

Pasala, Scott G. Phillips, Leonard Porter, John J. Quigley, Terrance J. Quigley, David M. Ramirez, Michael Alexander Rechenmacher, Theodore Rounds, Andrew Rueb, Jr., Dennis Joseph Ryczek, Eugene Rymut, Jerome Rymut, Edward Saibert, Richard Sandine, James Sawyer, Russell P. Scardigli, Monroe Smith, Jr., Michael E. Sons, Dennis Soroka, Ronald Stark, Grant E. Steeve, Donald F. Swift, Irvin Termuende, Raymond Travis, William L. Troth, Stanley Tylinski, Harry E. VanBeek, Richard Lynn Wagner, John Joseph Wagner, Jr., William Ward, James Robert Wasser, Sr., William E. Waters, Howard Westphal, Frank L. White, Ronald G. Williams, Francis S. Willsey, George M. Wolk, Donald Yozeitis, Laverne C. Zorbaugh, Joseph B. Zych.

HONORING AND COMMENDING
COLONEL KIRBY GROSS

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2023

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend Colonel Kirby Gross on his retirement.

Colonel Kirby Gross has served in the United States Army as a trauma surgeon for a span of 21 years. He has been deployed 10 times totaling over 5 years of combat service. Colonel Gross has served for 5 years of combat service, after being deployed a total of 10 times. Throughout Colonel Gross's career, he served in many positions that increased his positive influence on the lives of others.

During his 21 years of service, Colonel Gross served twice as the Joint Theater Trauma System Director, and the Theater Medical Director for Operation Inherent Resolve. Here, he was able to develop medical assets which provided care to injured soldiers within the theater, therefore improving battlefield care. Throughout his many positions, he was able to demonstrate empathy towards warriors, aiding many in their return to good health.

Colonel Gross served the country in many important and influential roles. He worked as the Commander of the 772nd Forward Surgical Team (FST) to Iraq, which is where he assumed the role of Chief of Surgery of the 10th Combat Support Hospital Directors of the Joint Trauma System (JTS), Chief of Defense Medical Readiness Training Institute (DMRTI), and Chief of Surgery of the Army Trauma Training Detachment (ATTD). He has been able to use his roles to improve care for wounded warriors, positively impacting their families and our Nation.

Today, Colonel Gross works diligently as an Army Trauma Surgeon in the Division of Trauma within the Section of Military, Diplomatic, and Field Surgical Affairs at Cooper University Health Care as part of the Army Medical Department, Military-Civilian Trauma Team Training Program. Colonel Gross's work has affected the lives of many, as he improved the survivability of soldiers throughout the Global War on Terrorism. His actions have influenced and encouraged an environment of achievement that will assuredly increase the survivability rate of military campaigns for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring and commending Colonel Kirby Gross,

on behalf of a grateful nation for his dedication to our country and those who have bravely served and defended the United States of America to the best of his ability.

Be it known to all, that I hereby honor Colonel Kirby Gross, and extend great appreciation for outstanding service to our community.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF DR.
MARC A. NIGLIAZZO

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2023

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to celebrate the well-deserved retirement of Dr. Marc A. Nigliazzo, who has worked tirelessly to serve the communities of Central Texas through his time at Temple College and Texas A&M University-Central Texas. Nigliazzo's dedication to our home is truly unrivaled.

Throughout his career, Dr. Nigliazzo has touched the lives of all his students. From his time as president at Temple College to his tenure as the inaugural president at Texas A&M-Central Texas he always went the extra mile to insure a positive impact on his students and the community.

Dr. Nigliazzo has played a vital role in promoting accelerated learning as well as building safe and supportive school communities for our central Texas communities. His dedication to education and addressing the major challenges that Texas A&M University-Central Texas has faced has brought the school to where it is today.

His great work has not gone unnoticed. Dr. Nigliazzo was awarded the Leopard Pride for his work with the Temple College athletic program and the Temple College Board of Trustees named the administration building in his honor. These tributes speak to the justifiably high regard his peers hold him in.

Retirement is to be celebrated and enjoyed. It is not the end of a career, but rather the beginning of a new adventure. I commend Dr. Marc A. Nigliazzo for his years of selfless service as well as his commitment to the betterment of higher education. He is an inspiration to our community, and I wish him only the best in the years ahead.

RECOGNIZING CALIFORNIA'S VERY
FLAWED K-12 MATH FRAMEWORK

HON. MICHELLE STEEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2023

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article written by Williamson M. Evers of California. His works explains major flaws in the draft of the California State Board of Education's K-12 mathematics instructional framework. The Board is having a final hearing today.

1. UNSCIENTIFIC TEACHING METHODS

Just as there is a science of reading instruction, there is a science of math instruction. The scientific way of teaching math includes:

having students memorize math facts (like multiplication tables and addition and sub-

traction facts) and standard algorithms (time-tested math procedures);

teaching computational procedures and conceptual understanding together (and not as progressives would have it, concepts before procedures);

stressing that getting answers to problems right and doing so quickly are components of math fluency; and

bearing in mind that committing math facts and procedures to long-term memory frees the student's mind to handle novel problems.

Instead, the progressive-education authors of the math framework want students to learn through their own inquiry and self-discovery. The authors give little emphasis to mastery of facts and standard algorithms. The authors want to organize math instruction not in the architectonic system of increasing abstraction in which it has traditionally been taught, but instead in accordance with vague, billowy "big ideas." Educational researcher Tom Loveless (retired from the Brookings Institution) says: "The previous framework was very clear that math fluency involves speed and accuracy. The proposed framework rejects speed as being even part of fluency, and that's a problem."

The newly revised framework delays fluency in multiplication and division tables until late in elementary school. This delay will spill over into subsequent math learning, and Loveless believes that many students will be unprepared for Algebra I even by ninth grade.

As I have written before (with my co-author, the late Ze'ev Wurman):

The framework promotes only the progressive-education approach to teaching math, calling it "student-led" instruction, "active learning," "active inquiry," and "collaborative" instruction. But evidence from the 1950s through recent times shows that this way of teaching math is ineffective. That evidence comes from scrutinizing carefully designed studies featuring randomized control and what are called quasi-experiments, which approximate the effect of a randomized assignment of students to different groups. Quasi-experiments look at cases, for example, where two adjoining districts with similar populations or two adjoining similar schools adopt different policies. Both sorts of studies are much stronger evidence than the case studies that progressive educators rely on.

In the spring 2012 issue of American Educator, the magazine of the American Federation of Teachers, top educational psychologists Richard E. Clark, Paul A. Kirschner, and John Sweller summarized "decades of research" that "clearly demonstrates" that for almost all students, "direct, explicit instruction" is "more effective" than inquiry-based progressive education in math.

Clark, Kirschner, and Sweller conclude that after "a half century" of progressive educators advocating inquiry-based teaching of math, "no body of sound research" can be found that supports using that approach with "anyone other than the most expert students." Evidence from the best studies, they emphasize, "almost uniformly" supports "full and explicit" instruction rather than an inquiry-based approach.

2. MISREPRESENTATION OF RESEARCH

Brian Conrad of Stanford's math department points out that the revised math framework contains much in the way of "false or misleading" descriptions of research on math instruction. It also cites "unpublished papers with design flaws," instead of relying solely on peer-reviewed published work. Conrad asks: Why does the framework "still not adhere to the level of

research quality” called for by the What Works Clearinghouse?

Conrad says that the framework is invoking neuroscience literature “in misleading ways” to promote “pseudo-scientific claims” about progressive-education math instruction improving pathways in the brain. The framework wrongly cites a paper to promote the general use of “invented strategies” (that is, students devising their own strategies) as a proven approach to learning standard algorithms.

Conrad finds that the framework distorts citations in a way that indicates “an ideological (rather than evidence-based) opposition to acceleration.” He points out that “there is extensive literature with conclusions opposite” that cited in the framework, “but these are barely ever mentioned.”

As Wurman and I have written before:

State-adopted education programs and recommendations are supposed to be “research-based.” This does not just mean an article or 2 in a peer-reviewed journal. It means there is a consensus or strong evidence of effectiveness in the published research. If no strong evidence exists, a practice should not be broadly recommended. . . .

If the framework writers had wanted solid evidence, they would have relied on the final report and subgroup reports of the 2008 federal National Mathematics Advisory Panel. They would have made even more use of the federal Institute of Education Sciences practice guides, which are designed for teachers and curriculum writers.

3. REJECTION OF ALGEBRA I IN 8TH GRADE

The revised framework rejects (as did its earlier iterations) the time-honored aim of preparing students to take Algebra I in eighth grade. Eighth-grade algebra is the policy in high-performing foreign countries whose inhabitants will compete with America’s children in the future—and that eighth-grade goal was expressly part of the 1999 and 2006 California math frameworks. This current framework recommends ninth grade as when almost all students should take Algebra I.

Students who plan to go to selective colleges and universities or who plan to major in STEM fields in college need to pass calculus in high school. Taking algebra in eighth grade allows them to do so.

Education journalist John Fensterwald points out that:

To discourage widespread enrollment in eighth-grade algebra, the framework’s diagram laying out STEM and non-STEM course pathways omits eighth-grade algebra as an option.

There are possible (but laborious and bureaucratically troublesome) workarounds for STEM-inclined students, like double-booking math classes in one year. But the system is not friendly to the workarounds, and they are discouraging to students. As Conrad points out, the framework authors (who are ideologically opposed to acceleration) had three years to come up with a way to accommodate those who need to take calculus in high school, but they didn’t do it.

The recent effort in San Francisco Unified to make all students take Algebra I in ninth grade, was, as Conrad points out, “a total failure, exacerbating the very inequities it aimed to prevent.”

4. SUBSTITUTION OF WEAK DATA SCIENCE FOR RIGOROUS ALGEBRA II

The framework promotes the idea of students taking math-lite data science courses instead of Algebra II. Students who take such math-lite courses will be ill-prepared for math and other STEM courses when they get to college.

In his report on an earlier draft of the math framework, Conrad says of the pro-

motion of these data science classes: “Whatever author is responsible for such a myopic view of mathematics should never again be involved in the setting of public policy guidance on math education.”

5. KNEE-JERK OPPOSITION TO TRACKING AND ACCELERATION

I have previously mentioned the framework’s opposition to acceleration. It also opposes tracking. As Conrad points out, the framework uses “citation misrepresentations” to promote its “anti-tracking narrative” of heterogeneously-grouped classrooms at all levels.”

Homogeneously-grouped classrooms allow teachers to work more effectively without the need to teach students who are at widely different levels. Students can be evaluated on their achievements in different subjects and placed in accelerated classes only in the subjects where they excel. This avoids the misplacements inherent in across-the-board multi-subject tracking. The framework displays an ideological rather than empirical opposition to ability grouping.

6. CLASSES IN WOKENESS INSTEAD OF MATH

In Chapter 2, the framework pushes teaching methods in math class that emphasize radically egalitarian “social justice” goals. Not only is radical egalitarianism ethically dubious, but math class should be for math, not for political indoctrination.

For example, the current framework contends that mathematics is to be used to “both understand and impact the world.” It argues that math teachers should hold the political position that “mathematics plays a role in the power structures and privileges that exist within our society and can support action and positive change.”

Furthermore, according to this official California framework, teachers should use mathematics politically “to analyze and discuss issues of fairness and justice.” In an elementary school classroom, teachers would, for example, have students “studying counting and comparing to understand fairness” in the context of current and historical events.

The framework recommends the fringy methods of “trauma-informed pedagogy,” which encourage students to suggest “recommendations and taking action.” Teachers should also, it says, provide “curricular examples” that provide students with a mathematical toolkit and mindset “to identify and combat inequities.” According to the framework, students are “to use mathematics to highlight inequities.” Then they should learn to use mathematics to transform the world—a rather inappropriate task for math class.

CONCLUSION

There are close to 6 million students in California. What is done in California public schools influences practices in the rest of the country. Parents and taxpayers want math to be taught sensibly. It’s just a scientific reality that children need to learn math facts and standard algorithms. This current California counterproductive math instructional framework will produce a repeat of the Math Wars of the 1990s or a deeper rebellion against public schools and in favor of parental choice.

RECOGNIZING THE PATRIOTISM OF JEWS DURING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2023

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of a scholarly article recently published by the Jewish Review of Books, titled “When Freedom Began to Ring.” Authored by Paul Finkelman and South-Eastern Pennsylvanian Lance J. Sussman, this article explores how the patriotism of Jews during the American Revolution contributed to political equality and a national policy of religious liberty in the newly formed nation. Religious liberty is a critical component to our identity as Americans and this research highlights the important contributions of Jews in shaping this culture of religious tolerance in our Republic. I include in the RECORD the full article by Paul Finkelman and Lance J. Sussman.

WHEN FREEDOM BEGAN TO RING

(By Paul Finkelman and Lance J. Sussman)

In his famous 1790 letter to the Jewish community of Newport, Rhode Island, George Washington wrote that “the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.” These words were not the kind of quid pro quo sometimes offered by European Enlightenment leaders of the time to Jews; it was not an implicit warning that they ought to behave themselves if they wanted to be tolerated.

President Washington, under whose leadership many Jews had fought during the Revolutionary War, was simply recognizing that America only required of its Jews what it required of all its citizens. At the founding, America was already not a Christian nation, and this was in large part because of its Jews.

Everywhere else in the world, prior to the American Revolution, Jews were disfranchised, politically isolated, and vulnerable. Even where they were relatively secure, such as in England, they were not full citizens. In 1775, on the eve of the Revolutionary War, English Jews could not vote, serve on juries, serve in Parliament, be military officers, attend a university, engage in some businesses, become barristers, or practice some other professions. Jewish immigrants had to pay special “alien” taxes forever, because they could not naturalize. And as aliens, immigrant Jews were prohibited from owning real estate or seagoing vessels, and from engaging in colonial or foreign trade.

Things had been somewhat better in England’s North American colonies, where momentum toward full equality built as the Revolution grew nearer, in part because of Jewish support for the patriot cause. In 1765, ten Jewish merchants in New York City, along with nearly two hundred Christian businessmen, signed a non-importation agreement to boycott British goods. Jewish merchants in Philadelphia and Newport, signed similar agreements. Others, most famously Haym Salomon, joined the Sons of Liberty. Gershom Mendes Seixas, the spiritual leader of New York’s Shearith Israel—the first synagogue in what became the United States—actively supported Independence. In 1774, Francis Salvador had won a