

### Overview

The goals of the work group members were to initially explore the existing standards and to determine aspects that would be the focus for key revisions and for areas of strength that would be retained in the revised standards. Key areas were pinpointed by the group k-12:

- Improving the Clarity of the wording within the standards
- Strategic use of examples to clarify the skill required in the standard
- Utilizing the Desegregated (Unpacked) Standards for expansion of skills/clarification
- Continuing the Rigor the current standards provided k-12

The workgroup's goals were to improve clarity and make the language in the standards more user-friendly for all stakeholders. No standards were removed, but some were added or re-worked to add essential skills and make them more closely align with other standards K-12. A variety of other state standards were consulted; many of their ideas were considered and some were adopted through group consensus. Best practice for ELA standards were also evaluated with each decision proposed or agreed upon by the groups.

Through grade level, grade band, and vertical alignment conversations, the standards were thoroughly discussed, reviewed, and debated in order to provide a solid understanding as to the impact the standard/skill and rigor would have k-12. Understanding that a revision at one grade level can impact the rigor and scaffolding at all grade levels was a guiding focus as the work groups reviewed every standard in each strand.

### Key Topics of Debate and Discussion

#### *Topic 1: Reading for Information/Reading for Literacy standard/Writing—Standard 10*

There was quite a bit of discussion in regards to RI.10/RL.10/W.10 Many K-5 teams had mixed feelings about adding “self-selected texts” to the standard, not because they did not all believe in its importance, but because of the possible implications for instruction and proficiency if placed there. Many felt that the disaggregated standards would be a good place to add and explain additional details concerning this standard and how to address those concerns. This topic was tabled two times allowing reflection and research as to what other states and best practice stated about self-selection. After several hours of discussion and negotiation of language, k-12 all came to consensus in order to best align the language and beliefs for what all educators want for SD students.

#### *Topic 2: Deletion of the grade band language to grade level specific language*

The idea of grade bands, such as 4-5 grade level complexity band, seemed confusing to many educators at the elementary level and it made determining proficiency difficult since a span of two grade level years was mentioned. After much discussion k-5 and k-12 were able to come to consensus, respecting the beliefs and justification provided by all. Another take-away from this conversation is that grade 6 has a difficult time as not all districts have a 6-8 middle school and therefore place 6<sup>th</sup> grade as an elementary classroom. This causes some obstacles when addressing standards and how to adapt to grade-band discussions.

#### *Topic 3: Writing (W6)*

This standard caused long conversations and debates at the k-6 levels and was tabled one time in order for groups to research and revisit the language. The primary concern was whether to keep the following or remove it, “demonstrate sufficient command of keyboarding skills to type a minimum of one to two pages in a single sitting.” Two philosophies emerged in the discussion with some focusing on the importance of producing and publishing writing in one setting with a specific length, while others focused on the keyboarding aspect and feared that individuals would be assessed on speed of skills vs. content of the writing piece. There also was concern then in providing a specific length for those students who would struggle with

keyboarding skills overall. After much discussion by grades and grade-bands, it was decided to keep the language in with some tweaks. Several grades added language about keyboarding skills to support the integration of technology with the writing process and to support the work being done at lower levels. K-12 felt students need to be prepared for the rigors of high school writing, including being able to produce ample amounts of writing in one sitting.

### K-5<sup>th</sup> Key Proposals

The intentions of overall changes k-5 were to clarify the language and make the standards more “stakeholder-friendly.” Other changes were focused on aligning expectations with current research on foundational literacy skills. The elementary groups changed wording for clarification of the standards and increased rigor with text features and reading informational text (in alignment with K-12.) In a few of the standards rigor was increased to align with K-5 or K-12 expectations.

- The biggest addition made at the elementary level was with a **k-4 vertical handwriting** set of standards. As some districts are hearing negative feedback from stakeholders due to this missing standard, the K-4 team decided this standard should be added to the language standards in order to align with the K-1 placement of these standards. The team did not want to place this standard in writing, because the majority felt that the writing standards were more about the creation of writing versus the formation and fluency.
- K-12 decided to incorporate the “self-selected texts” standard and language in Reading for Informational Text/Reading for Literacy and Writing standards (RI.10; RL.10; W10). The consensus of the group focused on the importance of recognizing that self-selecting texts for enjoyment is an essential component of lifelong literacy.
- Removal of language that indicated the text complexity grade-band and applied wording to indicate end of the year grade level expectations only.

### 6-8<sup>th</sup> Key Proposals

- The intentions of overall changes k-5 were to clarify the language and make the standards more “stakeholder-friendly.” For example: Broke down some standards to include “a’s” and “b’s” for the sake of clarity and readability.
- Added *etc.* to the examples to help the stakeholder understand that there are more examples that can be used and not to limit one to the choices listed.
- In highlighting the importance of student choice of texts, 6-8 agreed with other grade levels in adding language about students’ self-selecting texts for independent reading as well as reading a wide range of texts.
- Added language to writing to support students’ selecting writing topics and formats because of its real-world implications and because of the importance of choice in student engagement.
- The skill of cooperating and mediating disagreement was added as sub-standard 8.SL.1.e (in alignment with 6th and 7th grade.)
- The wording of 8.SL.2 was changed to emphasize the analysis of information, which is more consistent with anchor standard 2 for Speaking and Listening, as well as comparable RI standards. The addition of analyzing author’s purpose was still included to increase rigor from 7.SL.2

Reading Standards for Literacy in History and Social Studies 6–12
---

Reading Standards for Literacy in Science and Technical Subjects 6–12
---

- Some minor changes were made to clarify the expectations for teachers, students, and other stakeholders. The ability to distinguish between reasoned judgement and bias was explicitly added to 6-8.RST.8.

Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects 6–12
--

- In 6-8.WHST.9, we provided the option of using literary fiction or non-fiction texts to support writing.

9/10-11/12<sup>th</sup> Key Proposals

- Expanded RL9 to include world literature in light of the need to expose students to a wider range of founding documents; i.e. those from Europe that inspired our own founding documents.
- Added language to RI.10/RL.10/W10 increasing the rigor and connecting standards across grade level; included a missing element of student choice and independent reading skills

Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects 6–12
--

- Changes were made to WHST9 -to add informational text, literary non-fiction, and literary fiction texts to allow for greater flexibility and cross-discipline collaboration.\
- Changed the language WHST4 to remove the grade bands and say “grade specific;” we also added the language to make reading tables, graphs, and equations a necessary skill.