a distribution to the Available School Fund (ASF) shall be made for the current state fiscal year.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was carried unanimously by the Committee of the Full Board to recommend that the State Board of Education approve for first reading and filing authorization the proposed new 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.2.

DISCUSSION ITEMS
5. Public Hearing on Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading, Subchapter C, High School
(Board agenda page I-243)

Public testimony was provided by the following individual:
NAME: Mark Grayson
AFFILIATION: Self

Mrs. Lowe explained that Mr. Grayson’s testimony pertained to item 2 on Thursday’s agenda regarding graduation requirements and asked committee members to consider his testimony during the Thursday discussion. CFB-01/13/2010 3

System and Its Benefits, Subchapter A, High School
(Board agenda page I-245)
Public testimony was provided by the following individuals:
NAME: Edwin Greiner
AFFILIATION: Admiral, Texas Navy
NAME: Dan Arellano
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Patricia Epstein
AFFILIATION: Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Dallas
NAME: Dick Brown
AFFILIATION: Admiral, Texas Navy
NAME: Kathy Miller
AFFILIATION: Texas Freedom Network
NAME: Pat Jackson
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Robert Bohmfalk
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Steven K. Green
AFFILIATION: Willamette University Center for Religion, Law and Democracy
NAME: Stephen R. Nickle
AFFILIATION: Trinity University Chaplain
NAME: William B. Proctor
AFFILIATION: Retired Educator
NAME: Shammi Gill
AFFILIATION: Houston Public Library
NAME: Lela Pittenger
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Manpreet K. Singh
AFFILIATION: The Spurlock Law Firm
NAME: Cecilia Wood
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Josephine Krouse
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Bonny Brogdon
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Deanna Newberg
AFFILIATION: Public School Teacher
NAME: Joni Cohan
AFFILIATION: National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Dallas Section
NAME: Gail Spurlock
AFFILIATION: Self (Testimony read by Carole Haynes)
NAME: Stephen Cure
AFFILIATION: Texas State Historical Association
NAME: The Honorable Tara Rios Ybarra
AFFILIATION: Texas State Representative
NAME: John Reiser
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Jack Kamrath
AFFILIATION: American Heritage Education Foundation
NAME: Sue Tilis
AFFILIATION: National Council of Jewish Women, Dallas
NAME: Daniel Boone (Testimony read by Jolane Steuckrath)
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Mike Owens
AFFILIATION: American Heritage Education Foundation
NAME: Cheryl Pollman
AFFILIATION: National Council of Jewish Women
NAME: Gurvinder P. Singh
AFFILIATION: G. P. PropertiesCFB-01/13/2010 5
NAME: Sarah Weis
AFFILIATION: Americans United for Separation of Church and State
NAME: Jeff Bankston
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Harsimran Singh
AFFILIATION: Round Rock High School
NAME: The Honorable Norma Chavez
AFFILIATION: Texas State Representative
NAME: John Aston
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Donna Starnes
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: James Akers
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Justin Flores
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Paul Dixon
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Paul Herrera
AFFILIATION: American GI Forum, State Commander
NAME: Thomas B. Green
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Fidel Castillo
AFFILIATION: Coalition for Educational Reform
NAME: William Murray
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Mary Torres
AFFILIATION: Auxiliary of Disabled Veterans
NAME: George Scaggs
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Patrick Burkart
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Russell J. Ramsland, Jr.
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Dotty Griffith
AFFILIATION: American Civil Liberties Union of Texas
NAME: Janie Britain
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Nancy Hester
AFFILIATION: Texas Council for Social Studies
NAME: Royal E. Smith
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Beverly Smith
AFFILIATION: Lovejoy ISD
NAME: Julio Noboa
AFFILIATION: Multicultural Alliance for Social Studies Advocacy (MASSA)
NAME: Ken Brewer
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Jon Roland
AFFILIATION: Constitution Society
NAME: Josemaria Vasquez
AFFILIATION: America’s Last Patrol, Post 3
NAME: Mary Reid
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Martha Sanchez
AFFILIATION: La Union del Pueblo Entero
NAME: Armando Garza (Testimony read by Antonio Carrizales)
AFFILIATION: Proyecto Azteca and City of San Juan
NAME: Rebecca Flores
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Jose Saldana
AFFILIATION: La Union del Pueblo Entero
NAME: The Honorable Wayne Christian (Testimony read by Heather Liggett)

AFFILIATION: Texas State Representative
NAME: Maria Gutierrez Dorr

AFFILIATION: Mexican American Farm Workers Organization
NAME: Rosa Rosales

AFFILIATION: League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) - National
NAME: Diana Gomez

AFFILIATION: Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Azteca (MEChA)
NAME: Rocio Villalobos

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Nelia Barrera

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Jesse Villarreal

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Karen Gross

AFFILIATION: Anti-Defamation League
NAME: Manuel Medrano

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Stephanie Villarreal

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Phil Samponaro

AFFILIATION: The University of Texas at Brownsville
NAME: Robert Trampota

AFFILIATION: Bexar County Czech Heritage Society
NAME: Rebecca Bell-Metereau

AFFILIATION: Texas State University
NAME: Paul Gelencser

AFFILIATION: Citizen

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga that the public hearing be extended. The motion failed.

Mrs. Lowe adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p. m.
The State Board of Education Committee of the Full Board met at 9:05 a.m. on Thursday, January 14, 2010, in the State Board of Education Room, #1-104, of the William B. Travis Building, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas. All members of the committee were present, as follows:

Presiding: Gail Lowe, chair; Rick Agosto, Lawrence A. Allen, Jr., Mary Helen Berlanga, David Bradley, Barbara Cargill, Bob Craig, Cynthia Dunbar (arrived at 10 p. m.), Pat Hardy, Mavis B. Knight, Terri Leo, Don McLeroy, Ken Mercer, Geraldine Miller, Rene Núñez

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. Discussion of Parliamentary Procedures

Parliamentarian Kirk Overbey provided the Committee of the Full Board instruction on the appropriate way to make a motion.

Commissioner’s Comments Regarding the SBOE Agenda

Commissioner of Education Robert Scott, whose comments were delayed until Thursday, informed the committee that Governor Rick Perry announced on Wednesday that Texas would not apply for the federal Race to the Top grant at this time because the grant requirements would infringe Texas’ right to set its own curriculum standards. He was also asked about early childhood programs, the Quality Counts 2010 Report and textbook adoption issues.

ACTION ITEMS


Monica Martinez, managing director, curriculum division, explained the proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter E, Graduation Requirements, Beginning with School Year 2004-2005, and Subchapter F, Graduation Requirements, Beginning with School Year 2007-2008.

Ms. Martinez also explained the requirement that all students on the Recommended High School Program and the Distinguished Achievement Program take the physics end-of-course assessment including students who take Principles of Technology (POT) for physics credit. She explained that minor edits to the POT course would be required in order to ensure students have an opportunity to be successful on the physics end-of-course assessment. She indicated that an item would be...
presented at the March meeting to address the required edits. Ms. Martinez also provided information regarding a recent petition that had been filed for rule changes to this chapter and information regarding the public comments that had been received. Public testimony was provided by the following individuals:

NAME: The Honorable Joe Farias
AFFILIATION: Texas State Representative

NAME: George C. Thomas
AFFILIATION: Socorro Independent School District

NAME: Stan Ray
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Deborah Parrish
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Bonnie Garza
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Crystal Smith
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Jim Wussow
AFFILIATION: Plano ISD

NAME: Sandra West
AFFILIATION: Science Teachers Association of Texas

NAME: Kim Distin
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Steven Schaferman
AFFILIATION: Texas Citizens for Science

NAME: Paula Tripp
AFFILIATION: Sam Houston State University; Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers Association of Texas

NAME: Kevin Fisher
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Diana Everett
AFFILIATION: Texas Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance

NAME: Craig Agnew
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Susan Modisette
AFFILIATION: Plano ISD

NAME: Brian Holt
AFFILIATION: Assistant Principal, Robinson HS

NAME: Robert Floyd
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Mr. Allen, and carried to recommend the addition of “(iv) team sports; and individual sports” and “(B) Athletics I-IV may be substituted for any credit earned under (7)(A) but not to exceed one credit per school year. A student may not receive credit for a physical education course more than once.” to §74.52, §74.53, and §74.54 (b)(7)(A) and to §74.62, §74.63, and §74.64 (b)(7) as shown in Attachment A.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo, seconded by Mr. Agosto, and carried to recommend the addition of the following language to §74.63(b)(7):
“(D) If a student is unable to comply with all of the requirements for a physical education course due to a physical limitation certified by a licensed medical practitioner, a modification to a physical education course does not prohibit the student from earning a Recommended High School Program diploma. A student with a physical limitation must still demonstrate proficiency in the relevant knowledge and skills in a physical education course that do not require physical activity.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo, seconded by Mr. Agosto, and carried to recommend the addition of the following language to §74.64(b)(7):
“(D) If a student is unable to comply with all of the requirements for a physical education course due to a physical limitation certified by a licensed medical practitioner, a modification to a physical education course does not prohibit the student from earning a Distinguished Achievement Program diploma. A student with a physical limitation must still demonstrate
proficiency in the relevant knowledge and skills in a physical education course that do not
require physical activity.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to
recommend removing the phase-out of IPC from the Recommended High School Program as
shown in Attachment A.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Lowe and carried unanimously to recommend
approval for second reading and final adoption the proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter
74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter E, Graduation Requirements, Beginning with School
Year 2004-2005, and Subchapter F, Graduation Requirements, Beginning with School Year

3. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 66, State Adoption and
   Distribution of Instructional Materials
   (Second Reading and Final Adoption)
   (Board agenda page I-61)
   [Official agenda item #6]
   John Lopez, managing director of the division of instructional materials and educational
technology division, introduced the item for second reading and final adoption.
   Oral testimony was provided by the following individual:
   NAME: Deborah Parrish
   AFFILIATION: Self

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried
unanimously to recommend that the State Board of Education add the words “and enrichment”
to 19 TAC §66.104(r) to read, “A school district or open-enrollment charter school that selects
from the commissioner’s list as specified in TEC, §31.0231, must purchase a classroom set of
textbooks adopted by the SBOE under TEC, §31.023 or §31.035, for each subject and grade
level in the foundation and enrichment curriculum.” (Mr. Allen was absent for the vote.)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mr. Allen, and carried
unanimously to recommend that the State Board of Education strike the language “For
elementary grades, a district must order a minimum of 22 units per classroom for each content
area and grade level based on student eligibility through the Public Education Information
Management System (PEIMS). For secondary grades, a district must order a minimum of 32
units, with the exception of school districts with small enrollments, times the number of teachers
for each content area or course” from 19 TAC §66.104(s). (Mr. Agosto was absent for the
vote.)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried
unanimously to recommend that the State Board of Education add subsection (t) to 19 TAC
§66.104 to read, “The classroom set requirement shall be implemented as new textbook
adoptions become available and are funded. The classroom set requirement will begin with
Proclamation 2010.”
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried unanimously to recommend that the State Board of Education amend 19 TAC §66.69 by adding a new subparagraph (b) to read, “Three-dimensional ancillary materials designed for use as manipulatives in Pre-Kindergarten systems that cannot be produced in a digital or web-based format shall not be required to be provided electronically”; rename the existing subsection (b) to (c); and file the amendment for first reading and filing authorization in the Texas Register.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried unanimously to recommend that the State Board of Education approve 19 TAC Chapter 66, State Adoption and Distribution of Instructional Materials, as amended, for second reading and final adoption. (Mr. Bradley, Mrs. Cargill, and Mr. Mercer were absent for the vote.)

4. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading, Subchapter C, High School
(First Reading and Filing Authorization)
(Board agenda page I-87)
[Official agenda item #7]
Anita Givens, associate commissioner for standards and programs, explained that the documents provided to the committee were the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS standards) revision committees’ recommended amendments to the high school English elective courses.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried unanimously to recommend that the State Board of Education approve for first reading and filing authorization the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading, Subchapter C, High School.

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)
(Board agenda page I-133)
[Official agenda item #8]
Ms. Givens explained that board members had been given binders that included Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS standards) review committees’ recommendations for amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 113 and Chapter 118 shown using strike throughs and underlines.

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(2) to read as follows:
“(2) History. The student understands how historical figures, patriots, and good citizens helped to shape the community, state, and nation. The student is expected to:”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded to amend Mrs. Cargill’s proposed amendment by striking “good” from the knowledge and skills statement. The motion failed.
VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Mrs. Cargill. The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify contributions of historical figures including Stephen F. Austin, George Washington, Christopher Columbus, and John Smith who helped to shape our state and nation; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Agosto to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify contributions of historical figures including Stephen F. Austin, George Washington, Christopher Columbus, John Smith, and Jose Antonio Navarro who helped to shape our state and nation; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(2)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify contributions of patriots and good citizens who have shaped the community.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(5)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify how the human characteristics of place such as ways of earning a living, shelter, clothing, food, and activities are based upon geographic location.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(11)(A) and (b)(11)(B) to read as follows:
“(A) identify similarities and differences among people such as kinship, laws, and religion; and
(B) identify similarities and differences among people such as music, clothing, and food.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(15)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) create and interpret visuals including pictures and maps.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(2) to read as follows:
“The student understands how historical figures and other individuals influenced helped to shape the community, state, and nation. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(2)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify historical figures such as including Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Edison, Garrett Morgan, Richard Allen, and other individuals who have exhibited individualism and inventiveness; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mr. Craig, to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(2)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) compare the similarities and differences among the lives and activities of historical figures and other individuals who have influenced the community, state, and nation.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(5)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) locate places of significance such as including the local community, Texas, the state capitol, the U.S. capital, major cities in Texas, the coast of Texas, Canada, Mexico, and the United States on maps and globes.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(12) to read as follows:

“(12) Government. The student understands the role of authority figures, public officials, and citizens. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add §113.12(b)(12)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify and describe the role of a good citizen in maintaining a representative republic and in keeping elected officials responsive to the wishes of the people.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(13)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify characteristics of good citizenship such as justice, truth, respect, and responsibility for the common good including truthfulness, respect for others and oneself, responsibility in daily life, and participation in government by educating oneself about the issues, holding public officials to their word, and voting;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy to amend Mrs. Cargill’s proposed amendment by striking the phrase “holding public officials to their word.” The motion failed.

**VOTE:** A vote was taken on the original motion made by Mrs. Cargill. The motion carried. Mrs. Knight objected.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(13)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify historical figures such as Nathan Hale, Benjamin Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt who have exemplified good citizenship; and”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.12(b)(15)(B) as follows:
“(B) explain the way folktales and legends such as Aesop's fables reflect beliefs, customs, language, and traditions of communities.”
The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(4)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify contributions of historical figures such as including Thurgood Marshall, Irma Rangel, and Theodore Roosevelt who have influenced the community, state, and nation;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. Mc Leroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(4)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify historical figures such as including Amelia Earhart, Robert Fulton, and George Washington Carver, and W.E.B. Dubois who have exhibited individualism and inventiveness;”
The motion carried. Ms. Hardy objected.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(8)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify ways in which people have modified the physical environment such as building roads, clearing land for urban development and agricultural use, and drilling for oil;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(8)(C) to read as follows:
“(8)(C) identify benefits and consequences of human modification of the physical environment such as the use of irrigation to improve crop yields; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. Mc Leroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.13(b)(11)(C) to read as follows:
“(11)(C) describe how governments tax citizens, such as through income taxes, property taxes, and sales taxes to pay for services and projects voted on by elected officials.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.13(b)(12)(D) to read as follows:
“(12)(D) identify how citizens participate in their own governance through staying informed of what public officials are doing, providing input to them, holding them accountable, volunteering to participate in government functions, and voting.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. Mc Leroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(13)(A) to read as follows:
“(13)(A) identify characteristics of good citizenship such as a belief in justice, truth and responsibility for the common good including truthfulness, equality, respect for others and
oneself, responsibility in daily life, and participation in government by educating oneself about the issues, holding public officials to their word, and voting;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(13)(B) to read as follows: “(13)(B) identify historical figures such as Paul Revere, Abigail Adams, Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASP) of WWII, WWII Navajo Code Talkers, and Sojourner Truth who have exemplified good citizenship;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(13)(D) to read as follows: “(13)(D) apply good citizenship to promote citizen active involvement in community service.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(14)(D) to read as follows: “(14)(D) identify how selected customs, symbols, and celebrations reflect an American love of individualism, inventiveness, and freedom.”

The motion carried. Mrs. Knight objected.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(1)(C) to read as follows: “(C) describe how individuals, including Daniel Boone, Christopher Columbus, the Founding Fathers, and Juan de Oñate, have contributed to the expansion of existing communities or to the creation of new communities.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(1)(C) to read as follows: “(C) describe how individuals, including Daniel Boone, Christopher Columbus, the Founding Fathers, and such as Juan de Oñate, have contributed to the expansion of existing communities or to the creation of new communities.”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(8)(B) to read as follows: “(B) explain how supply and demand and local, state and federal taxes affect the price of a good or service;”

The motion carried. Ms. Hardy objected.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Miller and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(8)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify individuals, past and present, including Henry Ford and other entrepreneurs in the community such as Mary Kay Ash, Wallace Amos, and Milton Hershey who have started new businesses.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(8)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify individuals, past and present, including Henry Ford and other entrepreneurs in the community such as Mary Kay Ash, Wallace Amos, Milton Hershey, and Sam Walton who have started new businesses.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(8)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify individuals, past and present, including Henry Ford and other entrepreneurs in the community such as Mary Kay Ash, Wallace Amos, Milton Hershey, and Sam Walton who have started new businesses.”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Nuñez and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(8)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify individuals, past and present, including such as Henry Ford and other entrepreneurs in the community such as Mary Kay Ash, Wallace Amos, Milton Hershey, and Sam Walton who have started new businesses.”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(11)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify characteristics of good citizenship such as a belief in justice, truth, and responsibility for the common good including truthfulness, equality respect for others and oneself, responsibility in daily life, and participation in government by educating oneself about the issues, holding public officials to their word, and voting;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Miller and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(11)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify historical and contemporary figures, including Helen Keller, and Clara Barton, and Dolores Huerta, who have exemplified good citizenship;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(14)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify and compare the heroic deeds of state and national heroes including Dr. Hector P. Garcia, Harriett Tubman, James A. Lovell, Jr., Juliette Gordon Low, Todd Beamer and other contemporary heroes; and”

The motion carried. Ms. Hardy objected.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(14)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify and compare the heroic deeds of state and national heroes including Dr. Hector P. Garcia, Harriet Tubman, James A. Lovell, Jr., Juliette Gordon Low, Todd Beamer, Ellen Ochoa, and other contemporary heroes; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(14)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify and analyze the heroic deeds of individuals, including military and first responders such as the four chaplains.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(15)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) explain the significance of various individual writers and artists and their stories, poems, statues, paintings, and other examples of cultural heritage to communities around the world such as including Carmen Lomas Garza, Laura Ingalls Wilder, and Bill Martin Jr.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(15)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) explain the significance of various individual writers and artists and their stories, poems, statues, paintings, and other examples of cultural heritage to communities around the world including Carmen Lomas Garza, and Laura Ingalls Wilder, and Bill Martin Jr.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education replace “communities around the world” with “other communities” in §113.14 (b)(2)(B); §113.14 (b)(2)(C); §113.14 (b)(4)(E); §113.14 (b)(15)(A); §113.14 (b)(15)(B).
The motion passed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education replace “communities in other nations” with “other communities” in §113.14(b)(13); §113.14(b)(13)(A); and §113.14(b)(13)(B).
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Allen to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(1)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify American Indian groups in Texas and North America before European exploration such as the Lipan Apache and Karankawas;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) summarize motivations for European exploration and settlement of Texas including economic opportunity, the search for freedom, and the desire for expansion;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) summarize motivations for European exploration and settlement of Texas including economic opportunity, the search for freedom, and the desire for expansion and explain the economic motivations for Anglo-American colonizers in Texas such as the Old 300;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(3)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify important Texan Texian, Tejano, and other participants of the Texas Revolution such as William B. Travis, James Bowie, Susanna Dickinson, George Childress, Juan N. Seguín, David Crockett, and Antonio López de Santa Anna;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(3)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify important Texian, Tejano, and other participants of the Texas Revolution such as including William B. Travis, James Bowie, Susanna Dickinson, George Childress, Juan N. Seguín, David Crockett, and Antonio López de Santa Anna;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education add §113.15(b)(3)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) Identify the Tejano leaders who died at the Alamo;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mrs. Berlanga to recommend that the State Board of Education add §113.15(b)(5)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify the accomplishments of notable individuals such as Henry Cisneros, Miriam A. Ferguson, John Tower, Scott Joplin, Audie Murphy, Cleto Rodríguez, Stanley Marcus, Bessie Coleman, and other local notable individuals.”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education add §113.15(b)(5)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify the accomplishments of notable individuals such as John Tower, Scott Joplin, Audie Murphy, Cleto Rodríguez, Stanley Marcus, Bessie Coleman, Raul A. Gonzales, and other local notable individuals.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add §113.15(b)(9)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) compare the positive and negative consequences of human modification of the environment in Texas, past and present, such as economic development the impact on habitats and wildlife as well as air and water quality.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add §113.15(b)(9)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) describe the positive impact of private, voluntary conservation efforts and wildlife management practices in preserving natural environments and protecting native species.

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.15(b)(11):
“(11) Economics. The student understands the reasons for exploration and colonization of Texas. The student is expected to:
(A) explain the economic motivations for European exploration and settlement in Texas; and
(B) explain the economic motivations for Anglo-American colonizers in Texas such as the Old 300.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(18)(A) as follows:
“(A) identify important individuals who have participated voluntarily in civic affairs at state and local levels such as including Adina de Zavala and Clara Driscoll;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(18)(B) as follows:
“(B) explain how individuals can participate voluntarily in civic affairs at state and local levels through activities such as holding public officials to their word, letter writing, historic preservation, and service projects;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(18)(D) as follows:
“(D) identify the importance of historical figures and important individuals who modeled active participation in the democratic process such as including Sam Houston, Barbara Jordan, Lorenzo de Zavala, Ann Richards, Sam Rayburn, Henry B. González, and other local individuals; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Miller and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(18)(D) as follows:
“(D) identify the importance of historical figures and important individuals who modeled active participation in the democratic process including Sam Houston, Barbara Jordan, Lorenzo de Zavala, Ann Richards, Sam Rayburn, Henry B. González, James Baker, and other local individuals; and”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(20)(C) as follows:
“(C) summarize the contributions of people of various racial, ethnic, and religious groups in the development of Texas such as the Norteño music of Lydia Mendoza and Chelo Silva.”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(1)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) describe the accomplishments of significant individuals during the colonial period, including William Bradford, Anne Hutchinson, William Penn, John Smith, John Wise, and Roger Williams.”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify and analyze the causes and effects of events prior to and during the American Revolution, including the French and Indian War, religious revivals, and the Boston Tea Party, and the Declaration of Independence;”
The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(2)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify the Founding Fathers and Patriot Heroes, their motivations, and their contributions during the revolutionary period, including John Adams, Samuel Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Nathan Hale, Thomas Jefferson, the Sons of Liberty, and George Washington; and”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(4) by adding the following:
“(A) describe the significance and impact of the Second Great Awakening.”
The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(4)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify significant events and concepts associated with U.S. territorial expansion, including the Louisiana Purchase, the expedition of Lewis and Clark and recognize the contributions of Sacajawea, and Manifest Destiny;”
The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(5)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) analyze various issues and events of the 20th century such as industrialization, urbanization, increased use of oil and gas, the Great Depression, world wars, the civil rights movement, and military actions (Tuskegee Airmen).”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(5)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify the accomplishments of individuals such as including Jane Addams, Susan B. Anthony, Dwight Eisenhower, Martin Luther King Jr., Rosa Parks, Cesar Chavez, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Ronald Reagan, and Colin Powell who have made contributions to society in the areas of civil rights, women's rights, military actions, and politics.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(5)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify the accomplishments of individuals including Martin Luther King Jr. and Cesar Chavez, and such as Jane Addams, Susan B. Anthony, Dwight Eisenhower, Rosa Parks, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Ronald Reagan, and Colin Powell who have made contributions to society in the areas of civil rights, women's rights, military actions, and politics.”
The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(7)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) locate on a map important political features such as ten of the largest urban areas in the United States, the 50 states and their capitals, and regions such as the Northeast, the Midwest, and the Southwest; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(14)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify and compare the systems of government of early European colonists, including representative government and monarchy; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(15)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify the purposes and explain the key elements importance of the Declaration of Independence; ”
and to add new (B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify the key elements of the Declaration of Independence; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(17)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) describe the origins and significance of national celebrations such as Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Constitution Day, Columbus Day, and Veterans Day; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(18)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) explain how the duty individuals can have to participate in civic affairs at the local, state, and national levels; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.18(b)(4)(F) to read as follows:

“(F) identify the location of major world countries such as Canada, Mexico, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, Norway, Sweden, Russia, South Africa, Nigeria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Israel, Iran, India, Pakistan, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of China (Taiwan), Japan, North and South Korea, Indonesia, and Australia.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.18(b)(9)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) understand the importance of morality and ethics in maintaining a functional free enterprise system; and”

The motion carried. Ms. Hardy opposed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.18(b)(9)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand the poor record of collectivist, non-free market economic systems to deliver improved economic development over numerous contemporary and historical societies.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.18(b)(10)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify and describe the effects of increasing government regulation and taxation on economic development and business planning.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.18(b)(12)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) compare ways in which various societies such as China, Germany, India, and Russia organize government and how they function; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.18(b)(14)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify and explain the importance duty of civic participation in democratic societies;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.18(b)(19)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain the significance of religious holidays and observances such as Christmas, and Easter, Ramadan, the annual hajj, and Yom Kippur, and Rosh Hashanah, Diwali, and Vaisakhi in various contemporary societies.”

The motion failed.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.18(b)(20)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) give examples of scientific discoveries and technological innovations, including the role of scientists and inventors, that have transcended the boundaries of influenced contemporary societies and have shaped the world;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(2)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify important individuals, events, and issues related to European exploration of Texas such as Alonso Álvarez de Pineda, Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca and his writings, the search for gold, and the conflicting territorial claims between France and Spain;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(2)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify important events and issues related to European colonization of Texas, including the establishment of Catholic missions, towns, and ranches; and individuals, including such as Fray Damián Massanet, José de Escandón, Antonio Margil de Jesús, and Francisco Hidalgo;”
The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(2)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify the issues and events related to Mexico becoming an independent nation and its impact on Texas such as including Texas involvement in the fight for independence, the Battle of Medina, the Mexican Federal Constitution of 1824, the merger of Texas and Coahuila as a state, the State Colonization Law of 1825 and, slavery;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(2)(E) to read as follows:
“(E) identify the contributions of significant individuals, including Moses Austin, Stephen F. Austin, Erasmo Seguin, José Bernardo, Martin de Leon, and Green DeWitt, during the Mexican settlement of Texas; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(3)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) explain the issues surrounding significant events of the Texas Revolution, including the Battle of Gonzales, William B. Travis’ letter “To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World,” the siege of the Alamo, the Convention of 1836, Fannin's surrender at Goliad, and the Battle of San Jacinto.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(4) to read as follows:
“(A) identify individuals, events, and issues during the administrations of Republic of Texas Presidents Houston, Lamar, and Jones such as the Texas Rangers, Jack Coffee Hayes, Chief Bowles, William Goyens, Mary Maverick, José Antonio Navarro, the Cordova Rebellion, the Council House Fight, the Sante Fe Expedition, the Texas Navy, public debt, and the roles of racial and ethnic groups;
(B) describe the development and history of the Texas Navy;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(7)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) define and trace the impact of "boom-and-bust" cycles of leading Texas industries throughout the 20th and early 21st centuries such as farming, oil and gas production, cotton, ranching, real estate, banking, and computer technology;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(10)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify ways in which Texans have adapted to and modified the environment and analyze the benefits and consequences of the modifications; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(11)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) analyze the effects of the changing population distribution and growth in Texas during the 20th and 21st centuries and the additional need for education, health care, and transportation; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(15)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) describe the structure, funding, and governance of Texas public education, including local property taxes, bond issues, state and federal funding supported by state and federal taxpayers.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(18)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify the contributions of Texas leaders, including such as James A. Baker III, Henry B. González, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Barbara Jordan, and Sam Rayburn, and Raul Gonzalez.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(19)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify examples of Spanish influence and the influence of other cultures on Texas such as place names, vocabulary, religion, architecture, food, and the arts; and”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(19)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify contributions to the arts by Texans such as Roy Bedichek, Sandra Cisneros Diane Gonzales Bertrand, J. Frank Dobie, Scott Joplin, Elisabet Ney, Amado Peña Jr., and Walter Prescott Webb.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(19)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify contributions to the arts by Texans such as Roy Bedichek, Diane Gonzales Bertrand, J. Frank Dobie, Scott Joplin, Elisabet Ney, Amado Peña Jr., and Walter Prescott Webb, and Horton Foote.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(19)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify contributions to the arts by Texans such as Roy Bedichek, Diane Gonzales Bertrand, J. Frank Dobie, Scott Joplin, Elisabet Ney, Amado Peña Jr., Walter Prescott Webb, and Horton Foote, and Santa Barraza.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(20)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify Texas leaders in science and technology such as Walter Cunningham, Michael DeBakey, Denton Cooley, Benjy Brooks, Michael Dell, and Howard Hughes Sr.;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Dunbar and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(1)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify the major eras and events in U.S. history through 1877, including colonization, revolution, drafting of the Declaration of Independence, creation, and ratification of the Constitution, religious revivals, such as the Second Great Awakening, early Republic, Age of Jackson, westward expansion, reform movements, sectionalism, Civil War, and Reconstruction, and describe their defining characteristics, causes and effects;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(3)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) describe how religion and virtue contributed to the growth of representative government in the American colonies.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(4)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) analyze causes of the American Revolution, including the Proclamation of 1763, the
Intolerable Acts, the Stamp Act, mercantilism, lack of representation in Parliament, and British
economic policies following the French and Indian War;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State
Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(4)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain the roles played by significant individuals during the American Revolution,
including Abigail Adams, John Adams, Wentworth Cheswill, Samuel Adams, Mercy Otis
Warren, James Armistead, Benjamin Franklin, Bernardo de Galvez, King George III, Haym
Salomon, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, the Marquis de Lafayette, Thomas Paine, and
George Washington;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the
State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(4)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain the roles played by significant individuals during the American Revolution,
including Abigail Adams, John Adams, Wentworth Cheswill, Samuel Adams, Mercy Otis
Warren, James Armistead, Benjamin Franklin, Bernardo de Galvez, Crispus Attucks, King
George III, Haym Salomon, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, the Marquis de Lafayette, Thomas
Paine, and George Washington;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded to recommend that the
State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(5)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) describe major domestic problems faced by the leaders of the new Republic such as
maintaining national security, building a military, creating a stable economic system, setting up
the court system, and defining the authority of the central government;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State
Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(6)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) identify areas that were acquired to form the United States, including the Louisiana
Purchase.”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State
Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(7)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify the provisions and compare the effects of congressional conflicts and compromises
prior to the Civil War, including the roles of John Quincy Adams, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay,
and Daniel Webster.”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State
Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(8)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) analyze the ideas contained in Jefferson Davis’s inaugural address and Abraham Lincoln's ideas about liberty, equality, union, and government as contained in his first and second inaugural addresses and the Gettysburg Address.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(11)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) describe the benefits and consequences of human modification of the physical environment of the United States; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(12) to read as follows:
“(B) explain reasons for the development of the plantation system, the growth of the slave Atlantic Triangular trade, and the spread of slavery; and
(C) explain the reasons for the increase in factories and urbanization; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(14)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) explain why a free enterprise (capitalist, free market) system of economics developed in the new nation, including minimal government intrusion and taxation and property rights; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(15)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify the influence of ideas from historic documents, including the Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights, the Mayflower Compact, The Wealth of Nations, the Declaration of Independence, the Federalist Papers, and selected anti-federalist writings, on the U.S. system of government;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(19)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) explain the importance of personal responsibilities, including such as accepting responsibility for one's behavior and supporting one's family;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(19)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify examples of responsible citizenship, including obeying rules and laws, staying informed on public issues, voting, and serving on juries;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(20)(A) to read as follows:
(A) explain the role of significant individuals, including Charles de Montesquieu, John Locke, William Blackstone, and such as William Penn in the development of self-government in colonial America;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(20)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) analyze reasons for and the impact of selected examples of civil disobedience in U.S. history such as the Boston Tea Party and Henry David Thoreau's refusal to pay a tax.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(22)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe the contributions of significant political, social, and military leaders of the United States such as Frederick Douglass, John Paul Jones, James Monroe, Stonewall Jackson, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig and carried unanimously to recess the meeting and continue proposed amendments to social studies TEKS standards at a meeting of the Committee of the Full Board on January 15, 2010.

6. **Report and Recommendations from the Commissioner of Education Regarding Instructional Materials Offered for Adoption under Midcycle 2010 Proclamation**

   (Board agenda page I-233)

   [Official agenda item #9]

   Item to be considered on Friday, January 15, 2010.

7. **Midcycle 2011 Proclamation of the State Board of Education Advertising for Bids on Instructional Materials**

   (Board agenda page I-239)

   [Official agenda item #10]

   Item to be considered on Friday, January 15, 2010. CFB-01/14/2010 28

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

8. **Discussion of Pending Litigation**

   (Board agenda page I-249)

   The committee did not discuss pending litigation; therefore, no executive session was held.

   Mrs. Lowe recessed the meeting at 10:43 p. m.
ACTION ITEM


Mrs. Lowe explained that the Committee of the Full Board was reconvening its meeting of the previous day in order to continue the discussion and consideration of amendments to this item. Anita Givens, associate commissioner for standards and programs, introduced the item. The committee chair entertained motions for amendments to the high school United States History Studies Since 1877 course.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.41(c)(1) to read as follows:

“(1) History. The student understands the principles included in the Celebrate Freedom Week program. The student is expected to:”

“(A) describe the intent, meaning, and importance of the Declaration of Independence and the U. S. Constitution, including the Bill of Rights”

“(B) describe the meaning of the following text from the Declaration of Independence: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure the rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

“(C) explain the application of these founding principles to historical events as U. S. History since Reconstruction course material is covered.”
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.41(c)(1)(C) and amend §113.41(c)(1)(A) and (c)(1)(B) to read as follows:
“(A) describe the identify and analyze the text, intent, meaning, and importance of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution, including the Bill of Rights and the full text of the first three paragraphs of the Preamble of the Declaration of Independence.
“(B) describe the meaning of the following text from the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness--That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed." Identify and analyze the application of these founding principles to historical events of U.S. history.”
“(C) Explain the application of these founding principles to historical events as U.S. History since Reconstruction course material is covered.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41 (c)(1)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) explain the significance of the following years as turning points: 1898 (Spanish-American War), 1914-1918 (World War I), 1929 (The Great Depression begins), 1939-1945 (World War II), 1957 (Sputnik launch ignites USA/USSR Space Race), 1968-69 (MLK assassination, USA Moon Landing), 1991 (Cold War ends), 2001 (Terrorist attacks of WTC, Pentagon), and 2008 (Election of first black president).”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mr. Agosto, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(2)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) analyze economic issues such as industrialization, the growth of railroads, the growth of labor unions, farm issues, the cattle industry boom, and the rise of entrepreneurship, free enterprise and big business; and”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(2)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) analyze social issues affecting women, minorities, children, immigrants, urbanization, The Social Gospel, and philanthropy of industrialists.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41 (c)(3)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) explain why significant events, policies, and individuals such as the Spanish-American War, U.S. imperialism, expansionism Henry Cabot Lodge, Alfred Thayer Mahan, Theodore Roosevelt, Samuel Dole, and missionaries moved the United States into the position of a world power;”
The motion carried. Mrs. Knight opposed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(3)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) evaluate American imperialism expansionism, including near and long-term responses from the United States, and acquisitions such as Guam, Hawaii, Cuba, Philippines, and Puerto Rico, and the United States;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.41(c)(3)(G) to read as follows:

“(G) analyze significant events such as the battle of Argonne Forest;”

The motion carried. Mrs. Knight opposed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(4)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) evaluate the impact of muckrakers and reform leaders such as Upton Sinclair, Susan B. Anthony, Ida B. Wells, and W. E. B. DuBois, Margaret Sanger, and John Dewey on American society; and”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(4)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify the causes of World War I and reasons for U.S. entry, including propaganda (information disseminated by an organization or government to promote a policy, idea, or cause) and unrestricted submarine warfare;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(5)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) analyze causes and effects of events and social issues, including such as immigration, Social Darwinism, race relations, nativism, the Red Scare, Prohibition, and the changing role of women; and”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(5)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) analyze the impact of significant individuals such as Clarence Darrow, William Jennings Bryan, Henry Ford, Glenn Curtiss, Marcus Garvey, and Charles A. Lindbergh.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(5)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) analyze the impact of significant individuals such as Clarence Darrow, William Jennings Bryan, Henry Ford, Glenn Curtiss, Marcus Garvey, and Charles A. Lindbergh.”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy, seconded by Mr. Mercer, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(6)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) analyze major military events of World War II, including the battle of Midway, the U.S. military advancement through the Pacific Islands, the Bataan Death March, the invasion of Normandy; and fighting the war on multiple fronts;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy, seconded Mr. Bradley, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(6)(E) to read as follows:
“(E) evaluate the military contributions of leaders during World War II including Omar Bradley, Dwight Eisenhower, Douglas MacArthur, Oveta Culp Hobby, Benjamin O. Davis, Chester A. Nimitz, George Marshall, and George Patton; and”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(6)(F) to read as follows:
“(F) explain the home front and how American patriotism inspired exceptional actions by citizens and military personnel alike, including high levels of military enlistment, volunteerism, purchase of war bonds, Victory Gardens, and the bravery and contributions of the Tuskegee airmen, and military enlistment, the Flying Tigers, the Navajo Code Talkers, including American Indian Code Talkers, the Double V campaign, and opportunities and obstacles for women and ethnic minorities.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(7)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) describe U.S. responses to Soviet expansion aggression after World War II, including the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Berlin airlift, and John F. Kennedy’s role in the Cuban Missile Crisis;”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(7)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) describe how McCarthyism and the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) how the later release of the Venona Papers confirmed suspicions of communist infiltration in U. S. government; the arms race; and the space race increased Cold War tensions,”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(8)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) describe the role of political organizations that promoted the Civil Rights Movement, including LULAC, the GI Forum, La Raza Unida, and MALDEF, ones from African American, Chicano, American Indian, women's, and other civil rights movements;”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Nunez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(8)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify the role of significant leaders who supported or opposed the Civil Rights Movement, including Martin Luther King Jr., Cesar Chavez, Betty Friedan, George Wallace, Vilma Martinez, and others;”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(8)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify the role of significant leaders who supported or opposed the Civil Rights Movement, including Martin Luther King Jr., Cesar Chavez, Betty Friedan, George Wallace, and others;”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41 (c)(9)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) describe Richard M. Nixon’s role leadership in the normalization of relations with China and the policy of détente;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(9)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe Ronald Reagan’s leadership in domestic and international policies such as including Reaganomics and Peace Through Strength;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded Mrs. Miller, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education add a new §113.41(c)(9)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) describe the causes, and key organizations and individuals of the conservative resurgence of the 1980s and 1990s, including Phyllis Schlafly, the Contract with America, the Heritage Foundation, the Moral Majority, and the National Rifle Association.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(10)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) discuss the role of third-party candidates such as Ross Perot and Ralph Nader analyze the impact of third parties on presidential elections;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41 (c)(11)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) analyze the impact of physical and human geographic factors on the Panama Canal, the Dust Bowl, the levee failure in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, and the settlement of the Great Plains; and”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41 (c)(11)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) analyze the impact of physical and human geographic factors on the settlement of the Great Plains, the Panama Canal, the Klondike Gold Rush, the Dust Bowl, and the levee failure in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina; and”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(12)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) analyze the causes and effects of changing demographic patterns resulting from legal and illegal immigration to the United States.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(13)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) understand the effects of governmental actions on individuals, industries, and communities including the impact of the Fifth Amendment property rights.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Miller, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education add a new §113.41(c)(14)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) describe the emergence of monetary policy in the United States, including the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, and the shifting trend from a gold standard to fiat money.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(15)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) analyze causes of economic growth and prosperity in the 1920s, including Warren Harding’s Return to Normalcy, reduced taxes, and increased production efficiencies;”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(15)(B) to read as follows: “(B) identify the causes of the Great Depression, including the impact of tariffs on world trade, stock market speculation, buying stock on margin, the stock market crash, bank failures, and the flawed monetary policy actions of the Federal Reserve System;”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(15)(C) to read as follows: “(C) analyze the effects of the Great Depression on the U.S. economy and society, such as widespread unemployment and deportation and repatriation of people of European and Mexican heritage, and others;”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(15)(D) to read as follows: “(D) compare Herbert Hoover’s and Franklin Roosevelt’s the New Deal policies and its opponents’ approaches to resolving the economic effects of the Great Depression;”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education add a new §113.41(c)(18)(A) to read as follows: “(A) evaluate the impact of New Deal legislation on the historical roles of state and federal governments;”

The motion carried. Mrs. Knight opposed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(18)(D) to read as follows: “(D) understand that the United States participates in international organizations and treaties.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga, seconded by Mr. Nuñez, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(20)(A) to read as follows: “(A) analyze the effects of landmark U.S. Supreme Court decisions, including Plessy v. Ferguson, Hernandez v. Texas, Brown v. Board of Education, Delgado v. Bastrop ISD, and Tinker v. Des Moines; and”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(20)(A) to read as follows: “(A) analyze the effects of landmark U.S. Supreme Court decisions, including such as Plessy v. Ferguson, Hernandez v. Texas, Brown v. Board of Education, Delgado v. Bastrop I.S.D., and Tinker v. Des Moines; and”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(20)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) analyze the effects of landmark U.S. Supreme Court decisions, including Brown v. Board of Education, and such as Plessy v. Ferguson, Hernandez v. Texas, Brown v. Board of Education, Delgado v. Bastrop I.S. D., and Tinker v. Des Moines; and”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(20)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) discuss historical reasons to amend the constitution why the constitution has been amended.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education add a new §113.41(c)(20)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) evaluate Constitutional “change” in terms of strict constructionalism versus judicial interpretation.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education add a new §113.41(c)(21)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify and analyze methods of expanding the right to participate in the democratic process, including lobbying, nonviolent protesting, litigation, and amendments to the U.S. Constitution;”

**MOTION:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(22)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) evaluate the contributions of significant political and social leaders in the United States such as Andrew Carnegie, Hector P. Garcia, Thurgood Marshall, Billy Graham, Barry Goldwater, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Clare Boothe Luce, Oveta Culp Hobby, Newt Gingrich, William F. Buckley, Phyllis Schlafly, and Hillary Clinton;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mrs. Berlanga to amend the proposed amendment by adding “Edward Kennedy” to §113.41 (c)(22)(B). The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded Mr. Agosto to amend the proposed amendment by adding “the Kennedy family” to §113.41 (c)(22)(B). The motion failed.

**VOTE:** A vote was taken on the original motion made by Dr. McLeRoy. The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(23)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature on American society such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and hip hop country and western music;”

The motion failed. CFB-01/15/2010 9

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(23)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature on American society such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and hip hop country and western music;”
The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(23)(B) to read as follows: “(B) describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature on American society such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and hip hop, and country and western music;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(24)(A) to read as follows: “(A) explain actions taken by people from racial, ethnic, gender, and religious groups to expand economic opportunities and political rights in American society;”

The motion carried. Mrs. Berlanga opposed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(24)(C) to read as follows: “(C) explain how the contributions of people of various racial, ethnic, gender, and religious groups shape American culture; and”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeRoy, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried to recommend that the State Board of Education add a new §113.41(c)(24)(E) to read as follows: “(E) discuss the meaning and historical significance of the mottos, E pluribus Unum and In God We Trust.”

The meeting of the Committee of the Full Board recessed at 1:50 p.m., and reconvened at 2:20 p.m.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Mrs. Knight, and carried unanimously that the State Board of Education postpone until the March 2010 meeting further consideration of first reading and filing authorization, the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter A, Elementary, Subchapter B, Middle School, and Subchapter C, High School, and 19 TAC Chapter 118, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Economics with Emphasis on the Free Enterprise System and Its Benefits, Subchapter A, High School.

Mrs. Lowe adjourned the meeting of the Committee of the Full Board at 2:28 p.m.
Report of the State Board of Education
Committee of the Full Board
March 10, 2010
The State Board of Education Committee of the Full Board met at 11:22 a.m. on Wednesday, March 10, 2010, in the State Board of Education Room, #1-104, of the William B. Travis Building, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas. All members of the committee were present, as follows:
Presiding: Gail Lowe, chair; Rick Agosto, Lawrence A. Allen, Jr., Mary Helen Berlanga, David Bradley, Barbara Cargill, Bob Craig, Cynthia Dunbar, Pat Hardy, Mavis B. Knight, Terri Leo, Don McLeroy, Ken Mercer, Geraldine Miller, Rene Nuñez

DISCUSSION ITEM
1. Public Hearing on Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading, Subchapter C, High School
(Board agenda page I-235)
Anita Givens, associate commissioner for standards and programs, stated that no member of the public had signed up for public testimony. Mrs. Lowe declared the public hearing closed.

ACTION ITEMS
2. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading, Subchapter C, High School
(Second Reading and Final Adoption)
(Board agenda page I-1)
[Official agenda item #3]
Ms. Givens explained that the documents provided to the committee were the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS standards) revision committees’ recommended amendments to the high school English elective courses. She explained there have been no changes since first reading. The SBOE directed staff to change the terminology “e.g.” to “such as.” The SBOE also directed staff to include an explanation of the use of “including” and “such as” in the introduction to each high school English elective course.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried unanimously to recommend approval for second reading and final adoption the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading, Subchapter C, High School. CFB-03/10/2010 2

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)
Public testimony was provided by the following individuals:
NAME: The Honorable Wayne Christian
AFFILIATION: Texas House of Representatives
NAME: The Honorable Dan Flynn
AFFILIATION: Texas House of Representatives
NAME: Jose A. Flores
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Placido Salazar
AFFILIATION: American G.I. Forum
NAME: Rhett Smith
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Antonio Diaz
AFFILIATION: Texas Indigenous Council
NAME: Mary Jane Martinez
AFFILIATION: Texas Families of Incarcerated Youth
NAME: Roman Pena
AFFILIATION: League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) and American G.I. Forum
NAME: Pete Berkowitz and Suzanne Ransleben
AFFILIATION: Texas Holocaust and Genocide Commission
NAME: Chip Adams
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Vadim Anshelevich
AFFILIATION: Self CFB-03/10/2010
NAME: Gary Dale Nunn
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Marvinette Smith
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Tom Wood
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Ronald Rocha
AFFILIATION: Coalition for Education Reform
NAME: Carlos B. Bonapart
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Lanell Haynie
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Maggie Rivas-Rodriguez
AFFILIATION: U.T. Austin/U.S. Latino and Latina World War II Oral History Project
NAME: Luis Figueroa  
AFFILIATION: Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)

NAME: Cathlyn Anderson  
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Amadeep Singh  
AFFILIATION: Sikh Coalition

NAME: Emilio Zamora  
AFFILIATION: U.T. Austin, Department of History

NAME: Nettie P. Hinton  
AFFILIATION: NAACP – San Antonio Branch

NAME: Juan Mancias  
AFFILIATION: Carrizo-Comecrudo Tribe of Texas

NAME: Jan Payne Pierce  
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Jana Zettl  
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Gary Bledsoe (Testimony read by Yannis Banks)  
AFFILIATION: Texas NAACP

NAME: Rishi Bhutada  
AFFILIATION: Hindu-American Foundation

NAME: Aubrey Garner  
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: The Honorable Eddie Rodriguez  
AFFILIATION: Texas State Representative

NAME: Zenobia Joseph  
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Richard Clayton  
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Patty Quinzi  
AFFILIATION: Texas American Federation of Teachers (AFT)

NAME: Leon Hernandez (Testimony read by Cruz Chavira)  
AFFILIATION: LULAC and Miguel Hernandez Chapter of American GI

NAME: Jonathan Saenz  
AFFILIATION: Liberty Institute

NAME: Fidel Castillo  
AFFILIATION: Coalition for Educational Reform

NAME: James Akers  
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Bill Proctor  
AFFILIATION: Self
MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(b)(2) to read as follows:
“(2) The following periodization should serve as the framework for the organization of this course: 8000 BCE BC – 500 BCE BC (Development of River Valley Civilizations); 500 BCE BC-600 CE AD (Classical Era); 600-1450 (Post-classical Era); 1450-1750 (Connecting Hemispheres); 1750-1914 (Age of Revolutions); and 1914-present (20th Century to the Present). Specific events and processes may transcend these chronological boundaries.”
and to recommend that the State Board of Education amend any reference throughout the social studies standards to “BCE” and “CE” to read “BC” and “AD” respectively.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(b)(2) to read as follows:
“(2) The following periodization should serve as the framework for the organization of this course: 8000 BC (BCE)-500 BC (BCE) (Development of River Valley Civilizations); 500 BC (BCE)-600 AD (CE) (Classical Era); 600-1450 (Post-classical Era); 1450-1750 (Connecting Hemispheres); 1750-1914 (Age of Revolutions); and 1914-present (20th Century to the Present). Specific events and processes may transcend these chronological boundaries.”
The motion failed.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Ms. Hardy.
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(1)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify major causes and describe the major effects of the following important turning points in world history from 600 to 1450: the spread of Christianity, the decline of Rome and the formation of medieval Europe; the development of Islamic caliphates and their impact on Asia, Africa, and Europe; the Mongol invasions and their impact on Europe, China, India, and Southwest Asia, and Mesoamerican civilizations;”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. Mcлерoy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(3)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) describe the major political, religious/philosophical, and cultural influences of Persia, India, China, Israel, Greece, and Rome, including the development of monotheism, Judaism, and Christianity;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(4)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) explain the characteristics of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(4)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) explain the political, economic, and social impact of Islam on Europe; Asia; and Northern, Eastern, and Sub-Saharan Africa;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. Mcлерoy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(4)(H) to read as follows:
“(H) explain the development of the slave trade within Africa;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(4)(K) to read as follows:
“(K) explain three pro-free market factors contributing to European technological progress during the rise and decline of the medieval system.”
The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(5) to read as follows:
“(5) History. The student understands the causes, characteristics and impact of the European Renaissance and the Reformation from 1450 to 1750. The student is expected to:”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.42(5)(A) as follows:
“(A) explain how the Crusades contributed to the development of the European Renaissance; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(5)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) explain the political, intellectual, artistic, economic, and religious impact of the Renaissance;”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(5)(B) to read as follows: “(B) explain the political, intellectual, artistic, economic, and religious impact of the Reformation.”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(6) to read as follows: “(6) History. The student understands the characteristics and impact of Maya, Inca, and Aztec civilizations. The student is expected to:”
The motion carried. MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(6)(A) to read as follows: “(A) compare the major political, economic, social, and cultural developments of the Maya, Inca, and Aztec civilizations and explain how prior civilizations influenced their development.”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(6)(B) to read as follows: “(B) explain how the Inca and Aztec empires were impacted by European exploration/colonization.”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.42(6)(B) and (C) as follows: “(B) compare the major political, economic, social, and cultural developments of the Maya, Inca, and Aztecs and explain how prior civilizations influenced their development;” “(C) explain how the Inca and Aztec empires were impacted by European exploration/colonization;”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(6)(H) to read as follows: “(H) explain three pro-free market factors contributing to the success of Europe’s Commercial Revolution.”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(7)(E) to read as follows: “(E) explain the benefits of free enterprise in the Industrial Revolution.”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by McIleroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(8)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) compare the causes, characteristics, and consequences of the American and French, and Latin American revolutions, emphasizing the role of the Enlightenment, the Glorious Revolution, and religion;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(8)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) trace the influence of the American and French revolutions on Latin America, including the role of Simon Bolivar;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(8)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify the influence of the following ideas on political revolutions: such as separation of powers, checks and balances, liberty, equality, democracy, popular sovereignty, human rights, constitutionalism, and nationalism.”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(10) to read as follows:

“(10) History. The student understands the causes and impact of the global economic depression immediately following World War I. The student is expected to:”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(11)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain the roles of various world leaders including Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, Hideki Tojo, Joseph Stalin, Franklin Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill prior to and during World War II; and”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education add new in §113.42(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand the importance of Medal of Honor recipients including Private Cleto Rodriguez, Sergeant Alejandro Ruiz, and Lieutenant Vernon J. Baker.”

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mrs. Miller to amend Mrs. Berlanga’s proposed amendment to §113.42(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand the importance of Medal of Honor recipients including individuals of all races and gender including Private Cleto Rodriguez, Sergeant Alejandro Ruiz, and Lieutenant Vernon J. Baker.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend Mr. Craig’s proposed amendment to §113.42(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand the importance of Medal of Honor recipients including individuals of all races and gender such as Private Cleto Rodriguez, Sergeant Alejandro Ruiz, and Lieutenant Vernon J. Baker.”
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The motion failed.

VOTE: A vote was taken on Mr. Craig’s amendment to Mrs. Berlanga’s motion.

The motion carried.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Mrs. Berlanga.

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(12) to read as follows:
“(12) History. The student understands the impact of major events associated with the Cold War and decolonization independence movements. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(12)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) summarize the factors that contributed to communism in China: including Mao Zedong’s role in its rise, and how it differed from Soviet communism;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(12)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify the following major events of the Cold War: including the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the arms race;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(12)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) explain the roles of modern world leaders including Ronald Reagan, Mikhail Gorbachev, Lech Walesa, and Pope John Paul II in the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(12)(E) to read as follows:
“(E) summarize the rise of independence movements in Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia and reasons for ongoing conflicts.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(12)(F) to read as follows:
“(F) explain how Arab rejection of the State of Israel has led to ongoing conflict.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(13) to read as follows:
“(13) History. The student understands the development of radical Islamic fundamentalism and the subsequent use of terrorism by some of its adherents and the ongoing conflict between Palestinians and Israelis in the second half of the 20th century. The student is expected to:”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(13)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) summarize the development and impact of radical Islamic fundamentalism on events in the second half of the 20th century including Palestinian terrorism and the growth of Al Qaeda;”
The motion carried.

Mr. Agosto, Mr. Allen, Mrs. Berlanga, and Mr. Nuñez opposed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.42(c)(13)(B) as follows:
“(B) explain the origins and impact of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on global politics; and”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(13)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) other acts of terrorism prior to September 11, 2001, not related to Islam, including the U.S. Cavalry against American Indians, the Texas Rangers against Mexican Americans, and for decades by the Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacist groups right here in our own country.”
The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(17)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify the historic origins and characteristics of communism, including the contributions influences of Karl Marx;”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(17)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify the historic origins and characteristics of fascism.”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(19)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify the impact of political and legal ideas contained in the following documents: Hammarabi's Code, the Jewish Ten Commandments, Justinian's Code of Laws, Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights, John Locke's "Two Treatises of Government," the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen;”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education substitute §113.42(19)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) explain the impact of the writings of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Voltaire, Charles de Montesquieu, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, and Sir William Blackstone:”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(19)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) explain the significance of the League of Nations and role of the United Nations from its conception to the present.”
The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(21)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) identify examples of politically motivated mass murder in Cambodia, China, Latin America, and the Soviet Union, and Armenia;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(21)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify examples of genocide, including the Holocaust and genocide in Armenia, the Balkans, and Rwanda;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education add “Darfur” in §113.42(21)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify examples of genocide, including the Holocaust and genocide in the Balkans, Rwanda and Darfur;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(21)(E) to read as follows:
“(E) identify examples of individuals who led resistance to political oppression such as Nelson Mandela, Mohandas Gandhi, Oscar Romero, and Chinese student protestors in Tiananmen Square; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education add “Natan Sharansky” in §113.42(21)(E) to read as follows:
“(E) identify examples of individuals who led resistance to political oppression such as Nelson Mandela, Mohandas Gandhi, Natan Sharansky, and Chinese student protestors in Tiananmen Square; and;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(21)(E) to read as follows:
“(E) identify examples of individuals who led resistance to political oppression such as Nelson Mandela, Mohandas Gandhi, Natan Sharansky, Las Madres de Plaza de Mayo, and Chinese student protestors in Tiananmen Square; and;”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(22)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) describe the historical origins, central ideas, and spread of major religious and philosophical traditions, including Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Sikhism, and the development of monotheism; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Agosto to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(22)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) describe the historical origins, central ideas, and spread of major religious and philosophical traditions, including Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, and the development of monotheism the Eastern religions of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Sikhism; and the Western Religions of Judaism, (including the development of monotheism), Christianity, and Islam; and”
The motion failed.

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(23)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) describe the major influences of women during major eras of world history such as Elizabeth I, Queen Victoria, Mother Teresa, Indira Gandhi, and Margaret Thatcher.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to amend Ms. Hardy’s proposed amendment by adding Golda Meier to read as follows:
“(B) describe the major influences of women during major eras of world history such as Elizabeth I, Queen Victoria, Mother Teresa, Indira Gandhi, and Margaret Thatcher, and Golda Meier.”
The motion carried. Mr. Agosto, Mr. Allen, and Mrs. Knight voiced their opposition.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the Ms. Hardy’s amended motion.
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(24)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) summarize the following fundamental ideas and institutions of Eastern civilizations that originated in China and India: Hinduism, Confucianism, Daoism, the Mandate of Heaven, Legalism, and Buddhism;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(24)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) explain the relationship among Christianity, individualism, and growing secularism that began with the Renaissance and how the relationship influenced subsequent political developments; and”
The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education reinsert the original (20)(A)(B)(C) to become §113.42(26)(A)(B)(C) to read as follows: CFB-03/10/2010 15
“(26) Culture. The student understands the relationship between the arts and times during which they were created. The student is expected to: (A) identify significant examples of art and architecture that demonstrate an artistic ideal or visual principal from selected cultures; (B) analyze examples of how art, architecture, literature, music, and drama reflect the history of cultures in which they are produced; and (C) identify examples of art, music, and literature that transcend the cultures in which they were created and convey universal themes.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(25)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) identify the origin and diffusion of major ideas in mathematics, science, and technology that occurred in River Valley civilizations, classical Greece and Rome, classical India, and the Islamic caliphates between 700 and 1200, and in China from the Tang to Ming dynasties;”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(25)(E) to read as follows:
“(E) identify the contributions of significant scientists such as Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, and Pythagoras.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(26)(E) to read as follows:
“(E) identify the contributions of significant scientists and inventors such as Robert Boyle, Marie Curie, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, Sir Isaac Newton, Louis Pasteur, and James Watt.”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.43(15) to read as follows:
“(15) Citizenship. The student understands how geography affects different points of view on influence the development of public issues and policies and decision making processes on local, state, national, and international levels. The student is expected to:
(A) compare the effects of different social, economic, and political points of view about public issues and policies;
(A) identify and give examples of different points of view that influence the development of public policies and decision making processes on local, state, national, and international levels; and
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Mrs. Miller, and carried unanimously to adjourn the Committee of the Full Board meeting.
Mrs. Lowe adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p. m.
The State Board of Education met at 9:10 a.m. on Friday, March 12, 2010, in the State Board of Education Room, #1-104, of the William B. Travis Building, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas. All members of the board were present, as follows:

Presiding: Gail Lowe, Chair; Rick Agosto; Lawrence A. Allen, Jr., Vice Chair; Mary Helen Berlanga; David Bradley; Barbara Cargill; Bob Craig; Cynthia Dunbar; Pat Hardy; Mavis B. Knight; Terri Leo, Secretary; Don McLeroy; Ken Mercer; Geraldine Miller; Rene Nuñez

Student Performance

The student performance was provided by the Klein Forest High School Jazz Ensemble, Klein Independent School District.

Invocation

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes

State Board of Education, January 15, 2010

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes of the January 15, 2010, meeting of the State Board of Education, as printed.

Public Testimony - Individual testimony will be taken to address items other than those on the board agenda.

The State Board of Education received one presentation of public testimony, as follows.

NAME: Linda Holcombe
AFFILIATION: Texas Industrial Vocational Association
TOPIC: Waiver to Allow 2-3 Hour Work-Based Training Courses to Substitute for One P. E. Credit

1. Resolutions and Presentations

Grace Shore

Ms. Leo read the resolution, which the members of the State Board of Education adopted by unanimous consent, expressing their sympathy and condolences to the family of Grace Shore.

(ATTACHMENT 1, page 15)
2. Approval of Consent Agenda

Any agenda item may be placed on the consent agenda by any State Board of Education committee. The State Board of Education may elect to take separate action on any item on the consent agenda.

In addition to the items on the original consent agenda, the following agenda items received unanimous approval in committee and were brought forward to the consent agenda for board approval:

- **Official Agenda Item #13**—Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 112, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Science, Subchapter D, Other Science Courses
- **Official Agenda Item #14**—Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 111, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Mathematics, Subchapter D, Other High School Mathematics Courses
- **Official Agenda Item #16**—Adoption of Review of 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements
- **Official Agenda Item #20**—Authorization to Issue a Request for Proposals for Absolute Return Asset Class

Mrs. Lowe reported that Official Agenda Item #20 was being pulled from the consent agenda, per Ms. Hardy’s request. *By unanimous consent, the State Board of Education approved the following items on the consent agenda, including the three items that were brought forward.*

(1) **Adoption of Review of 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations**

(Adoption of Review)

(Board agenda page II-133)

(COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION)

The State Board of Education adopted the review of 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter A, Gifted/Talented Education; Subchapter B, Adult Basic and Secondary Education; Subchapter C, General Educational Development; and Subchapter D, Special Education Services and Settings, as recommended by the Committee on Instruction.

(2) **Ratification of the Purchases and Sales of the Investment Portfolio of the Permanent School Fund for the Months of December 2009 and January 2010**
The State Board of Education ratified the purchases and sales for the months of December 2009 and January 2010, in the amount of $728,512,795 and $453,101,093, respectively, as recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund.

(3) Authorization to Issue a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Legal Counsel for the Permanent School Fund

The State Board of Education approved the issuance of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for outside legal counsel for the State Board of Education and the Permanent School Fund: Fiduciary Counsel, Alternative Assets Portfolio/Contracting and Tax Counsel, as recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund.

13. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 112, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Science, Subchapter D, Other Science Courses

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)

14. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 111, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Mathematics, Subchapter D, Other High School Mathematics Courses

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)
The State Board of Education approved for first reading and filing authorization the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 111, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Mathematics, Subchapter D, Other High School Mathematics Courses, as recommended by the Committee on Instruction.

16. Adoption of Review of 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements
(Adoption of Review)
(Board agenda page II-43)

The State Board of Education adopted the review of 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter A, Required Curriculum; Subchapter B, Graduation Requirements; Subchapter C, Other Provisions; Subchapter D, Graduation Requirements, Beginning with School Year 2001-2002; Subchapter E, Graduation Requirements, Beginning with School Year 2004-2005; and Subchapter F, Graduation Requirements Beginning with School Year 2007-2008, as recommended by the Committee on Instruction.

COMMITTEE OF THE FULL BOARD

3. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading, Subchapter C, High School
(Second Reading and Final Adoption)

(MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee of the Full Board and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 110, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading, Subchapter C, High School, with an effective date of August 22, 2011, to be implemented beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, as amended. (ATTACHMENT 2, page 17)

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)
The Committee of the Full Board made amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Subchapters A-C, and 19 TAC Chapter 118, Subchapter A, over a three-day period, from Wednesday, March 10, through Friday, March 12, 2010. Attachment 3 on page 59 reflects all amendments that were made throughout the meetings in the order they appear in the proposal, including the amendments reflected below. Although the committee had not completed all amendments on Thursday, March 11, a vote was taken to adjourn the meeting and to resume on March 12. Due to the late adjournment, the March 11 Committee of the Full Board minutes, which were distributed on March 12, did not include all of the amendments considered on March 11.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to approve for first reading and filing authorization the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter A, Elementary, Subchapter B, Middle School, and Subchapter C, High School, and 19 TAC Chapter 118, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Economics with Emphasis on the Free Enterprise System and Its Benefits, Subchapter A, High School, as amended.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mr. Agosto, and carried to amend §113.15(b)(2)(E) as follows:

(E) identify the accomplishments and explain the economic motivations and impact of significant empresarios, including Stephen F. Austin and Martín de León, on the settlement of Texas.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mr. Agosto, and carried to amend §113.15(b)(2)(A) as follows:

(A) summarize motivations for European exploration and settlement of Texas, including economic opportunity, the search for freedom, and the desire for expansion [and explain the economic motivations for Anglo-American colonizers in Texas such as the Old 300];

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mr. Agosto, and carried to add new §113.41(c)(7)(C) as follows:

(C) analyze the function of the United States Office of War Information;

(Mr. Allen was absent for the vote.)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mr. Nuñez, and carried to add new §113.44(c)(14)(D) as follows:

(D) understand the voter registration process and the criteria for voting in elections.

(Mr. Bradley was absent for the vote.)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §113.43(c)(17)(B) as follows:
(B) describe [compare] major world religions, including animism, Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, and Sikhism, and their spatial distribution;

**MOTION:** *It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Agosto to add new §113.19(b)(3)(C) as follows:*

(C) identify the Tejanos who died at the Alamo;

**MOTION:** *It was moved by Mr. Nuñez to amend §113.19(b)(3)(C) as follows:*

(C) explain the issues surrounding significant events of the Texas Revolution, including the Battle of Gonzalez, William B. Travis’s letter “To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World,” the siege of the Alamo, the Tejanos who died at the Alamo, the Constitutional Convention of 1836, Fannin’s surrender at Goliad, and the Battle of San Jacinto.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** *It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to amend §113.19(b)(3)(C) as follows:*

(C) explain the issues surrounding significant events of the Texas Revolution, including the Battle of Gonzalez, William B. Travis’s letter “To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World,” the siege of the Alamo [, the Tejanos who died at the Alamo,] and the 189 heroes who gave their lives there, the Constitutional Convention of 1836, Fannin’s surrender at Goliad, and the Battle of San Jacinto.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** *It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to amend §113.19(b)(3)(C) as follows:*

(C) explain the issues surrounding significant events of the Texas Revolution, including the Battle of Gonzalez, William B. Travis’s letter “To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World,” the siege of the Alamo [, the Tejanos who died at the Alamo,] and the 189 heroes who gave their lives there, the Constitutional Convention of 1836, Fannin’s surrender at Goliad, and the Battle of San Jacinto.

*The motion carried*, with 10 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No, as follows:

**Aye:**
- Mr. Bradley
- Ms. Leo
- Mrs. Cargill
- Mrs. Lowe
- Mr. Craig
- Dr. McLeroy
- Ms. Dunbar
- Mr. Mercer
- Ms. Hardy
- Mrs. Miller

**No:**
- Mr. Agosto
- Mrs. Knight
- Mr. Allen
- Mr. Nuñez
- Mrs. Berlanga
VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to insert the proposed language, “and the 189 heroes who gave their lives there.” The motion carried, with 11 members voting Aye and 4 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Bradley  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mrs. Cargill  
Dr. McLeroy  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Mercer  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mrs. Miller  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Nuñez  
Ms. Leo

No:  
Mr. Agosto  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) as follows:

(B) describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, [the Beat Generation,] hip hop, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and country and western music on American society;

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Ms. Hardy to retain the words “Beat Generation” in §113.41(c)(24)(B) as follows:

(B) describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, hip hop, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and country and western music on American society;

The motion carried unanimously, with 15 members voting Aye and 0 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Agosto  
Mrs. Knight  
Mr. Allen  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mr. Bradley  
Dr. McLeroy
A vote was taken on the motion to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) by inserting the words “hip hop.” The motion failed, with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  No:
Mr. Agosto  Mr. Bradley
Ms. Hardy  Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Allen  Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Knight  Dr. McLeroy
Mrs. Berlanga  Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Nuñez  Mr. Mercer
Mr. Craig  Ms. Leo
Mrs. Miller

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) as follows:

(B) describe both the positive and negative impacts of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and country and western music on American society;

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Allen to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) as follows:

(B) describe both the positive and negative impacts of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature, such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, [the Beat Generation,] rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and country and western music on American society;

The motion failed, with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  No:
Mr. Agosto  Mr. Bradley
Ms. Dunbar  Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Allen  Mr. Craig
Mrs. Knight  Dr. McLeroy
VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to approve for first reading and filing authorization, the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter A, Elementary, Subchapter B, Middle School, and Subchapter C, High School, and 19 TAC Chapter 118, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Economics with Emphasis on the Free Enterprise System and Its Benefits, Subchapter A, High School, as amended. The motion carried, with 10 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Hardy
Mrs. Miller

No:
Mr. Agosto
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Allen
Mr. Nuñez
Mrs. Berlanga

(ATTACHMENT 3, page 59)

5. Proclamation 2012 of the State Board of Education

Advertising for Bids on Instructional Material

(Board agenda page I-147)

The State Board of Education, without objection, postponed this item until the May 2010 meeting.

6. Report and Recommendations from the Commissioner of Education Regarding Instructional Materials Offered for Adoption under Midcycle 2010 Proclamation

(Board agenda page I-149)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and carried unanimously that the State Board of Education require that all publishers make corrections listed in the Report of the
Commissioner of Education Concerning Required Corrections of Factual Errors; require that all student textbooks meet established manufacturing standards and specifications; place the remaining instructional materials submitted for adoption on the Conforming List or Nonconforming List as indicated on the Final Recommendations of the Commissioner of Education Regarding Instructional Materials Offered for Adoption Under Midcycle 2010 Proclamation. (Mr. Allen and Mrs. Berlanga were absent for the vote.)

(ATTACHMENT 4, page 95)

7. Midcycle 2011 Proclamation of the State Board of Education Advertising for Bids on Instructional Materials

(Board agenda page I-155)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried unanimously to approve the release and issuance of the Midcycle 2011 Proclamation of the State Board of Education Advertising for Bids on Instructional Materials. (Mr. Allen and Mrs. Berlanga were absent for the vote.)

(ATTACHMENT 5, page 99)

8. Proposed New 19 TAC §66.67, Adoption of Open-Source Instructional Materials, and Proposed Amendment to 19 TAC §66.69, Ancillary Materials

(Second Reading and Final Adoption)

(Board agenda page I-197)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar, seconded by Ms. Leo, and carried unanimously to amend §66.67(h) by adding the following language, “and the State Board of Education shall hold a public hearing on the textbooks.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried, with Mrs. Knight abstaining, to amend §66.67 by inserting a new subsection (j) with the following language, “For purposes of this chapter, an entity producing an open-source material shall comply with all duties of publishers in TAC Chapter 66 or in TEC Chapter 31, from which such entity is not explicitly exempted.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar, seconded by Mrs. Miller, and carried, with Mrs. Knight abstaining, to amend §66.67 by inserting a new subsection (k) with the following language, “An open-source textbook defined in TEC §31.0241 and §31.071 shall not fulfill the requirement of a classroom set.”

VOTE: The State Board of Education by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board approved for second reading and final adoption the proposed new 19 TAC §66.67,
Adoption of Open-Source Instructional Materials, and proposed amendment to 19 TAC §66.69, Ancillary Materials, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register, as amended. (Mrs. Leo and Mr. Mercer were absent for the vote.)

(ATTACHMENT 6, page 139)


(Second Reading and Final Adoption)

(Board agenda page I-205)

The State Board of Education, without objection, postponed this item until the May 2010 meeting.


(Second Reading and Final Adoption)

(Board agenda page I-223)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Nuñez, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board, to approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed new 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.2, Distributions to the Available School Fund, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register, as amended.

(ATTACHMENT 7, page 141)

COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION

11. Proposed Amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 101, Assessment,

Subchapter E, Local Option, §101.101, Group-Administered Tests

(Second Reading and Final Adoption)

(Board agenda page II-1)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was recommended by the Committee on Instruction that the State Board of Education by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 101,
Assessment, Subchapter E, Local Option, §101.101, Group-Administered Tests, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register. The motion carried unanimously. (Mr. Bradley and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)

(ATTACHMENT 8, page 143)

12. Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter A, Required Curriculum

(Second Reading and Final Adoption)

(Board agenda page II-7)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee on Instruction that the State Board of Education by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter A, Required Curriculum, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register, as amended. The motion carried, with Mrs. Berlanga abstaining. (Mr. Bradley, Ms. Dunbar, and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)

(ATTACHMENT 9, page 145)

13. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 112, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Science, Subchapter D, Other Science Courses

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)

(Board agenda page II-15)

Action taken on this item by the State Board of Education is addressed under agenda item #2—Approval of Consent Agenda.

14. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 111, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Mathematics, Subchapter D, Other High School Mathematics Courses

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)

(Board agenda page II-31)

Action taken on this item by the State Board of Education is addressed under agenda item #2—Approval of Consent Agenda.
15. Update on Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS Standards) Review

(Board agenda page II-39)

No action was taken on this item.

16. Adoption of Review of 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements

(Adoption of Review)

(Board agenda page II-43)

Action taken on this item by the State Board of Education is addressed under agenda item #2—Approval of Consent Agenda.

17. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter B, Adult Basic and Secondary Education

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)

(Board agenda page II-157)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was recommended by the Committee on Instruction and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to approve for first reading and filing authorization the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter B, Adult Basic and Secondary Education. (Mr. Bradley, Ms. Dunbar, Ms. Hardy, and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)

COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL FINANCE/PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND


(First Reading and Filing Authorization)

(Board agenda page III-1)

**MOTION:** It was recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund that the State Board of Education approve for first reading and filing authorization the proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.65, Guarantee Program for School District Bonds, to maintain the $2,300 application fee and to set the multiplier at three times the cost value of the Permanent School Fund.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley that the State Board of Education approve an amendment to the proposed text to 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.65, Guarantee Program for School District Bonds, relating to the certification of the use of bond proceeds. The motion failed, with 5 members voting Aye, 8 members voting No, and 1 member Abstaining, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Cargill
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar

No:
Mrs. Berlanga
Ms. Leo
Mr. Craig
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Hardy
Mrs. Miller
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Nuñez

Abstain:
Mr. Agosto

(Mr. Allen was absent for the vote.)

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to approve for first reading and filing authorization the proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.65, Guarantee Program for School District Bonds, to maintain the $2,300 application fee and to set the multiplier at three times the cost value of the Permanent School Fund. The motion carried unanimously. (Mr. Allen was absent for the vote.)


(Board agenda page III-15)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to ratify the proposed
decrease of the amount of capacity held in reserve for the guarantee program for school district bonds from 8 percent to 5 percent of the Permanent School Fund’s capacity to guarantee bonds. (Mr. Mercer was absent for the vote.)

20. Authorization to Issue a Request for Proposals for Absolute Return Asset Class

(Board agenda page III-19)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried unanimously to refer this back to the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School.

21. Decision on Real Estate Investments

(Board agenda page III-23)

Because of a potential conflict of interest, Mrs. Miller recused herself from participating in any discussion or voting on this item.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** The State Board of Education unanimously approved the execution of agreements, subject to continued due diligence, with Mesa West Real Estate Income Fund II, L.P., and Invesco Mortgage Recovery Fund, necessary to make an investment commitment of $40 million each, as recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund.

COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL INITIATIVES


(Board agenda page IV-1)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was recommended by the Committee on School Initiatives and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to take no action on the proposed repeal of 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation, and proposed new 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs.

23. Consider for Action Any Changes to the Charters of Imagine International Academy of North Texas and Imagine International Academy Williamson County

(Board agenda page IV-51)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was recommended by the Committee on School Initiatives and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to approve the charter for Imagine
International Academy of North Texas with the condition that the management contract is approved by the commissioner of education.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was recommended by the Committee on School Initiatives and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to approve the charter for International Academy of Central Texas, LLC, formerly Imagine International Academy of Williamson County, pending resolution of the contingencies identified by staff.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS ON COMMITTEE AGENDAS**

Committee on Instruction

No report was presented.

Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund

No report was presented.

Committee on School Initiatives

*Mr. Craig reported on the following action item of the Committee on School Initiatives: Review of Open-Enrollment Charter School Applications Removed from Consideration for Incompleteness.*

**REPORTS OF OTHER STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND CONCERNS IN INDIVIDUAL DISTRICTS**

No reports were presented.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

______________________________

Terri Leo, Secretary

**RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS Grace Shore of Longview, a former public school math teacher, was appointed to join the State Board of Education in 1997 by Governor George W. Bush; and

WHEREAS in making this appointment, Gov. Bush noted that Grace Shore “shared a commitment to education excellence, local control and accountability”; and

WHEREAS Grace Shore knew that providing the schoolchildren of Texas with a quality education is the most important thing a state can do; and
WHEREAS Governor Rick Perry, reiterated that belief and faith in Grace Shore by appointing her as chair of the State Board of Education in 2001, stating that “Grace’s experience on the board, in the classroom, and in the business world will help as we work to make a good education system even better”; and

WHEREAS Grace Shore was elected to the State Board of Education to represent the constituents of District 8 in 1998 and served until January 2003; and

WHEREAS as a member of this esteemed body Grace Shore served on the board’s Instruction, Planning, and School Finance/Permanent School Fund committees; and

WHEREAS this former teacher, long-time community leader, and volunteer passed away recently after a long and courageous fight against cancer; and

WHEREAS Grace Shore will live on in the annuals of the State Board of Education as a committed and valiant supporter of the idea of a strong Texas public education system; and

WHEREAS both former and current members of the State Board of Education regret the passing of this esteemed colleague; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the State Board of Education express their sympathy and condolences to the family of Grace Shore; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be presented to the family of Grace Shore and that a copy be kept in the permanent records of the State Board of Education.

WITNESS our signatures this twelfth day of March, two thousand and ten, in Austin, Texas.

_________________________________
Gail Lowe, Chair

_________________________________
Terri Leo, Secretary
GENERAL AMENDMENTS

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education substitute the term “constitutional republic” for “democratic republic” wherever it appears in the social studies TEKS standards documents.

The motion carried with 9 members voting Aye, 3 members voting No, and 2 members abstaining, as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Bradley  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mrs. Cargill  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mr. Mercer  
Ms. Hardy  
Mrs. Miller  
Ms. Leo  

No:  
Mr. Craig  
Mrs. Knight  
Mr. Nuñez  
Abstain:  
Mr. Agosto  
Mr. Allen  

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education replace the term “democratic society” with “societies with representative governments” wherever it appears in the social studies TEKS standards documents.

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add a statement to the introduction for any course that uses the term “free enterprise” to read as follows:

“Students identify the role of the U.S. free enterprise system within the parameters of this course and understand that this system may also be referenced as capitalism or the free market system.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education strike the parenthetical terms “(capitalist, free market)” wherever they appear in the social studies TEKS standards documents.

The motion carried.

§113.12. Social Studies, Grade 1, Beginning with School Year 2011-2012
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(13)(B) to read as follows: “(B) identify historical figures such as Nathan Hale, Benjamin Franklin, Francis Scott Key, and Eleanor Roosevelt who have exemplified good citizenship; and”

The motion failed.

§113.13. Social Studies, Grade 2, Beginning with School Year 2011-2012

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(4)(A) to read as follows: “(A) identify contributions of historical figures, including Thurgood Marshall, Irma Rangel, John Hancock, and Theodore Roosevelt, who have influenced the community, state, and nation;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(13)(B) to read as follows: “(B) identify historical figures including such as Paul Revere, Abigail Adams, World War II Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASPs) and Navajo Code Talkers, and Sojourner Truth who have exemplified good citizenship;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez and seconded by Mr. Agosto to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(14)(A) to read as follows: “(C) identify and compare the heroic deeds of state and national heroes, including Hector P. Garcia, Harriet Tubman, James A. Lovell, Juliette Gordon Low, Todd Beamer, Ellen Ochoa, John “Danny” Olivas, and other contemporary heroes; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(15)(B) to read as follows: “(B) explain the significance of various individual writers and artists and their stories, poems, statues, paintings, and other examples of cultural heritage to other communities, including Carmen Lomas Garza, and Laura Ingalls Wilder, and Bill Martin Jr.”

The motion carried.

§113.15. Social Studies, Grade 4, Beginning with School Year 2011-2012
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Agosto to amend §113.15(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) summarize motivations for European exploration and settlement of Texas, including economic opportunity, the search for freedom, and the desire for expansion, and explain the economic motivations for Anglo-American colonizers in Texas such as the Old 300;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Agosto to amend §113.15(b)(2)(E) to read as follows: “(E) identify the accomplishments and explain the economic motivations and impact of significant empresarios, including Stephen F. Austin and Martín de León, on the settlement of Texas.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(3)(A) to read as follows: “(A) analyze the causes, major events, and effects of the Texas Revolution, including the battles of the Alamo, the Texas Declaration of Independence, the Runaway Scrape, and the battle of San Jacinto;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(3)(B) to read as follows: “(B) identify important Texian, Tejano, and other participants of the Texas Revolution, including summarize the significant contributions of individuals such as Texans-William B. Travis, James Bowie, David Crockett, George Childress, and Sidney Sherman; Tejanos-Juan N. Seguín, Plácido Benavides, and Francisco Ruiz; Mexicans-Antonio López de Santa Anna and Vicente Filisola; and non-combatants-Susanna Dickinson and Enrique Esparza;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.15(b)(3)(C) to read as follows: “(C) Identify the Tejano leaders who died at the Alamo;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(17)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) explain the role duty of the individuals in state and local elections such as being informed and voting;”
The motion carried.

§113.16. Social Studies, Grade 5, Beginning with School Year 2011-2012

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(3)(B) to read as follows: “(B) identify the contributions of individuals, including James Madison, George Mason, Charles Pinckney, and Roger Sherman, who helped create the U.S. Constitution.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(7)(C) to read as follows: “(C) locate on a map important political features such as the ten largest urban areas in the United States, the 50 states and their capitals, and regions such as the Northeast, the Midwest, and the Southwest; and”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education strike the phrase “holding public officials to their word” in §113.12(b)(13)(A), §113.14(b)(11)(A), and §113.15(b)(17)(B) and the phrase “holding them accountable” in §113.13(b)(12)(D). The motion failed with 10 members voting No and 3 members voting Aye, as follows:

Aye: Mr. Allen Mrs. Knight Ms. Hardy
No: Mr. Bradley Mrs. Lowe Mrs. Cargill Dr. McLeroy Mr. Craig Mr. Mercer Ms. Dunbar Mrs. Miller Ms. Leo Mr. Nuñez

§113.18. Social Studies, Grade 6, Beginning with School Year 2011-2012

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.18(b)(4)(F) to read as follows:

“(F) identify the location of major world countries such as Canada, Mexico, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, Norway, Sweden, Russia, South Africa, Nigeria, Iraq,
Afghanistan, Israel, Iran, India, Pakistan, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of China (Taiwan), Japan, North and South Korea, Indonesia, and Australia.”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.18(b)(11)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify reasons for limiting the power of government; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.18(b)(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) review the record of human rights abuses of unlimited governments, including the oppression of Christians in Sudan.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.18(b)(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) review the record of human rights abuses of unlimited governments, including the oppression of Christians in Sudan.”

The motion carried.

**VOTE:** A vote was taken on the original motion made by Mr. Mercer.

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.18(b)(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) review the record of human rights abuses of unlimited governments such as the oppression of Christians in Sudan.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.18(b)(14)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify reasons for limiting the power of government in a democratic society.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.18(b)(16)(C) to read as follows:
“(C) analyze the efforts and activities institutions use to sustain themselves over time such as the development of an informed citizenry through compulsory education and the use of monumental architecture by religious institutions.”

The motion carried.

§113.19. Social Studies, Grade 7, Beginning with School Year 2011-2012

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Agosto to add new §113.19(b)(3)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify the Tejanos who died at the Alamo”

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez to amend §113.19(b)(3)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) explain the issues surrounding significant events of the Texas Revolution, including the Battle of Gonzalez, William B. Travis’s letter “To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World,” the siege of the Alamo, the Tejanos who died at the Alamo, the Constitutional Convention of 1836, Fannin’s surrender at Goliad, and the Battle of San Jacinto.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to amend §113.19(b)(3)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) explain the issues surrounding significant events of the Texas Revolution, including the Battle of Gonzalez, William B. Travis’s letter “To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World,” the siege of the Alamo, the Tejanos who died at the Alamo, and the 189 heroes who gave their lives there, the Constitutional Convention of 1836, Fannin’s surrender at Goliad, and the Battle of San Jacinto.”

The motion carried with 10 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No as follows:

Aye: Mr. Bradley, Ms. Leo, Mrs. Cargill, Mrs. Lowe, Mr. Craig, Dr. McLeroy, Ms. Dunbar, Mr. Mercer, Ms. Hardy, Mrs. Miller

No: Mr. Agosto, Mrs. Knight, Mr. Allen, Mr. Nuñez, Mrs. Berlanga
VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to insert the proposed language “and the 189 heroes who gave their lives there.” The motion carried, with 11 members voting Aye and 4 members voting No as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Bradley  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mrs. Cargill  
Dr. McLeroy  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Mercer  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mrs. Miller  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Nuñez  
Ms. Leo  

No:  
Mr. Agosto  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight  

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.19(b)(3)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) explain how victory at San Jacinto brought civil, political, and religious freedom to Texas.”

The motion carried with 9 members voting Aye and 6 members voting No as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Bradley  
Dr. McLeroy  
Mrs. Cargill  
Mr. Mercer  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mrs. Miller  
Ms. Leo  
Mr. Nuñez  
Mrs. Lowe  

No:  
Mr. Agosto  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Allen  
Ms. Hardy  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mrs. Knight  

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(18)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify the contributions of Texas leaders, including Lawrence Sullivan "Sul" Ross, John Nance Garner IV ("Cactus Jack"), James A. Baker III, Henry B. González, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Barbara Jordan, Sam Rayburn, and Raul A. Gonzalez.”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(18)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify the contributions of Texas leaders, including Lawrence Sullivan "Sul" Ross, John Nance Garner IV ("Cactus Jack"), James A. Baker III, Henry B. González, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Barbara Jordan, Raymond L. Telles, Sam Rayburn, and Raul A. Gonzalez.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.19(b)(19)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify contributions to the arts by Texans such as Roy Bedichek, Diane Gonzales Bertrand, J. Frank Dobie, Scott Joplin, Elizabet Ney, Amado Peña Jr., Walter Prescott Webb, Horton Foote, and Tex Avery Santa Barraza.”

The motion carried with 10 members voting Aye and 4 members voting No as follows:

Aye:
- Mr. Bradley
- Ms. Leo
- Mrs. Cargill
- Mrs. Lowe
- Mr. Craig
- Dr. McLeRoy
- Ms. Dunbar
- Mr. Mercer
- Ms. Hardy
- Mrs. Miller

No:
- Mr. Agosto
- Mrs. Berlanga
- Mr. Allen
- Mrs. Knight

§113.20. Social Studies, Grade 8, Beginning with School Year 2011-2012

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeRoy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(8)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) explain the roles played by significant individuals and heroes during the Civil War, including Jefferson Davis, Ulysses S. Grant, Robert E. Lee, and Abraham Lincoln, and William Carney;”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(8)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) explain the roles played by significant individuals and heroes during the Civil War, including Jefferson Davis, Ulysses S. Grant, Robert E. Lee, and Abraham Lincoln, and William Carney, and Philip Bazaar;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. Mc Leroy and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(8)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) explain the roles played by significant individuals and heroes during the Civil War, including Jefferson Davis, Ulysses S. Grant, Robert E. Lee, and Abraham Lincoln, and Medal of Honor recipients William Carney and Philip Bazaar;”

The motion carried.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Mrs. Cargill.

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. Mc Leroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(20)(A) to read as follows: “(A) explain the role of significant individuals including Thomas Hooker, Charles de Montesquieu, John Locke, William Blackstone, and William Penn, in the development of self-government in colonial America;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.20(b)(24)(B) to read as follows: “(B) evaluate the impact of reform movements, including educational reform public education, temperance, women’s rights movement, prison reform, abolition, labor reform movement, and care of the disabled.”

The motion carried.

§113.41. United States History Studies Since 1877 (One Credit), Beginning with School Year 2011-2012

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.41(c)(1)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) explain the contributions of the Founding Fathers such as Benjamin Rush, John Hancock, John Jay, John Witherspoon, John Peter Muhlenberg, Charles Carroll, and Jonathan Trumbull.”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(7)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify reasons for U.S. involvement in World War II, including the growth of dictatorships Italian, German, and Japanese dictatorships and their aggression, especially the attack on Pearl Harbor;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(7)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) evaluate the domestic and international leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman during World War II, including the U.S. relationship with its allies; and domestic industry’s rapid mobilization for the war effort;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(7)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) analyze major issues of World War II, including the Holocaust, the internment of Japanese, German, and Italian Americans, the regulation of some foreign nationals, and the development of conventional and atomic weapons;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Agosto to add new §113.41(c)(7)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) analyze the function of the United States Office of War Information;”

The motion carried. (Mr. Allen was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(7)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) analyze major military events of World War II, including the Battle of Midway, the U.S. military advancement through the Pacific Islands, the Bataan Death March, the invasion of Normandy, and fighting the war on multiple fronts, and liberation of concentration camps;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(9)(D) to read as follows:
“(D) identify the roles of significant leaders who supported or opposed the civil rights movement, including Martin Luther King Jr., Cesar Chavez, Rosa Parks, George Wallace, and others;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION:** *It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.41(c)(9)(G) to read as follows:*

“(G) describe how litigation played a role in protecting the rights of the minority during the civil rights movement, including the landmark cases of Brown v. Board of Education, Mendez v. Westminster, Hernandez v. Texas, Edgewood ISD v. Kirby, and Sweatt v. Painter.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** *It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to amend Mrs. Knight’s proposed amendment to §113.41(c)(9)(G) to read as follows:*

“(G) describe how litigation played a role in protecting the rights of the minority during the civil rights movement, including such as the landmark cases of Brown v. Board of Education, Mendez v. Westminster, Hernandez v. Texas, Edgewood ISD v. Kirby, and Sweatt v. Painter.”

*The motion carried.*

**VOTE:** *A vote was taken on the original motion by Mrs. Knight. The motion carried.*

**MOTION:** *It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(9) to read as follows:*

“(C) describe the role of groups that sought to maintain the status quo; identify the role of significant leaders who supported various rights movements, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Cesar Chavez, and Betty Friedan;

“(D) identify the roles of significant leaders who supported or opposed the civil rights movement, including Martin Luther King Jr., Cesar Chavez, George Wallace, and others; analyze the effectiveness of the adversarial approach taken by many civil rights groups versus the philosophically persuasive tone of Dr. Martin Luther King’s “I have a dream” speech, and his letter from the Birmingham jail;

“(E) describe presidential actions and bipartisan congressional efforts votes by party to achieve equality address minority rights in the United States, including desegregation of the armed forces, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

“(F) evaluate changes in the United States that have resulted from the civil rights movement such as increased participation of minorities in the political process. describe the role of individuals and groups that sought to maintain the status quo, such as governors George Wallace, Orval Faubus, and Lester Maddox, and including the Congressional bloc of southern Democrats, and*
“(G) evaluate changes and events in the United States that have resulted from the civil rights movement, including increased participation of minorities in the political process and unrealistic expectations for equal outcomes.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** *It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to amend Dr. McLeroy’s proposed amendment to §113.41(c)(9)(C) to read as follows:*

“(C) identify the role of significant leaders who supported various rights movements, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Cesar Chavez, Rosa Parks, and Betty Friedan;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** *It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded to amend Dr. McLeroy’s proposed amendment to §113.41(c)(9)(G) to read as follows:*

“(G) evaluate changes and events in the United States that have resulted from the civil rights movement, including increased participation of minorities in the political process and unrealistic expectations for equal outcomes.”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** *It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded to amend Dr. McLeroy’s proposed amendment to §113.41(c)(9)(D) to read as follows:*

“(D) analyze the effectiveness of the adversarial approach taken by many some civil rights groups versus the philosophically persuasive tone of Dr. Martin Luther King’s “I have a dream” speech, and his letter from the Birmingham jail;”

*The motion carried.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** *It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded to amend Dr. McLeroy’s proposed amendment to §113.41(c)(9)(D) to read as follows:*

“(D) analyze the effectiveness of the adversarial approach taken by some civil rights groups versus the philosophically persuasive tone of Dr. Martin Luther King’s “I have a dream” speech, and his letter from the Birmingham jail;”

*The motion failed.*

**MOTION AND VOTE:** *It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mr. Craig to amend Dr. McLeroy’s proposed amendment to §113.41(c)(9)(D) to read as follows:*

“(D) analyze the effectiveness of the adversarial approach taken by some civil rights groups such as the Black Panthers versus the philosophically persuasive tone of Dr. Martin Luther King’s “I have a dream” speech, and his letter from the Birmingham jail;”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded to amend Dr. McLeroy’s proposed amendment to §113.41(c)(9)(E) to read as follows:

“(D) describe presidential actions and bipartisan congressional efforts votes to achieve equality address minority rights in the United States, including desegregation of the armed forces, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965;”

The motion carried.

**VOTE:** A vote was taken on the original motion by Dr. McLeroy. The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(12)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) analyze the impact of physical and human geographic factors on the Panama Canal, the Klondike Gold Rush, the Dust Bowl, the levee failure in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, and the settlement of the Great Plains; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(16)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) analyze the causes of economic growth and prosperity in the 1920s, including Warren Harding’s Return to Normalcy, reduced taxes, and increased production efficiencies;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(17)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) describe the economic effects of World War II on the home front such as the end of the Great Depression, rationing, and women and minority increased opportunity for employment, including for women and minorities;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(17)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify actions of government and the private sector such as the Great Society, affirmative action, and Title IX to create economic opportunities for citizens and analyze the unintended consequences of each; and”
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The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(18)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) discuss the role of American entrepreneurs who achieved the American Dream such as Bill Gates, Sam Walton, Estee Lauder, Robert Johnson, Lionel Sosa, and Mary Kay Ash millions of small business entrepreneurs in affecting the global economy, and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(19)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain constitutional issues raised by how the role of the federal government policy changes during times of significant events, including World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, the 1960s, and 9/11;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education add §113.41(c)(22) to read as follows:

“(22) Citizenship. The student understands the concept of American exceptionalism. The student is expected to:

“(A) describe how American values are different and unique from those of other nations;

“(B) describe United States citizens as people from numerous places throughout the world, who hold a common bond in standing for certain self-evident truths; and

“(C) discuss Alexis de Tocqueville’s five values crucial to America's success as a constitutional republic: (1) liberty, (2) egalitarianism, (3) individualism, (4) populism, and (5) laissez-faire.”

The motion carried with 8 members voting Aye and 3 members voting No as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Cargill
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Miller

No:
Mr. Craig
Mrs. Knight
Ms. Hardy
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, hip hop, and country and western music on American society;”

The motion carried.

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, hip hop, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and country and western music on American society;”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Ms. Hardy to retain the words “Beat Generation” in §113.41(c)(24)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe the impact of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, hip hop, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and country and western music on American society;”

The motion carried unanimously with 15 members voting Aye and no members voting No as follows.

Aye:
Mr. Agosto
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Allen
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Berlanga
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Bradley
Dr. McLeroy
Mrs. Cargill
Mr. Mercer
Mr. Craig
Mrs. Miller
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Nuñez
Ms. Hardy
VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) by inserting the words “hip hop.” The motion failed with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Agosto  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Nuñez  
Mr. Craig

No:  
Mr. Bradley  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mrs. Cargill  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mr. Mercer  
Mrs. Leo  
Mrs. Miller

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe both the positive and negative impacts of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and country and western music on American society;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Allen to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe both the positive and negative impacts of significant examples of cultural movements in art, music, and literature such as Tin Pan Alley, the Harlem Renaissance, the Beat Generation, rock and roll, the Chicano Mural Movement, and country and western music on American society;”

The motion failed with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Agosto  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Nuñez  
Mrs. Cargill

No:  
Mr. Bradley  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mr. Craig  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Mercer  
Mrs. Leo  
Mrs. Miller
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MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(25)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) explain actions taken by people to expand economic opportunities and political rights for racial, ethnic, and religious minorities as well as women in American society;”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Mr. Allen to amend Mrs. Knight’s proposed amendment to §113.41(c)(25)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) explain actions taken by people to expand economic opportunities and political rights, including those for racial, ethnic, and religious minorities as well as women, in American society;”

The motion carried.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion by Mrs. Knight. The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.41(c)(25)(F) to read as follows:

“(F) discuss the importance of congressional Medal of Honor recipients, including individuals of all races and genders such as Vernon J. Baker, Alvin York, and Roy Benavides.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(26) to read as follows:

“(26) Science, technology, and society. The student understands the impact of science, and technology, and the free enterprise system on the economic development of the United States. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(26)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) understand the impact of technological and management innovations and their applications in the workplace and the resulting productivity enhancements for business and labor the response by business on the American labor movement; such as assembly line manufacturing, time study analysis, robotics, computer management, and just-in-time inventory management.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(27) to read as follows:
“(27) Science, technology, and society. The student understands the influence of scientific discoveries, and technological innovations, and the free enterprise system on the standard of living in the United States. The student is expected to:

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(27)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) analyze how scientific discoveries, and technological innovations, and the application of these by the free enterprise system, including those in transportation and communication, improve change the standard of living in the United States; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.41(c)(27)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain how space technology and exploration improve impact the quality of life.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.41(c)(27)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) understand how the free enterprise system drives technological innovation and its application in the marketplace, such as cell phones, inexpensive personal computers, and global positioning products.”

The motion carried.

§113.42. World History Studies (One Credit), Beginning with School Year 2011-2012.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(b)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) The following periodization should serve as the framework for the organization of this course: 8000 BCE BC – 500 BCE BC (Development of River Valley Civilizations); 500 BCE BC-600 CE AD (Classical Era); 600-1450 (Post-classical Era); 1450-1750 (Connecting Hemispheres); 1750-1914 (Age of Revolutions); and 1914-present (20th Century to the Present). Specific events and processes may transcend these chronological boundaries.” and to recommend that the State Board of Education amend any reference throughout the social studies standards to “BCE” and “CE” to read “BC” and “AD” respectively.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(b)(2) to read as follows:
“(2) The following periodization should serve as the framework for the organization of this course: 8000 BC (BCE)-500 BC (BCE) (Development of River Valley Civilizations); 500 BC (BCE)-600 AD (CE) (Classical Era); 600-1450 (Post-classical Era); 1450-1750 (Connecting Hemispheres); 1750-1914 (Age of Revolutions); and 1914-present (20th Century to the Present). Specific events and processes may transcend these chronological boundaries.”

The motion failed with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Agosto  
Mrs. Knight  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Miller  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Nuñez  
Mr. Craig  

No:  
Mr. Bradley  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Cargill  
Mrs. Lowe  
Ms. Dunbar  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Mercer

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Ms. Hardy.

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(1)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify major causes and describe the major effects of the following important turning points in world history from 600 to 1450: the spread of Christianity, the decline of Rome and the formation of medieval Europe; the development of Islamic caliphates and their impact on Asia, Africa, and Europe; the Mongol invasions and their impact on Europe, China, India, and Southwest Asia, and Mesoamerican civilizations;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(3)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) describe the major political, religious/philosophical, and cultural influences of Persia, India, China, Israel, Greece, and Rome, including the development of monotheism, Judaism, and Christianity;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(4)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) explain the characteristics of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(4)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) explain the political, economic, and social impact of Islam on Europe; Asia; and Northern, Eastern, and Sub-Saharan Africa;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(4)(H) to read as follows:

“(H) explain the development of the slave trade within Africa;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(4)(K) to read as follows:

“(K) explain three pro-free market factors contributing to European technological progress during the rise and decline of the medieval system.”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(5) to read as follows:

“(5) History. The student understands the causes, characteristics and impact of the European Renaissance and the Reformation from 1450 to 1750. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.42(c)(5)(A) as follows:

“(A) explain how the Crusades contributed to the development of the European Renaissance; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(5)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) explain the political, intellectual, artistic, and religious impact of the Renaissance;”
The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(5)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) explain the political, intellectual, artistic, economic, and religious impact of the Renaissance;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(5)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain the political, intellectual, artistic, economic, and religious impact of the Reformation.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(6) to read as follows:

“(6) History. The student understands the characteristics and impact of Maya, Inca, and Aztec civilizations. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education strike former §113.42(c)(6)(B) and (C) and add them to new (6) as follows:

“(6) History. The student understands the characteristics and impact of Maya, Inca, and Aztec civilizations. The student is expected to:”

“(A) compare the major political, economic, social, and cultural developments of the Maya, Inca, and Aztecs and explain how prior civilizations influenced their development;”

“(B) explain how the Inca and Aztec empires were impacted by European exploration/colonization;”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(6)(H) to read as follows:

“(H) explain three pro-free market factors contributing to the success of Europe’s Commercial Revolution.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(6)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) explain the benefits of free enterprise in the Industrial Revolution.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(8)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) compare the causes, characteristics, and consequences of the American and French, and Latin American revolutions, emphasizing the role of the Enlightenment, the Glorious Revolution, and religion;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(8)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) trace the influence of the American and French revolutions on Latin America, including the role of Simon Bolivar;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(8)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify the influence of the following ideas on political revolutions: such as separation of powers, checks and balances, liberty, equality, democracy, popular sovereignty, human rights, constitutionalism, and nationalism.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(10) to read as follows:

“(10) History. The student understands the causes and impact of the global economic depression immediately following World War I. The student is expected to:”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(11)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain the roles of various world leaders including Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, Hideki Tojo, Joseph Stalin, Franklin Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill prior to and during World War II; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education add new in §113.42(c)(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand the importance of Medal of Honor recipients including Private Cleto Rodriguez, Sergeant Alejandro Ruiz, and Lieutenant Vernon J. Baker.”

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mrs. Miller to amend Mrs. Berlanga’s proposed amendment to §113.42(c)(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand the importance of Medal of Honor recipients including individuals of all races and gender including Private Cleto Rodriguez, Sergeant Alejandro Ruiz, and Lieutenant Vernon J. Baker.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend Mr. Craig’s proposed amendment to §113.42(c)(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand the importance of Medal of Honor recipients including individuals of all races and gender such as Private Cleto Rodriguez, Sergeant Alejandro Ruiz, and Lieutenant Vernon J. Baker.”

The motion failed.

VOTE: A vote was taken on Mr. Craig’s amendment to Mrs. Berlanga’s motion.

The motion carried.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Mrs. Berlanga.

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(12) to read as follows:

“(12) History. The student understands the impact of major events associated with the Cold War and decolonization independence movements. The student is expected to:”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(12)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) summarize the factors that contributed to communism in China: including Mao Zedong's role in its rise, and how it differed from Soviet communism;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(12)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify the following major events of the Cold War: including the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the arms race;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(12)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) explain the roles of modern world leaders including Ronald Reagan, Mikhail Gorbachev, Lech Walesa, and Pope John Paul II in the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(12)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) summarize the rise of independence movements in Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia and reasons for ongoing conflicts;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(12)(F) to read as follows:

“(F) explain how Arab rejection of the State of Israel has led to ongoing conflict;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(13) to read as follows:
“(13) History. The student understands the development of radical Islamic fundamentalism and the subsequent use of terrorism by some of its adherents and the ongoing conflict between Palestinians and Israelis in the second half of the 20th century. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(13)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) summarize the development and impact of radical Islamic fundamentalism on events in the second half of the 20th century including Palestinian terrorism and the growth of Al Qaeda;”

The motion carried.

Mr. Agosto, Mr. Allen, Mrs. Berlanga, and Mr. Nuñez opposed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.42(c)(13)(B) as follows:

“(B) explain the origins and impact of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on global politics; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(13)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) other acts of terrorism prior to September 11, 2001, not related to Islam, including the U.S. Cavalry against American Indians, the Texas Rangers against Mexican Americans, and for decades by the Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacist groups right here in our own country.”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(17)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify the historic origins and characteristics of communism, including the contributions influences of Karl Marx;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(17)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify the historic origins and characteristics of fascism.”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(19)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify the impact of political and legal ideas contained in the following documents: Hammurabi's Code, the Jewish Ten Commandments, Justinian's Code of Laws, Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights, John Locke's "Two Treatises of Government," the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education substitute §113.42(c)(19)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) explain the impact of the writings of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Voltaire, Charles de Montesquieu, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, and Sir William Blackstone;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(19)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) explain the significance of the League of Nations and role of the United Nations from its conception to the present.”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(21)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify examples of politically motivated mass murder in Cambodia, China, Latin America, and the Soviet Union, and Armenia;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(21)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify examples of genocide, including the Holocaust and genocide in Armenia, the Balkans, and Rwanda;”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education add “Darfur” in §113.42(c)(21)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify examples of genocide, including the Holocaust and genocide in the Balkans, Rwanda and Darfur;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(21)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) identify examples of individuals who led resistance to political oppression such as Nelson Mandela, Mohandas Gandhi, Oscar Romero, and Chinese student protestors in Tiananmen Square; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education add “Natan Sharansky” in §113.42(c)(21)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) identify examples of individuals who led resistance to political oppression such as Nelson Mandela, Mohandas Gandhi, Natan Sharansky, and Chinese student protestors in Tiananmen Square; and;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(21)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) identify examples of individuals who led resistance to political oppression such as Nelson Mandela, Mohandas Gandhi, Natan Sharansky, Las Madres de Plaza de Mayo, and Chinese student protestors in Tiananmen Square; and;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(22)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) describe the historical origins, central ideas, and spread of major religious and philosophical traditions, including Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Sikhism, and the development of monotheism; and”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Agosto to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(22)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) describe the historical origins, central ideas, and spread of major religious and philosophical traditions, including Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, and the development of monotheism the Eastern religions of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Sikhism; and the Western Religions of Judaism, (including the development of monotheism), Christianity, and Islam; and”

The motion failed.

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(23)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe the major influences of women during major eras of world history such as Elizabeth I, Queen Victoria, Mother Teresa, Indira Gandhi, and Margaret Thatcher.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded to amend Ms. Hardy’s proposed amendment by adding Golda Meir to read as follows:

“(B) describe the major influences of women during major eras of world history such as Elizabeth I, Queen Victoria, Mother Teresa, Indira Gandhi, and Margaret Thatcher, and Golda Meir.”

The motion carried. Mr. Agosto, Mr. Allen, and Mrs. Knight voiced their opposition.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the Ms. Hardy’s amended motion.

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(24)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) summarize the following fundamental ideas and institutions of Eastern civilizations that originated in China and India: Hinduism, Confucianism, Daoism, the Mandate of Heaven, Legalism, and Buddhism;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(24)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) explain the relationship among Christianity, individualism, and growing secularism that began with the Renaissance and how the relationship influenced subsequent political developments; and”
The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.42(c)(25)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify the origin and diffusion of major ideas in mathematics, science, and technology that occurred in River Valley civilizations, classical Greece and Rome, classical India, and the Islamic caliphates between 700 and 1200, and in China from the Tang to Ming dynasties;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(25)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) identify the contributions of significant scientists such as Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, and Pythagoras.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education reinsert the original (20)(A)(B)(C) to become §113.42(c)(26)(A)(B)(C) to read as follows:

“(26) Culture. The student understands the relationship between the arts and times during which they were created. The student is expected to: (A) identify significant examples of art and architecture that demonstrate an artistic ideal or visual principal from selected cultures; (B) analyze examples of how art, architecture, literature, music, and drama reflect the history of cultures in which they are produced; and (C) identify examples of art, music, and literature that transcend the cultures in which they were created and convey universal themes.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.42(c)(26)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) identify the contributions of significant scientists and inventors such as Robert Boyle, Marie Curie, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, Sir Isaac Newton, Louis Pasteur, and James Watt.”

The motion carried.

§113.43. World Geography Studies (One Credit), Beginning with School Year 2011-2012.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.43(c)(15) to read as follows:
“(15) Citizenship. The student understands how geography affects different points of view on influence the development of public issues and policies and decision making processes on local, state, national, and international levels. The student is expected to:

(A) compare the effects of different social, economic, and political points of view about public issues and policies;

(A) identify and give examples of different points of view that influence the development of public policies and decision making processes on local, state, national, and international levels; and

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Craig to amend §113.43(c)(17)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe compare major world religions, including animism, Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, and Sikhism, and their spatial distribution;”

The motion carried.

§113.44. United States Government (One-Half Credit), Beginning with School Year 2011-2012.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(1)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) explain major political ideas in history, including natural law, natural rights, the laws of nature and nature’s God, unalienable rights, divine right of kings, social contract theory, and the rights of resistance to illegitimate government;”

The motion carried with 11 members voting Aye, 3 members voting No, and 1 member abstaining as follows:

Aye:  Mr. Agosto  Ms. Leo  Mr. Bradley  Mrs. Lowe  Mrs. Cargill  Dr. McLeroy  Mr. Craig  Mr. Mercer  Ms. Dunbar
No:    Mrs. Berlanga Mrs. Knight Mr. Nuñez Abstain: Mr. Allen
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mrs. Berlanga to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.44(c)(1)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America by barring government from promoting or disfavoring any particular religion over all others;”

The motion failed with 5 members voting Aye and 10 members voting No as follows:

Aye: Mr. Agosto, Mrs. Knight, Mr. Allen, Mr. Nuñez, Mrs. Berlanga
No: Mr. Bradley, Ms. Leo, Mrs. Cargill, Mrs. Lowe, Mr. Craig, Dr. McLeroy, Ms. Dunbar, Mr. Mercer, Ms. Hardy, Mrs. Miller

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Mr. Bradley to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(1)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify the contributions of the political philosophies of the Founding Fathers, including John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Jay, George Mason, Roger Sherman, and James Wilson, on the development of the U.S. government;”

The motion carried. Mrs. Berlanga objected.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(2)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) analyze the impact of political changes brought about by individuals, including Dr. Hector P. Garcia, political parties, interest groups, or the media, past and present.”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(5) to read as follows:
“(5) Economics. The student understands the roles played by local, state, and national
governments in both the public and private sectors of the U.S. free enterprise (capitalist, free
market) system. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State
Board of Education add new §113.44(c)(5)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand how government taxation and regulations can serve as restrictions to private
enterprise.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded to recommend that the State
Board of Education add new §113.44(c)(5)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand how government taxation and regulations can serve as restrictions to private
enterprise.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Ms. Hardy to
recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(7)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) analyze how the Federalist Papers such as Number 10, Number 39, and Number 51 explain
the principles of the American constitutional system of government;”

The motion carried. Mrs. Berlanga objected.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to
recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(7)(F) to read as follows:

“(F) identify how the American beliefs and principles reflected in the Declaration of
Independence and the U.S. Constitution contribute to both a national identity and federal identity
and are embodied in the United States today.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Ms. Hardy to
recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(7)(F) to read as follows:

“(F) identify how the American beliefs and principles reflected in the Declaration of
Independence and the U.S. Constitution contribute to both a national identity and federal identity
and are embodied in the United States today.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend
that the State Board of Education reinstate §113.44(c)(8)(F) to read as follows:

“(F) analyze selected issues raised by judicial activism and judicial restraint;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend
that the State Board of Education add new §113.44(c)(10)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) analyze the impact of the passage of the 17th amendment;”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Dr. McLeRoy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(13)(F) to read as follows:

“(F) recall the conditions that produced the 14th amendment, and describe subsequent efforts to selectively extend some of the selective incorporation of rights in the Bill of Rights to the states, including the Blaine Amendment and Supreme Court rulings, and analyze it’s the impact on the scope of fundamental rights in the Bill of Rights and on federalism.”

The motion carried with 8 members voting Aye and 7 members voting No as follows:

Aye: Mr. Bradley  Mrs. Lowe  Mrs. Cargill  Dr. McLeRoy  Ms. Dunbar  Mr. Mercer  Ms. Leo  Mrs. Miller
No: Mr. Agosto  Ms. Hardy  Mr. Allen  Mrs. Knight  Mrs. Berlanga  Mr. Nuñez  Mr. Craig

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to add new §113.44(c)(14)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) understand the voter registration process and the criteria for voting in elections.”

The motion carried. (Mr. Bradley was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(16)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) examine different points of view of political parties and interest groups such as including the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the National Rifle Association (NRA), and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), GI Forum, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), Council of La Raza, and Carrizo/Comecrudo Tribe of Texas on important contemporary issues; and”
The motion failed.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(16)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) analyze the importance of petition, assembly, speech, and press, and the right to keep and bear arms in a democratic society;”

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Mercer to amend Mrs. Cargill’s original motion to read as follows:

“(B) analyze the importance of petition, assembly, speech, and press, and the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms in a democratic society;”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar and seconded by Mr. Mercer to amend Mr. Agosto’s amendment to read as follows:

“(B) analyze the importance of the First Amendment rights to petition, assembly, speech, and press, and the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms in a democratic society;”

The motion carried.

**VOTE:** A vote was taken on Mr. Agosto’s amended amendment.

The motion carried.

**VOTE:** A vote was taken on Mrs. Cargill’s amended motion to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(16)(B).

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(17)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) evaluate a U.S. government policy or court decision that affected a particular racial, ethnic, or religious group was a result of changes in American culture such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the U.S. Supreme Court cases of Hernandez v. Texas and Grutter v. Bollinger; and”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.44(c)(17)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain changes in American culture brought about by government policies such as voting rights, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill of Rights), Immigration and

The motion carried.

§113.46. Sociology (One-Half Credit), Beginning with School Year 2011-2012.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.46(c)(1)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify sociologists such as W. E. B. DuBois, Booker T. Washington, Robert E. Park, Harriet Martineau, Jane Addams, Robert Nisbet, and Julian Samora and interpret their contributions to the field.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.46(c)(7)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify issues and concerns facing contemporary adolescents, such as dating, dating violence, sexuality, teen parenting, drug use, suicide, and eating disorders, including the importance of personal responsibility for life choices.”

The motion carried with 10 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Cargill
Dr. McLeroy
Mr. Craig
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Dunbar
Mrs. Miller
Ms. Leo
Mr. Nuñez

No:
Mr. Agosto
Ms. Hardy
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Knight
Mrs. Berlanga

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.46(c)(9)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) interpret differences in crime and arrest rates by social categories, such as ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, and age, including cross-reference with the National Crime Victimization Survey;”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Leo to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.46(c)(11)(E) as follows:

“(E) explain how institutional racism is evident in American society.”

The motion failed with 3 members voting Aye and 11 members voting No as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Mrs. Cargill
Ms. Leo

No:
Mr. Agosto
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Berlanga
Mr. Mercer
Mr. Craig
Mrs. Miller
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Nuñez
Ms. Hardy

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Ms. Dunbar to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.46(c)(12)(A) as follows:

“(A) differentiate between sex and gender as social constructs and determine how gender and socialization interact;”

The motion carried with 9 members voting Aye and 6 members voting No as follows:

Aye: Mr. Bradley Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Cargill Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar Mr. Mercer
Ms. Hardy Mrs. Miller
Ms. Leo

No: Mr. Agosto Mr. Craig
Mr. Allen Mrs. Knight
Mrs. Berlanga Mr. Nuñez

§118.4. Economics with Emphasis on the Free Enterprise System and Its Benefits, High School (One-Half Credit), Beginning with School Year 2011-2012.

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §118.4(5)(E) as follows:

“(E) analyze the importance of various economic theorists, including Milton Friedman, John Maynard Keynes, Karl Marx, and Adam Smith and their impact on the U.S. free enterprise system.”
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. Mc Leroy and seconded by Ms. Leo to amend Mr. Craig’s proposed amendment to read as follows:

“(E) analyze the importance of various economic theorists, including Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman, John Maynard Keynes, Karl Marx, and Adam Smith and their impact on the U.S. free enterprise system.”

The motion carried.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Mr. Craig.

The motion carried.

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §118.4(13)(D) as follows:

“(D) analyze the decline in value of the U.S. dollar since the inception of the Federal Reserve System in 1913.”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nunez and seconded to amend Mrs. Cargill’s proposed amendment by striking “since the inception of the Federal Reserve System in 1913.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded to amend Mrs. Cargill’s proposed amendment to read as follows:

“(D) analyze the decline in value of the U.S. dollar, including the abandonment of the Gold Standard.”

The motion carried.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Mrs. Cargill.

The motion carried.
报告
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全体委员会

公开听证会

2010年5月19日

州教育委员会全体委员会于2010年5月19日星期三上午9:03在威廉·B·特拉维斯大楼州教育委员会房间#1-104，1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas会面。委员会所有成员均出席，如下所示：

主持：Gail Lowe, 主席；Rick Agosto, Lawrence A. Allen, Jr., Mary Helen Berlanga, David Bradley, Barbara Cargill, Bob Craig, Cynthia Dunbar, Pat Hardy, Mavis B. Knight, Terri Leo, Don McLeroy, Ken Mercer, Geraldine Miller, Rene Nuñez

讨论项目

1. 公开听证会关于19 TAC章节113，


（委员会议程页1-133）

公共证词由以下个人提供：
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AFFILIATION: Southern Methodist University – Department of Anthropology

NAME: Daniel Bonevac
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AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Leticia Aleman
AFFILIATION: Self
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AFFILIATION: Texas Navy Association
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AFFILIATION: Center for Islamic Pluralism
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AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Adryana Boyne
AFFILIATION: Self
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NAME: Evelyn Hershey
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Brian Spears
AFFILIATION: Americans United for Separation of Church and State

NAME: Julio Noboa
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Paul Watson

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Sue Blanchette

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Mary Smith

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Marcia Hill

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Suha Ahmad

AFFILIATION: Palestinians for Peace and Democracy
NAME: Rajdeep Singh

AFFILIATION: Sikh Coalition
NAME: Joanie Muenzler

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Kathryn Sieverman

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Alex Gulakov

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Deanna Newberg

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Heather Liggett

AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Paul Henley

AFFILIATION: Texas State Teachers Association/National
Education Association

NAME: Diana Gomez
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Moninder Chadha
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Michael Hurta
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Bernardino Villasenor
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Yvonne Jonas
AFFILIATION: Parents/Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG)

NAME: Christina McDaniel
AFFILIATION: Midlothian ISD – Project CASH

NAME: James Green
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Stephanie Hampton
AFFILIATION: Midlothian ISD – Project CASH

NAME: Sarah Moczygemba
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Kyle Flaherty
AFFILIATION: Midlothian ISD – Project CASH

NAME: Darcy Kahroff
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Chase Terrell
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AFFILIATION: Self
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AFFILIATION: Midlothian ISD – Project CASH

NAME: Sara Legvold
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Bill Ames (Testimony read by Rita Owens)
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Kerry Watson
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Sherri Wyatt
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Kip Harmon
AFFILIATION: Leander ISD

NAME: Ed Gomez
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Henry Didrell
AFFILIATION: Self

NAME: Dana Ashrawi
AFFILIATION: Palestinian-American Cultural Center - Houston

NAME: Randall Terrell
AFFILIATION: Equality Texas Foundation

NAME: Joe Myrick
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Ibrahim Ashrawi
AFFILIATION: Palestinian-American Cultural Center - Houston
NAME: Jesus Reyes
AFFILIATION: Turtle Clan – Payaya Nation
NAME: Hart H. Murphy
AFFILIATION: Austin ISD
NAME: Terri Burke
AFFILIATION: American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Texas
NAME: John Barrera
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Roman Peña
AFFILIATION: League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
NAME: Jane Jolley
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Michael Hilshere
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Emilio Zamora
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Angela Garcia
AFFILIATION: League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
NAME: John Zerr
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: David Carter
AFFILIATION: Equality Texas
NAME: Mark Fergason
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Linda Odom
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Cynthia Bowen
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Leon Hernandez
AFFILIATION: League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
NAME: MerryLynn Gerstenschlager
AFFILIATION: Texas Eagle Forum
NAME: Kathy Miller
AFFILIATION: Texas Freedom Network
NAME: Jonathan Saenz
AFFILIATION: Liberty Institute
NAME: Royal Smith
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Rita Owens
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Placido Salazar
AFFILIATION: American GI Forum
NAME: Phil Samponaro
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: James Akers
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Zenobia Joseph
AFFILIATION: A+ Writers Consulting, LLC
NAME: William Proctor
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Mary Torres
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Jon Roland
AFFILIATION: Constitution Society
NAME: Jan Pierce
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Joe Flores
AFFILIATION: Self
NAME: Juan Mancias
AFFILIATION: Carrizo-Comecrudo Tribe of Texas
NAME: Timothy Bray
AFFILIATION: Self

Mrs. Lowe adjourned the public hearing at 11:58 p.m.
The State Board of Education Committee of the Full Board met at 9:07 a.m. on Thursday, May 20, 2010, in the State Board of Education Room, #1-104, of the William B. Travis Building, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas. All members of the committee were present, as follows:

Presiding: Gail Lowe, chair; Rick Agosto, Lawrence A. Allen, Jr., Mary Helen Berlanga, David Bradley, Barbara Cargill, Bob Craig, Cynthia Dunbar, Pat Hardy, Mavis B. Knight, Terri Leo, Don McLeroy, Ken Mercer, Geraldine Miller, Rene Nuñez

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Discussion of Parliamentary Procedures

(Board agenda page I-135)

Parliamentarian Kirk Overbey discussed the appropriate ways to amend a document.

2. Commissioner’s Comments Regarding the SBOE Agenda

(Board agenda page I-137)

Commissioner of Education Robert Scott and Deputy Associate Commissioner Julie Harris-Lawrence paid tribute to Jack Colley, director of the state’s Division of Emergency Management, who died earlier this month. They noted that Mr. Colley worked to keep Texas and its students safe, providing leadership as Texans were threatened by hurricanes and flu outbreaks.

The commissioner also complimented the board on its efforts to update the social studies Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills. He said he thought the proposal was fair and balanced. He urged the board to move forward towards adoption of the curriculum standards, saying that a delay would impact implementation of the college readiness standards and the creation of end-of-course exams based on the new standards.

ACTION ITEM

3. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter A, Elementary, Subchapter B,
Middle School, and Subchapter C, High School, and 19 TAC Chapter 118,
Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Economics with Emphasis on the
Free Enterprise System and Its Benefits, Subchapter A, High School
(Second Reading and Final Adoption)
(Board agenda page I-23)

[Official agenda item #5]

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education approve for second reading and final adoption proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter A, Elementary, Subchapter B, Middle School, and Subchapter C, High School, with an effective date of the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, to be implemented beginning with the 2011-2012 school year; and approve for second reading and final adoption proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 118, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Economics with Emphasis on the Free Enterprise System and Its Benefits, Subchapter A, High School, with an effective date of the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, to be implemented beginning with the 2011-2012 school year.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education add the following language to the introduction of each grade level and course:

“Students identify and discuss how the actions of U.S. citizens and the local, state, and federal government have either met or failed to meet the ideals espoused in the founding documents.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education substitute the words “positive and negative” for “benefits and” in §113.13(b)(8)(C), §113.16(b)(9)(B), §113.19(b)(10)(A), and §113.20(b)(11)(B).

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Allen and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(2) and (b)(2)(B) to read as follows:

“(2) History. The student understands how historical figures, patriots, and good citizens helped to shape the community, state, and nation. The student is expected to:

“(B) identify contributions of patriots and good citizens who have shaped the community.”
The motion failed, with 3 members voting Aye and 12 members voting No, as follows:

Aye: 
Mr. Agosto  
Mrs. Knight  
Mr. Allen  

No: 
Mrs. Berlanga  
Ms. Leo  
Mr. Bradley  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mrs. Cargill  
Dr. McLeroy  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Mercer  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mrs. Miller  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Nuñez

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify contributions of historical figures, including Stephen F. Austin, George Washington, Christopher Columbus, John Smith, and José Antonio Navarro, who helped to shape the state and nation; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.11(b)(5) to read as follows:

“(5) Geography. The student understands physical and human characteristics of place. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) History. The student understands how historical figures, patriots, and good citizens and other individuals helped to shape the community, state, and nation. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(2)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify historical figures, including such as Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Edison, Garrett Morgan, and Richard Allen, and other individuals who have exhibited individualism and inventiveness; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Lowe and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(5)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) locate the community, Texas, places of significance, including the local community, Texas, the state capital, the U.S. capital, major cities in Texas, the coast of Texas, Canada, Mexico, and the United States on maps and globes.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Allen and seconded by Mrs. Berlanga to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(12)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify and describe the role of a good citizen in maintaining a constitutional republic and in keeping elected officials responsive to the wishes of the people.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(13)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify characteristics of good citizenship, including truthfulness, respect for oneself and others and oneself, responsibility in daily life, and participation in government by educating oneself about the issues, respectfully holding public officials to their word, and voting;”

The motion carried, with 12 members voting Aye and 3 members voting No, as follows:

**Aye:**
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight  
Mr. Bradley  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Cargill  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mr. Craig  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mr. Mercer  
Ms. Hardy

**No:**
Mr. Agosto  
Mr. Nuñez  
Mrs. Berlanga
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(13)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify characteristics of good citizenship, including truthfulness, justice, respect for oneself and others, responsibility in daily life, and participation in government by educating oneself about the issues, respectfully holding public officials to their word, and voting;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.12(b)(13)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify historical figures such as Nathan Hale, Benjamin Franklin, Francis Scott Key, and Eleanor Roosevelt who have exemplified good citizenship; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(4) to read as follows:

“(4) History. The student understands how historical figures, patriots, and good citizens and other individuals helped shape the community, state, and nation. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Berlanga to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(4)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify historical figures, including such as Amelia Earhart, W. E. B. DuBois, Robert Fulton, and George Washington Carver, and W. E. B. DuBois, who have exhibited individualism and inventiveness; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Lowe and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(6)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) locate places of significance, including the local community, Texas, the state capital, the U.S. capital, major cities in Texas, the coast of Texas, Canada, Mexico, and the United States on maps and globes; and”

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.13(b)(8)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify ways in which people depend on the physical environment and natural resources to meet their basic needs;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(11)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) describe how governments tax citizens such as through income taxes, property taxes, and sales taxes to pay for services and projects voted on by elected officials.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(12)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify how citizens participate in their own governance through staying informed of what public officials are doing, providing input to them, holding them accountable, and volunteering to participate in government functions, and voting.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(13)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify characteristics of good citizenship, including truthfulness, justice, equality, respect for oneself and others and oneself, responsibility in daily life, and participation in government by educating oneself about the issues, respectfully holding public officials to their word, and voting;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(13)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify historical figures, including such as Paul Revere, Abigail Adams, World War II Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASPs) and Navajo Code Talkers, and Sojourner Truth, who have exemplified good citizenship;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Miller and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.13(b)(14)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify selected patriotic songs, including such as "The Star Spangled Banner" and "America the Beautiful";”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Mercer to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(6) to read as follows:

“(6) Economics. The student understands the purposes of earning, spending, saving, and donating money. The student is expected to:”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(8)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain how supply and demand and local, state, and federal taxes affect the price of a good or service;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education add new §113.14(b)(8)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) explain how government regulations and taxes impact consumer costs.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(11)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify characteristics of good citizenship, including truthfulness, justice, equality, respect for oneself and others and oneself, responsibility in daily life, and participation in government by educating oneself about the issues, respectfully holding public officials to their word, and voting;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Agosto to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(11)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify historical and contemporary figures, including Helen Keller, and Clara Barton, and Ruby Bridges, who have exemplified good citizenship;”

The motion carried. Mr. Agosto abstained.
MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education strike §113.14(b)(11)(B) and amend §113.14(b)(11)(C) to read as follows:

“(B) identify historical and contemporary figures, including Helen Keller, Clara Barton, and Ruby Bridges, who have exemplified good citizenship;”

“(C) identify historical figures individuals, including Helen Keller and Clara Barton, and contemporary figures, including Ruby Bridges, and military and first responders, who exemplify good citizenship; and”

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(11)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify historical figures, including such as Helen Keller and Clara Barton, and contemporary figures, including such as Ruby Bridges and military and first responders, who exemplify good citizenship; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Agosto to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(11)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) identify historical figures such as Helen Keller and Clara Barton, and contemporary figures such as Dolores Huerta, Ruby Bridges and military and first responders, who exemplify good citizenship; and”

The motion failed, with 6 members voting Aye and 9 members voting No, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye:</th>
<th>No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Agosto</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Craig</td>
<td>Mrs. Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Allen</td>
<td>Mrs. Cargill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Knight</td>
<td>Dr. McLeroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Berlanga</td>
<td>Ms. Dunbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nuñez</td>
<td>Mr. Mercer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Leo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTE: A vote was taken on the original motion made by Ms. Hardy, as amended.

The motion carried with 11 members voting Aye and 4 members voting No as follows:
Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Hardy
Mrs. Miller
Mrs. Knight

No:
Mr. Agosto
Mrs. Berlanga
Mr. Allen
Mr. Nuñez

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(11)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify and explain the importance of individual acts of civic responsibility, including obeying laws, serving the community, serving on a jury, and voting.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(13), §113.14(b)(13)(A), and §113.14(b)(13)(B) to read as follows:

“(13) Culture. The student understands ethnic and/or cultural celebrations of the local community and other communities in other nations. The student is expected to:

“(A) explain the significance of various ethnic and/or cultural celebrations in the local community and other communities in other nations; and

“(B) compare ethnic and/or cultural celebrations in the local community with other communities in other nations.”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(14)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify and compare the heroic deeds of state and national heroes, including Hector P. Garcia, Harriet Tubman, and James A. Lovell, and such as Harriet Tubman, Juliette Gordon Low, Todd Beamer, Ellen Ochoa, John “Danny” Olivas, and other contemporary heroes; and”

The motion carried.
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MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(15)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify various individual writers and artists such as Kadir Nelson, Tomie dePaola, and Phillis Wheatley and their stories, poems, statues, and paintings and other examples of cultural heritage from other various communities; and”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(15)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain the significance of various individual writers and artists, including Carmen Lomas Garza, Laura Ingalls Wilder, and Bill Martin Jr. and their stories, poems, statues, and paintings, and other examples of cultural heritage to other various communities.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Allen and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(15)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) explain the significance of various individual writers and artists, including such as Carmen Lomas Garza, Laura Ingalls Wilder, and Bill Martin Jr. and their stories, poems, statues, and paintings, and other examples of cultural heritage to various communities.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Knight to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.14(b)(16) and §113.14(b)(16)(B) to read as follows:

“(16) Science, technology, and society. The student understands how individuals have created or invented new technology and affected life in various communities around the world, past and present. The student is expected to:

“(B) identify the impact of scientific breakthroughs and new technology in computers, pasteurization, and medical vaccines on various communities around the world.”

The motion carried, with 12 members voting Aye and 3 members voting No, as follows:

Aye: Mr. Allen Mr. Bradley Mrs. Knight Ms. Leo
No: Mr. Agosto Mr. Nuñez Mrs. Berlanga
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeary
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Hardy
Mrs. Miller

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(1)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) identify American Indian groups in Texas and North America before European exploration such as the Lipan Apache, and the Karankawa, Caddo, and Jumano;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez and seconded by Mr. Agosto to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(1)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) describe the regions in which American Indians lived and identify American Indian groups living in Texas such as the Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo, the Alabama-Coushatta, and the Kickapoo;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) summarize motivations for European exploration and settlement of Texas, including economic opportunity, the search for freedom competition, and the desire for expansion;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(3)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) summarize the significant contributions of individuals such as Texians William B. Travis, James Bowie, David Crockett, George Childress, and Sidney Sherman; Tejanos Juan Antonio Padillo, Carlos Espalier, Juan N. Seguín, Plácido Benavides, and Francisco Ruiz; Mexicans Antonio López de Santa Anna and Vicente Filisola; and non-combatants Susanna Dickinson and Enrique Esparza;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(5)(C) to read as follows:

...
“(C) identify the accomplishments of notable individuals such as Henry Cisneros, John Tower, Scott Joplin, Audie Murphy, Cleto Rodriguez, Stanley Marcus, Bessie Coleman, Raul A. Gonzales, and other local notable individuals.”

The motion failed, with 5 members voting Aye and 10 members voting No, as follows:

Aye: Mr. Agosto  Mrs. Knight  Mr. Allen  Mr. Nuñez  Mrs. Berlanga
No:  Mr. Bradley  Ms. Leo  Mrs. Cargill  Mrs. Lowe  Mr. Craig  Dr. McLeroy  Ms. Dunbar  Mr. Mercer  Ms. Hardy  Mrs. Miller

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(9)(C) and strike §113.15(b)(9)(D) to read as follows:

“(C) compare the positive and negative consequences of human modification of the environment in Texas, past and present, both governmental and private, such as economic development and the impact on habitats and wildlife as well as air and water quality; and

“(D) describe the positive impact of private, voluntary conservation efforts and wildlife management practices in preserving natural environments and protecting native species.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(17)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify important individuals who have participated voluntarily in civic affairs at state and local levels, including such as Adina de Zavala and Clara Driscoll;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(17)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify the importance of historical figures and important individuals who modeled active participation in the democratic process, including Sam Houston, Barbara Jordan, Lorenzo de
Zavala, Ann Richards, Sam Rayburn, Henry B. González, James A. Baker III, Wallace Jefferson, and other local individuals; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(17)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) identify the importance of historical figures and important individuals who modeled active participation in the democratic process, including such as Sam Houston, Barbara Jordan, Lorenzo de Zavala, Ann Richards, Sam Rayburn, Henry B. González, James A. Baker III, Wallace Jefferson, and other local individuals; and”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.15(b)(19)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) summarize the contributions of people of various racial, ethnic, and religious groups in the development of Texas such as the norteño music of Lydia Mendoza, and Chelo Silva, and Julius Lorenzo Cobb Bledsoe.”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(1)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) describe the accomplishments of significant individuals during the colonial period, including William Bradford, Anne Hutchinson, William Penn, John Smith, John Wise, and Roger Williams, and other individuals such as William Bradford and John Wise.”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(2)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify and analyze the causes and effects of events prior to and during the American Revolution, including the French and Indian War and the Boston Tea Party and the Declaration of Independence and its impact in recruiting the help of other nations;”

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(3)(B) to read as follows:
“(B) identify the contributions of individuals, including James Madison, and such as George Mason, Charles Pinckney, and Roger Sherman, who helped create the U.S. Constitution.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mr. Craig to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(5)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) analyze various issues and events of the 20th century such as industrialization, urbanization, increased use of oil and gas, the Great Depression, the world wars, the civil rights movement, and military actions such as those in which the Tuskegee Airmen and the 442nd Infantry Regiment participated;”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(5)(A) and §113.16(b)(5)(C) to read as follows:

“(A) analyze various issues and events of the 20th century such as industrialization, urbanization, increased use of oil and gas, the Great Depression, the world wars, the civil rights movement, and military actions such as those in which the Tuskegee Airmen and the 442nd Infantry Regiment participated;

“(C) identify the accomplishments of individuals, including and groups such as Jane Addams, Susan B. Anthony, Dwight Eisenhower, Martin Luther King Jr., Rosa Parks, Cesar Chavez, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Ronald Reagan, and Colin Powell, and the Tuskegee Airmen and the 442nd Infantry Regiment who have made contributions to society in the areas of civil rights, women's rights, military actions, and politics.”

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(7)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) locate on a map important political features such as the ten largest urban areas in the United States, the 50 states and their capitals, and regions such as the Northeast, the Midwest, and the Southwest; and”

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mrs. Miller to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(15)(A) and strike §113.16(b)(15)(B) to read as follows:
“(A) identify the key elements, the purposes, and explain the importance of the Declaration of Independence;

“(B) identify the key elements of the Declaration of Independence;”

The motion carried.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Allen and seconded by Ms. Hardy to recommend that the State Board of Education amend §113.16(b)(23)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) identify the accomplishments of notable individuals in the fields of science and technology, including such as Benjamin Franklin, Eli Whitney, John Deere, Thomas Edison, Alexander Graham Bell, George Washington Carver, the Wright Brothers, and Neil Armstrong;”

The motion failed, with 6 members voting Aye and 9 members voting No, as follows:

**Aye:**
- Mr. Allen
- Mrs. Knight
- Mrs. Berlanga
- Mrs. Miller
- Ms. Hardy
- Mr. Nuñez

**No:**
- Mr. Agosto
- Ms. Leo
- Mr. Bradley
- Mrs. Lowe
- Mrs. Cargill
- Dr. McLeroy
- Mr. Craig
- Mr. Mercer
- Ms. Dunbar

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

4. **Review Potential Changes to the Long-Term Strategic Asset Allocation Plan of the Permanent School Fund**

(Board agenda page I-139)

Mrs. Lowe reported that this item would be discussed at the general board meeting on Friday, May 21, 2010.

Mrs. Lowe adjourned the meeting at 12:07 a.m.
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Minutes State Board of Education

May 21, 2010

The State Board of Education met at 9:10 a.m. on Friday, May 21, 2010, in the State Board of Education Room, #1-104, of the William B. Travis Building, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas. All members of the board were present, as follows:

Presiding: Gail Lowe, Chair; Rick Agosto; Lawrence A. Allen, Jr., Vice Chair; Mary Helen Berlanga; David Bradley; Barbara Cargill; Bob Craig; Cynthia Dunbar; Pat Hardy; Mavis B. Knight; Terri Leo, Secretary; Don McLeroy; Ken Mercer; Geraldine Miller; Rene Nuñez

Student Performance

The student performance was provided by the Trinity High School Harmony Show Choir, Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District.

Invocation

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes

State Board of Education, March 12, 2010

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes of the March 12, 2010, meeting of the State Board of Education, as printed.

Public Testimony - Individual testimony will be taken to address items other than those on the board agenda.

The State Board of Education received two presentations of public testimony, as follows.

NAME: Paul Aviña

AFFILIATION: Parent

TOPIC: Access to Education

NAME: Paul Henley

AFFILIATION: Texas State Teachers Association/National Education Association

TOPIC: State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC)
1. Resolutions and Presentations

There were no resolutions or presentations introduced.

2. Approval of Consent Agenda

Any agenda item may be placed on the consent agenda by any State Board of Education committee. The State Board of Education may elect to take separate action on any item on the consent agenda.

In addition to the items on the original consent agenda, the following agenda items received unanimous approval in committee and were brought forward to the consent agenda for board approval:

Official Agenda Item #14—Adoption of Review of 19 TAC Chapter 109, Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing Official Agenda Item #18—Review of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 245, Certification of Educators from Other Countries Official Agenda Item #19—Review of Proposed Repeal of 19 TAC Chapter 241, Principal Certificate, §241.35, Assessment Process Definition and Approval of Individual Assessments

By unanimous consent, the State Board of Education approved the following items on the consent agenda, including the three items that were brought forward.

(1) Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter D, Special Education Services and Settings

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)

(Board agenda page II-35)

(COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION)

The State Board of Education approved for first reading and filing authorization the proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter D, Special Education Services and Settings.

(2) Proposed Repeal of Career and Technical Education Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills in 19 TAC Chapters 119-125, and Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 127, Texas Essential Knowledge
and Skills for Career Development

(First Reading and Filing Authorization)

(Board agenda page II-43)

(COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION)

The State Board of Education approved for first reading and filing authorization the proposed repeal of Career and Technical Education Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills in 19 TAC Chapters 119-125, and the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 127, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Career Development.


(First Reading and Filing Authorization)

(Board agenda page II-53)

(COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION)


(4) Ratification of the Purchases and Sales of the Investment Portfolio of the Permanent School Fund for the Month of February 2010

(Board agenda page III-71)

(COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL FINANCE/PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND)
The State Board of Education ratified the purchases and sales for the month of February 2010 in the amount of $262,933,624 and $163,427,082, respectively, as recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund.

14. Adoption of Review of 19 TAC Chapter 109,

Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing

(Board agenda page III-17)

(COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL FINANCE/PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND)

The State Board of Education adopted the review of 19 TAC Chapter 109, Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing, Subchapter A, Budgeting, Accounting, Financial Reporting, and Auditing for School Districts; Subchapter B, Texas Education Agency Audit Functions; Subchapter C, Adoptions by Reference; and Subchapter D, Uniform Bank Bid or Request for Proposal and Depository Contract, as recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund.

18. Review of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 245,

Certification of Educators from Other Countries

(Board agenda page IV-1)

(COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL INITIATIVES)

The State Board of Education took no action on the review of proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 245, Certification of Educators from Other Countries, as recommended by the Committee on School Initiatives.

19. Review of Proposed Repeal of 19 TAC Chapter 241,

Principal Certificate, §241.35, Assessment Process

Definition and Approval of Individual Assessments

(Board agenda page IV-11)

(COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL INITIATIVES)

The State Board of Education took no action on the review of proposed repeal of 19 TAC Chapter 241, Principal Certificate, §241.35, Assessment Process Definition and Approval of Individual Assessments, as recommended by the Committee on School Initiatives.
The Committee of the Full Board at its meeting on Thursday, May 20, 2010, did not discuss Item #4—Review Potential Changes to the Long-Term Strategic Asset Allocation Plan of the Permanent School Fund. Mrs. Lowe reported during that meeting that this item would be discussed at the general board meeting on Friday, May 21, 2010, thus the discussion at this general board meeting. Rhett Humphreys, CFA Partner and Senior Consultant with NEPC LLC, presented and reviewed the handout entitled, “Asset Allocation and Spending Policy Analysis” dated May 20, 2010.

The State Board of Education considered agenda items in the following order: items number 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 5, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 17.

3. Consideration of Petition for Adoption of Rule Change Concerning 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter F, Graduation Requirements, Beginning with School Year 2007-2008

(Board agenda page I-1)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was recommended by the Committee of the Full Board and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to amend §74.61(m), as follows:

(m) Transition for physical education and science requirements.

(1) Science and physical education graduation requirements successfully completed prior to the 2010-2011 school year shall count toward graduation in the manner established at the time the credit was earned.

(2) Physical education graduation requirements successfully completed through a two- or three-credit career and technical education work-based training course prior to the 2011-2012 school year shall count toward graduation.

[(m) High School graduation requirements successfully completed prior to the 2010-2011 school year shall count toward graduation in the manner established at the time the credit was earned.]

*(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)*

4. Proclamation 2012 of the State Board of Education

Advertising for Bids on Instructional Materials

(Board agenda page I-21)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was recommended by the Committee of the Full Board and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to postpone indefinitely Proclamation 2012 of the State Board of Education Advertising for Bids on Instructional Materials. *(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)*
MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee of the Full Board and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to establish a timeline for the request for supplemental science materials that includes the following milestone dates: request issued on May 21, 2010; samples due on March 4, 2011; state review panel meeting in April 2011; and adoption in May 2011. (Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION: It was recommended by the Committee of the Full Board to issue a request for supplemental high school materials for Biology, Chemistry, Integrated Physics and Chemistry (IPC), and Physics to include grades 6, 7, and 8.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Ms. Hardy, and carried unanimously to issue a request for supplemental science materials that would include grade 5. (Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to issue a request for supplemental high school materials for Biology, Chemistry, Integrated Physics and Chemistry (IPC), and Physics to include grades 5, 6, 7, and 8, as amended. The motion carried unanimously. (Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

Anita Givens, associate commissioner for standards and programs, presented the Cost Options for Supplemental Science Materials. The State Board of Education, without objection, directed staff to pursue Option C.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee of the Full Board and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education that the requested supplemental science materials cover all of the new science standards and that the commissioner of education and agency staff be allowed the flexibility to determine the extent to which the existing 19 TAC Chapter 66 rules would apply to the request for supplemental science materials. (Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

(ATTACHMENT 1, page 31)


(Second Reading and Final Adoption)

(Board agenda page I-23)

Mrs. Lowe reported that the board was ready to resume with this item, starting with Subchapter C, High School. Despite working into the night, the Committee of the Full Board was only able
to consider Kindergarten through Grade 8 at its meeting the previous day. Mrs. Lowe pointed out that staff had worked on providing committee minutes and rule text for K-5. Attachment 2, which starts on page 33, reflects all amendments that were made on Thursday, May 20, 2010, and includes the amendments reflected below. Attachment 3, which starts on page 79, reflects the rule text.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §113.42(c)(1)(C) as follows:

(C) identify major causes and describe the major effects of the following important turning points in world history from 600 to 1450; the spread of Christianity, the decline of Rome and the formation of medieval Europe; the development of Islamic caliphates and their impact on Asia, Africa, and Europe; the Mongol invasions and their impact on Europe, China, India, and Southwest Asia[, and the Mesoamerican civilizations];

(Mr. Agosto and Mr. Bradley were absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §113.42(c)(7)(F) as follows:

(F) explain new economic [three pro-free market] factors and principles that contributed to the success of Europe’s Commercial Revolution.

(Mr. Agosto was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Mr. Craig to amend §113.42(c)(8)(E) as follows:

(E) explain the effects [benefits] of free enterprise in the Industrial Revolution.

The motion carried, with 8 members voting Aye and 6 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mr. Craig  
Mrs. Miller  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Nuñez

No:  
Mr. Bradley  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Cargill  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mr. Mercer  
(Mr. Agosto was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §113.42(c)(25)(C) as follows:
(C) explain the relationship among Christianity, individualism, and growing secularism that began with the Renaissance and how the relationship influenced subsequent political developments; and

**MOTION:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to amend §113.42(c)(27)(A) as follows:

(A) identify the origin and diffusion of major ideas in mathematics, science, and technology that occurred in river valley civilizations, classical Greece and Rome, classical India, and the Islamic caliphates between 700 and 1200 and in China from the Tang to Ming dynasties such as Archimedes, Copernicus, Eratosthenes, Galileo, Pythagoras, Robert Boyle, and Isaac Newton;

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Mrs. Cargill to amend §113.42(c)(27)(A) as follows:

(A) identify the origin and diffusion of major ideas in mathematics, science, and technology that occurred in river valley civilizations, classical Greece and Rome, classical India, and the Islamic caliphates between 700 and 1200 and in China from the Tang to Ming dynasties, including [such as] Archimedes, Copernicus, Eratosthenes, Galileo, Pythagoras, Robert Boyle, and Isaac Newton;

The motion failed, with 5 members voting Aye and 10 members voting No, as follows:

**Aye:**
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Dunbar

**No:**
Mr. Agosto
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Berlanga
Dr. McLeroy
Mr. Craig
Mrs. Miller
Ms. Hardy
Mr. Nuñez

**VOTE:** A vote was taken on the motion to amend §113.42(c)(27)(A) as follows:

(A) identify the origin and diffusion of major ideas in mathematics, science, and technology that occurred in river valley civilizations, classical Greece and Rome, classical India, and the Islamic caliphates between 700 and 1200 and in China from the Tang to Ming dynasties such as Archimedes, Copernicus, Eratosthenes, Galileo, Pythagoras, Robert Boyle, and Isaac Newton;

The motion carried.
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to strike §113.42(c)(27)(E) as follows:

[(E) identify the contributions of significant scientists such as Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, and Pythagoras.]

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to amend §113.42(c)(28)(E) as follows:

(E) identify the contributions of significant scientists and inventors such as [Robert Boyle,] Marie Currie, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, [Isaac Newton,] Louis Pasteur, and James Watt.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Craig to amend §113.42(c)(28)(E) as follows:

(E) identify the contributions of significant scientists and inventors such as Marie Currie, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, Louis Pasteur, Alan Turing, and James Watt.

The motion failed, with 4 members voting Aye and 11 members voting No, as follows:

Aye: 
Mrs. Cargill  
Dr. McLeroy  
Mrs. Knight  
Mrs. Miller

No:  
Mr. Agosto  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Allen  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mr. Bradley  
Mr. Mercer  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Nuñez  
Ms. Dunbar

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to add a new statement to the introduction of §113.42 to read as follows:

Students understand that current sociology terminology BCE references BC and CE references AD.

The motion failed, with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Agosto  
Mrs. Knight

No:  
Mr. Bradley  
Ms. Leo
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Mrs. Miller to amend §113.42(c)(18)(A) as follows:

(A) identify the historic origins and characteristics of the free enterprise system, including the contributions of Adam Smith, especially the influence of his ideas found in “The Wealth of Nations”;

The motion carried, with 8 members voting Aye and 7 members voting No, as follows:

**Aye:**
Mr. Bradley
Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Cargill
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Miller

**No:**
Mr. Agosto
Ms. Hardy
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Knight
Mrs. Berlanga
Mr. Nuñez
Mr. Craig

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to add new §113.42(c)(18)(E) to read as follows:

(E) explain why communist command economies collapsed in competition with free-market economies at the end of the 20th century.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend the proposed new §113.42(c)(18)(E) as follows:

(E) explain why communist [command] economies collapsed in competition with free-market economies at the end of the 20th century.

The motion failed.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to add new §113.42(c)(18)(E) to read as follows:

(E) explain why communist command economies collapsed in competition with free-market economies at the end of the 20th century.
The motion carried, with 10 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Mrs. Knight
Mrs. Miller

No:
Mr. Agosto
Ms. Hardy
Mr. Allen
Mr. Nuñez
Mrs. Berlanga

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. Mc Leroy to add new §113.42(c)(18)(F) to read as follows:

(F) formulate generalizations on how economic freedom improved the human condition, based on students’ knowledge of the benefits of free enterprise in Europe’s Commercial Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and 20th century free-market economies compared to communist command communities.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Ms. Hardy to amend the proposed new §113.42(c)(18)(F) as follows:

(F) formulate generalizations on how economic freedom improved the human condition, based on students’ knowledge of the effects [benefits] of free enterprise in Europe’s Commercial Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and 20th century free-market economies compared to communist command communities.

The motion failed, with 5 members voting Aye, 9 members voting No, and 1 member Abstaining, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Craig
Mrs. Miller
Ms. Hardy

No:
Mrs. Berlanga
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Bradley
Dr. Mc Leroy
Mrs. Cargill
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Dun bar
Mr. Nuñez
Ms. Leo
(F) formulate generalizations on how economic freedom improved the human condition, based on students’ knowledge of the benefits of free enterprise in Europe’s Commercial Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and 20th century free-market economies compared to communist command communities.

The motion carried, with 9 members voting Aye, 5 members voting No, and 1 member Abstaining, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Cargill
Dr. McLeroy
Mr. Craig
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Dunbar
Mrs. Miller
Ms. Leo

No:
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Knight
Mrs. Berlanga
Mr. Nuñez
Ms. Hardy

Abstain:
Mr. Agosto

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to amend §113.42(c)(18) as follows:

(18) Economics. The student understands the historic origins of contemporary economic systems and the benefits of free enterprise in world history. The student is expected to:

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Allen to amend the proposed language to §113.42(c)(18) as follows:

(18) Economics. The student understands the historic origins of contemporary economic systems and the effects [benefits] of free enterprise in world history. The student is expected to:

The motion failed, with Mr. Agosto abstaining.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to amend §113.42(c)(18) as follows:

(18) Economics. The student understands the historic origins of contemporary economic systems and the benefits of free enterprise in world history. The student is expected to:
The motion carried, with 9 members voting Aye, 5 members voting No, and 1 member Abstaining, as follows:

**Aye:**
- Mr. Bradley
- Mrs. Lowe
- Mrs. Cargill
- Dr. McLeroy
- Mr. Craig
- Mr. Mercer
- Ms. Dunbar
- Mrs. Miller
- Ms. Leo

**No:**
- Mr. Allen
- Mrs. Knight
- Mrs. Berlanga
- Mr. Nuñez
- Ms. Hardy

**Abstain:**
- Mr. Agosto

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Nuñez, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §113.42(c)(22)(E) as follows:

(E) identify examples of individuals who led resistance to political oppression such as Nelson Mandela, Mohandas Gandhi, Oscar Romero, Natan Sharansky, Las Madres de la Plaza de Mayo, and Chinese student protestors in Tiananmen Square; and

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to add new §113.42(c)(21)(C) to read as follows:

(C) identify examples of key persons who were successful in shifting political thought, including William Wilberforce.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to amend §113.42(c)(20)(C) as follows:

(C) explain the impact of Enlightenment ideas from the writings of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Voltaire, Charles de Montesquieu, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, Thomas Jefferson [John Calvin], and William Blackstone; and

The motion failed, with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

**Aye:**
- Mr. Agosto
- Mrs. Knight
- Mr. Allen
- Mrs. Miller
- Mrs. Berlanga
- Mr. Nuñez

**No:**
- Mr. Bradley
- Ms. Leo
- Mrs. Cargill
- Mrs. Lowe
- Ms. Dunbar
- Dr. McLeroy
Mr. Craig
Ms. Hardy
Mr. Mercer

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Mr. Bradley to amend §113.42(c)(20)(C) as follows:

(C) explain the impact of the writings of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Voltaire, Charles de Montesquieu, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and William Blackstone; and

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to amend §113.42(c)(20)(C) as follows:

(C) explain the impact of the writings of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Voltaire, Charles de Montesquieu, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, Thomas Jefferson, [James Madison,] and William Blackstone; and

The motion carried, with 8 members voting Aye and 7 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  Mr. Agosto  Ms. Hardy  Mr. Allen  Mrs. Knight  Mrs. Berlanga  Mrs. Lowe  Mr. Craig  Mr. Nuñez
No:  Mr. Bradley  Dr. McLeroy  Mrs. Cargill  Mr. Mercer  Ms. Dunbar  Mrs. Miller  Ms. Leo

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to amend §113.42(c)(20)(C), as amended, as follows:

(C) explain the impact of the writings of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Voltaire, Charles de Montesquieu, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, Thomas Jefferson, and William Blackstone; and

The motion carried.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend §113.42(c)(20)(C) as follows:

(C) explain the political philosophies of individuals such as [impact of the writings of] John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Voltaire, Charles de Montesquieu, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, Thomas Jefferson, and William Blackstone; and
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The motion carried, with 11 members voting Aye and 3 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Hardy
Mrs. Miller
Mrs. Knight

No:
Mr. Agosto
Mr. Nuñez
Mrs. Berlanga

(Mr. Allen was absent for the vote.)

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Bradley to amend §113.42(c)(20)(C) as follows:

(C) explain the political philosophies found in primary sources of individuals such as John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Voltaire, Charles de Montesquieu, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, Thomas Jefferson, and William Blackstone; and

Mr. Bradley withdrew his motion.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy to reconsider §113.42(c)(27)(A) and §113.42(c)(27)(E) previously acted upon. There was no objection from the board to the reconsideration.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to amend §113.42(c)(27)(A) and §113.42(c)(27)(E) as follows:

(A) identify the origin and diffusion of major ideas in mathematics, science, and technology that occurred in river valley civilizations, classical Greece and Rome, classical India, and the Islamic caliphates between 700 and 1200 and in China from the Tang to Ming dynasties [such as Archimedes, Copernicus, Eratosthenes, Galileo, and Pythagoras, Robert Boyle, and Isaac Newton];

(E) identify the contributions of significant scientists such as Archimedes, Copernicus, Eratosthenes, Galileo, Pythagoras, Isaac Newton, and Robert Boyle.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy to reconsider §113.42(c)(18)(F) previously acted upon. There was no objection from the board to the reconsideration.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Ms. Hardy to amend §113.42(c)(18)(F) as follows:
(F) compare and contrast the success of communist and free enterprise systems. [formulate generalizations on how economic freedom improved the human condition, based on students’ knowledge of the benefits of free enterprise in Europe’s Commercial Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and 20th century free-market economies compared to communist command communities.]

The motion failed, with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mrs. Miller
Ms. Hardy

No:
Mr. Agosto
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Berlanga
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Bradley
Mr. Mercer
Mrs. Cargill
Mr. Nuñez

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to approve the previously adopted language to §113.42(c)(18)(F) as follows:

(F) formulate generalizations on how economic freedom improved the human condition, based on students’ knowledge of the benefits of free enterprise in Europe’s Commercial Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and 20th century free-market economies compared to communist command communities.

The motion carried, with 10 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Hardy
Mrs. Miller

No:
Mr. Agosto
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Allen
Mr. Nuñez
Mrs. Berlanga

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to amend §113.43(c)(11)(B) as follows:
(B) identify the factors affecting the location of different types of economic activities, including subsistence and commercial agriculture, manufacturing, and service industries [natural resources, manufacturing, agriculture, services, and cottage industry]; and

(Mr. Agosto was absent for the vote.)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §113.43(c)(16)(A) as follows:

(A) describe distinctive cultural patterns and landscapes associated with different places in Texas, the United States, and other regions of the world, and how these patterns influenced the processes of how physical geography, human adaption, and technology influence culture and impact innovation and diffusion;

(Mr. Agosto was absent for the vote.)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to amend §113.43(c)(16)(B) as follows:

(B) describe elements of culture, including language, religion, beliefs and customs, institutions, and technologies [entertainment, food, language, religion, recreation, and fashion];

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to strike §113.43(c)(21)(A) and to amend §113.43(c)(21)(B) as follows:

[(A) interpret reference and thematic maps using elements, including latitude and longitude, to determine absolute location;

(A) analyze and evaluate the validity and utility of multiple sources of geographic information such as primary and secondary sources, aerial photographs, and maps [use historical, geographic, and statistical information from a variety of sources such as databases (graphs and charts), photographs, GIS, and media services to infer geographic relationships and solve geographic problems];

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mrs. Miller, and carried to strike §113.43(c)(21)(C) as follows:

[(C) evaluate the context, bias, validity, and utility of a variety of primary and secondary sources;]

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Dr. McLeroy and seconded by Mr. Craig to amend §113.43(b)(1) as follows:

(1) In World Geography Studies, students examine people, places, and environments at local, regional, national, and international scales from the spatial and ecological perspectives of
geography. Students describe the influence of geography on events of the past and present with emphasis on [contemporary] issues of the historical time. A significant portion of the course centers around the physical processes that shape patterns in the physical environment; the characteristics of major landforms, climates, and ecosystems and their interrelationships; the political, economic, and social processes that shape cultural patterns of regions; types and patterns of settlement; the distribution and movement of the world population; relationships among people, places, and environments; and the concept of region. Students analyze how location affects economic activities in different economic systems. Students identify the processes that influence political divisions of the planet and analyze how different points of view affect the development of public policies. Students compare how components of culture shape the characteristics of regions and analyze the impact of technology and human modifications on the physical environment. Students use problem-solving and decision-making skills to ask and answer geographic questions.

The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Cargill and seconded by Dr. McLeRoy to amend §113.43(c)(14)(C) as follows:

(C) analyze the human and physical factors that influence the power to control territory and resources, create conflict/war, and impact international political relations of sovereign nations such as China, the United States, Japan, and Russia and organized nation groups such as the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), or the control of resources.

The motion carried, with 10 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No, as follows:

**Aye:**
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeRoy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Hardy
Mrs. Miller

**No:**
Mr. Agosto
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Allen
Mr. Nuñez
Mrs. Berlanga

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Dr. McLeRoy to add new §113.44(c)(7)(G) to read as follows:

(G) examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America and guaranteed it free exercise by saying that Congress shall make no law respecting an
establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and compare and contrast this to the phrase “separation of church and state.”

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to amend the proposed new language to §113.44(c)(7)(G) as follows:

(G) examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America and guaranteed it free exercise by saying that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, by prohibiting government from promoting or favoring any particular religion over all others [and compare and contrast this to the phrase “separation of church and state”].

*The motion failed*, with 5 members voting Aye and 10 members voting No, as follows:

- **Aye:**
  - Mr. Agosto
  - Mrs. Knight
  - Mr. Allen
  - Mr. Nuñez
  - Mrs. Berlanga

- **No:**
  - Mr. Bradley
  - Ms. Leo
  - Mrs. Cargill
  - Mrs. Lowe
  - Mr. Craig
  - Dr. McLeroy
  - Ms. Dunbar
  - Mr. Mercer
  - Ms. Hardy
  - Mrs. Miller

**VOTE:** *A vote was taken on the motion to add new §113.44(c)(7)(G) to read as follows:*

(G) examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America and guaranteed it free exercise by saying that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and compare and contrast this to the phrase “separation of church and state.”

*The motion carried*, with 11 members voting Aye and 3 members voting No, as follows:

- **Aye:**
  - Mr. Allen
  - Ms. Leo
  - Mr. Bradley
  - Mrs. Lowe
  - Mrs. Cargill
  - Dr. McLeroy
  - Ms. Dunbar
  - Mr. Mercer
  - Ms. Hardy
  - Mrs. Miller

- **No:**
  - Mrs. Berlanga
  - Mr. Nuñez
  - Mrs. Knight
Mr. Mercer  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mrs. Miller  
Ms. Hardy  

(Mr. Agosto was absent for the vote.)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend §113.44(b)(1), §113.44(c)(12)(A), §113.44(c)(15), and §113.44(c)(16) by striking the words “constitutional republic” and inserting the words “democratic society.” The motion failed.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Ms. Dunbar, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried, with Mrs. Berlanga opposing, to add a statement to the introduction for all social studies courses to read as follows:

Students understand that a constitutional republic is a representative form of government whose representatives derive their authority from the consent of the governed, serve for an established tenure, and are sworn to uphold the Constitution.

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend §113.44(c)(16)(A) as follows:

(A) examine different points of view of political parties and interest groups such as the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), established due to the discrimination of Hispanics, the National Rifle Association (NRA), the GI Forum, due to the discrimination of veterans, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) on important contemporary issues; and

The motion failed, with 7 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

**Aye:**  
Mr. Agosto  
Mrs. Knight  
Mr. Allen  
Mr. Mercer  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Nuñez  
Mr. Craig  

**No:**  
Mr. Bradley  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Cargill  
Mrs. Lowe  
Ms. Dunbar  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Hardy  
Mrs. Miller  

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to add new §113.46(c)(12)(A) to read as follows:
(A) differentiate between sex, a biological and physical characteristic, and gender, a social construct, and discuss how gender and socialization interact;

The motion failed.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to amend §113.46(c)(7)(C) and add new §113.46(c)(7)(D) as follows:

(C) identify issues and concerns facing contemporary adolescents such as dating, dating violence, sexuality, teen parenting, drug use, suicide, and eating disorders[, including the importance of personal responsibility for life choices.]

(D) identify and discuss the skills adolescents need to make responsible life choices.

The motion carried, with 8 members voting Aye and 7 members voting No, as follows:

Aye: Mr. Agosto, Ms. Hardy, Mr. Allen, Mrs. Knight, Mrs. Berlanga, Mrs. Lowe, Mr. Craig, Mr. Nuñez

No: Mr. Bradley, Dr. McLeroy, Mrs. Cargill, Mr. Mercer, Ms. Dunbar, Mrs. Miller, Ms. Leo

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Cargill, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried, to amend §113.46(c)(11)(E) as follows:

(E) explain instances of [how] institutional racism [is evident] in American society.

MOTION: It was recommended by the Committee of the Full Board that the State Board of Education approve for second reading and final adoption proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter A, Elementary, and Subchapter B, Middle School, as amended, with an effective date of the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, to be implemented with the 2011-2012 school year.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Ms. Dunbar, and carried to amend §113.12(b)(13)(A) as follows:

(A) identify characteristics of good citizenship, including truthfulness, justice, equality, respect for oneself and others, responsibility in daily life, and participation in government by educating oneself about the issues, respectfully holding public officials to their word, and voting;
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried to amend §113.15(b)(1)(C) as follows:

(C) describe the regions in which American Indians lived and identify American Indian groups remaining [living] in Texas such as Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo, Alabama-Coushatta, and Kickapoo.

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Bradley that the State Board of Education approve for second reading and final adoption proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter C, High School, as amended, with an effective date of the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, to be implemented with the 2011-2012 school year.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Leo and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to amend §113.41(c)(21)(A) as follows:

(A) analyze the effect of landmark U.S. Supreme Court decisions, including Brown v. Board of Education, and other U.S. Supreme Court decisions such as Plessy v. Ferguson, Hernandez v. Texas, Tinker v. Des Moines, Wisconsin v. Yoder[, and White v. Regester]; and

The motion failed, with 6 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Bradley  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Cargill  
Mrs. Lowe  
Ms. Dunbar  
Dr. McLeroy  

No:  
Mr. Agosto  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Mercer  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Nuñez  

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION: It was moved by Ms. Leo to amend §113.41(c)(21)(A) by adding Mobile v. Bolden. The motion died for a lack of a second.

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Dr. McLeroy to add new §113.41(c)(8)(C) to read as follows:

(C) critique the scholarly debate over the veracity of the Venona papers;

The motion failed, with 5 members voting Aye and 9 members voting No, as follows:

Aye: 

No: 

Mr. Agosto  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Mercer  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Nuñez  
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MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §113.41(c)(9)(C), as follows:

(C) identify the roles of significant leaders who supported various rights movements, including Martin Luther King Jr., Cesar Chavez, Rosa Parks, Hector P. Garcia, and Betty Friedan;

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Berlanga, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §113.41(c)(24)(B) as follows:

(B) evaluate the contributions of significant political and social leaders in the United States such as Andrew Carnegie, [Hector P. Garcia,] Thurgood Marshall, Billy Graham, Barry Goldwater, Sandra Day O’Connor, and Hillary Clinton.

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mrs. Berlanga to strike §113.41(c)(10)(E) as follows:

[(E) describe the causes and key organizations and individuals of the conservative resurgence of the 1980s and 1990s, including Phyllis Schlafly, the Contract with America, the Heritage Foundation, the Moral Majority, and the National Rifle Association; and]

The motion failed, with 5 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:
Aye:
Mr. Agosto
Mrs. Knight
Mr. Allen
Mr. Nuñez
Mrs. Berlanga

No:
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
(Ms. Hardy and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Allen and seconded by Mr. Agosto that the State Board of Education postpone until its July meeting the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter C, High School, for second reading and final adoption. The motion failed, with 6 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Agosto
Mr. Craig
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Knight
Mrs. Berlanga
Mr. Nuñez

No:
Mr. Bradley
Ms. Leo
Mrs. Cargill
Mrs. Lowe
Mr. Craig
Dr. McLeroy
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Mercer
(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight, seconded by Mr. Nuñez, and carried to amend §113.41(c)(29)(H) as follows:

(H) use appropriate skills to analyze and interpret social studies information such as maps, graphs, presentations, speeches, lectures, and political cartoons.

(Mr. Agosto, Mrs. Berlanga, and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight to add §113.41(c)(30)(D) to read as follows:

(D) attribute ideas and information to source materials and authors using a standard citation method.

The motion failed.
(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

**VOTE:** A vote was taken on the motion to approve for second reading and final adoption proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter C, High School, as amended, with an effective date of the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, to be implemented with the 2011-2012 school year. The motion carried, with 9 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Bradley  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Cargill  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mr. Craig  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mr. Mercer  
Ms. Hardy  

No:  
Mr. Agosto  
Mrs. Knight  
Mr. Allen  
Mr. Nuñez  
Mrs. Berlanga  

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

**MOTION AND VOTE:** It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mrs. Berlanga to strike §113.19(b)(5)(C) as follows:

[(C) identify significant individuals and events concerning Texas and the Civil War such as John Bell Hood, John Reagan, Francis Lubbock, Thomas Green, John Magruder and the Battle of Galveston, the Battle of Sabine Pass, and the Battle of Palmito Ranch.]

The motion failed, with 6 members voting Aye and 8 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:  
Mr. Agosto  
Ms. Hardy  
Mr. Allen  
Mrs. Knight  
Mrs. Berlanga  
Mr. Nuñez  

No:  
Mr. Bradley  
Ms. Leo  
Mrs. Cargill  
Mrs. Lowe  
Mr. Craig  
Dr. McLeroy  
Ms. Dunbar  
Mr. Mercer  

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Agosto and seconded by Mrs. Berlanga to amend §113.20 (b)(8)(C) as follows:

(C) analyze Abraham Lincoln’s ideas about liberty, equality, union, and government as contained in his first and second inaugural addresses and the Gettysburg Address [and contrast them with the ideas contained in Jefferson Davis’s inaugural address].

The motion failed, with 4 members voting Aye and 10 members voting No, as follows:

Aye: Mr. Agosto, Mrs. Berlanga, Mr. Allen, Mr. Nuñez
No: Mr. Bradley, Mrs. Knight, Mrs. Cargill, Ms. Leo, Mr. Craig, Mrs. Lowe, Ms. Dunbar, Dr. McLeroy, Ms. Hardy, Mr. Mercer

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Ms. Leo to approve for second reading and final adoption proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter A, Elementary, and Subchapter B, Middle School, as amended.

MOTION: It was moved by Mrs. Knight to add in the introductory statements K through 8 the following language: Students build a foundation to develop skills that will enable them to compete with people all over the globe to experience a successful prosperous career.

The motion failed for a lack of a second.

VOTE: A vote was taken on the motion to approve for second reading and final adoption proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 113, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies, Subchapter A, Elementary, and Subchapter B, Middle School, as amended, with an effective date of the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, to be implemented with the 2011-2012 school year.

The motion carried, with 9 members voting Aye and 5 members voting No, as follows:

Aye: Mr. Bradley, Ms. Leo
No: Mr. Agosto, Mrs. Knight
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and seconded by Ms. Hardy to add new §118.4(c)(1)(E) to read as follows:

(E) explain the concepts of socioeconomic status and stratification.

The motion failed.

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to amend §118.4(c)(5)(E) as follows:

(E) analyze the importance of various economic theorists, including Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman, John Maynard Keynes, [Karl Marx,] and Adam Smith, and their impact on the U.S. free enterprise system.

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to amend §118.4(c)(10)(A) as follows:

(A) interpret economic data, including unemployment rate, gross domestic product, gross domestic product per capita as a measure of national wealth, and rate of inflation; and

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Mr. Craig, and carried to amend §118.4(c)(12)(B) and to strike §118.4(c)(12)(C) as follows:

(B) describe the characteristics of money, including commodity money, fiat money, and representative money; and

[(C) analyze the costs and benefits of commodity money, fiat money, and representative money; and]

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Ms. Hardy, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried to amend §118.4(c)(18)(D) as follows:

(D) demonstrate how to maintain a checking account, including [balancing a checkbook or] reconciling a bank statement;

(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Nuñez to approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 118, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Economics with Emphasis on the Free Enterprise System and Its Benefits, Subchapter A, High School, as amended, with an effective date of the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, to be implemented beginning with the 2011-2012 school year. The motion carried, with 14 members voting Aye and 0 members voting No, as follows:

Aye:
Mr. Agosto
Ms. Hardy
Mr. Allen
Mrs. Knight
Mrs. Berlanga
Ms. Leo
Mr. Bradley
Mrs. Lowe
Mrs. Cargill
Dr. McLeroy
Mr. Craig
Mr. Mercer
Ms. Dunbar
Mr. Nuñez
(Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

(ATTACHMENT 2, page 33)
(ATTACHMENT 3, page 79)

COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION
The Committee on Instruction did not meet the previous day; therefore, no recommendations were made to the full board.

6. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 112, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Science, Subchapter D, Other Science Courses
MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board, to approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 112, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Science, Subchapter D, Other Science Courses, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register.

(ATTACHMENT 4, page 181)

7. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 111, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Mathematics, Subchapter D, Other High School Mathematics Courses

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board, to approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 111, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Mathematics, Subchapter D, Other High School Mathematics Courses, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register.

(ATTACHMENT 5, page 189)

8. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter B, Adult Basic and Secondary Education

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Craig, seconded by Dr. McLeroy, and carried by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board, to approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter B, Adult Basic and Secondary Education, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register. (Mr. Agosto was absent for the vote.)

(ATTACHMENT 6, page 191)


(First Reading and Filing Authorization)
MOTION AND VOTE: The State Board of Education unanimously approved for first reading and filing authorization the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter C, Other Provisions. (Mrs. Miller was absent for the vote.)

10. Proposed Approval of Innovative Courses

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mr. Nuñez, seconded by Mrs. Cargill, and carried unanimously to approve for a three-year period the innovative courses that do not fall within any of the subject areas of the foundation or enrichment curriculum. (Mr. Agosto, Mr. Craig, and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)

11. Update on Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS Standards) Review

No action was taken on this item.

12. Approval for Substitution of Instructional Materials

MOTION AND VOTE: It was moved by Mrs. Knight and carried unanimously to approve the request from The Math Learning Center to substitute Texas Bridges in Mathematics with Bridges in Mathematics instructional materials at grade 5. (Mr. Craig and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)

COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL FINANCE/PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND


(Second Reading and Final Adoption)
MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund and carried by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board, to approve for second reading and final adoption the proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.65, Guarantee Program for School District Bonds, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register.

(ATTACHMENT 8, page 199)

14. Adoption of Review of 19 TAC Chapter 109, Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing

(Board agenda page III-17)

Action taken on this item by the State Board of Education is addressed under agenda item #2—Approval of Consent Agenda.

15. Decision on Real Estate Investments

(Board agenda page III-73)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to approve execution of agreements with INVESCO Core Real Estate Fund and UBS Trumbull Property Fund, necessary to make an investment commitment of up to $100 million in each fund, subject to continued due diligence. (Mr. Craig, Dr. McLeroy, and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)


(Second Reading and Final Adoption)

(Board agenda page III-75)

MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund and carried by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the board, to approve for second reading and final adoption proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 33, Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, §33.5, Code of Ethics, as amended, with an effective date of 20 days after filing as adopted with the Texas Register. (Mr. Agosto was absent for the vote.)
17. Review of Absolute Return Asset Class

(MOTION AND VOTE: It was recommended by the Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund and carried unanimously by the State Board of Education to approve the issuance of a Request for Proposals for Absolute Return Discretionary Separate Account Fund-of-Funds Manager for the Permanent School Fund, as amended. (Mr. Craig and Mrs. Miller were absent for the vote.)

COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL INITIATIVES

18. Review of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 245, Certification of Educators from Other Countries

Action taken on this item by the State Board of Education is addressed under agenda item #2—Approval of Consent Agenda.

19. Review of Proposed Repeal of 19 TAC Chapter 241,

Principal Certificate, §241.35, Assessment Process
Definition and Approval of Individual Assessments

Action taken on this item by the State Board of Education is addressed under agenda item #2—Approval of Consent Agenda.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS ON COMMITTEE AGENDAS

Committee on Instruction
No report was presented.

Committee on School Finance/Permanent School Fund
No report was presented.

Committee on School Initiatives
No report was presented.
REPORTS OF OTHER STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND CONCERNS IN INDIVIDUAL DISTRICTS

No reports were presented.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p. m.

Terri Leo, Secretary
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