K-12 Technology Final Public Comment Response

The K-12 Technology Workgroup has reviewed the public comments in multiple capacities and has responded throughout the public hearings process. This statement represents final group consensus response to the public comments. The workgroup met via webinar on April 28, 2015 to review all four public comments received to date.

Exhibit #1 – Adam Dannenbring – Educator	
Comment	Workgroup Response
I saw that the typing standard has changed for 6th through 8th grade and I believe that it is important for 6th grade students to keep that 20 words per minute standard. What is the reasoning behind removing a required typing speed? How are students supposed to complete any computer work if they can't type at a certain speed?	The workgroup feels that keyboarding is a very important skill, but is too specific for the K-12 Technology Standards. This skill would be better suited for a computer class. With regard to the 6th grade example, the workgroup chose to address composition in the form of being able to type a 3 page paper in one sitting. This standard is aligned with grade-level language arts requirements. Different districts have different requirements for keyboarding and the workgroup wanted to support flexibility for districts to address student needs. The subsequent grade-levels build upon the 6th grade expectation but still do not address specific words-per-minute requirements. 7th and 8th grade address using keyed technology in a variety of environments.
Exhibit #2 – Nicomas Dollar - Educator	
Comment	Workgroup Response
I would like to see examples of activities used to teach the new standards. For example: How would you teach the following standard and what activities could you use? K-2 the standard LS1.A Using plant and animal anatomical function to design a solution to a human oproblem of growth and development.	These standards are created to be used in all classrooms and content areas, and therefore examples are not given for any specific content area in order to keep the document flexible for use in all classrooms.

Exhibit #3 – Florence Thompson – Self	
Comment	Workgroup Response
I object to the adoption of the standards for the following reasons: 1. Adoption of new standards at this time is in violation of the intent of South Dakota State Law (SDCL 13-3-48.1). The South Dakota legislature has wisely passed a law requiring the State Board of Education to pause development of new standards until 2016. It makes sense to wait, because Common Core is running into many implementation problems and into growing opposition across the country. At least two issues of constitutionality are headed for the US Supreme Court. Congress has legislation pending which could significantly weaken Federal interference in Education which would give the states more freedom. 2. These standards are not South Dakota standards but are a cynical Rebranding of the national Common Core Standards (CCSS). This same strategy of Rebranding has occurred in other states as the Common Core hierarchy struggles to maintain control. Using common sense, how can these be independently derived South Dakota standards? Is it just a coincidence that the proposed SD Standards still conform to the common core template in order to qualify for funding, align with the Common Core tests and textbooks and are nearly identical with every other state's Common Core standards? 3. Common Core is an unproven, radical, top-down-imposed transformation of the American education system. It moves US Education from a Knowledge system to a Process system. Its core tenet is called "Critical Thinking" but is not true critical thinking. This so-called "Critical Thinking" is constantly drilled into every lesson as the only acceptable thinking style. This "Discovery" method deliberately ignores the accumulated knowledge of civilization. Instead it forces children to constantly "reinvent the wheel" and then to verbally justify their findings. This method is radically experimental. It is the wrong learning style for many children, particularly visual learners (many Native Americans), simultaneous learners and those with poor short-term memory function. It is neuro-developmentally inappropriate for young children. Young children need to absorb and learn their knowledge base from adult example and instruction. This knowledge, they will later be able to use, as young adults, for true critical thinking or logical reasoning. Common Core methodically slows and fragments the learned acquisition of Knowledge. Instead it makes children dependent on constantly changing computer information for Knowledge base. 4. The extreme over-emphasis on "collaboration" forces conformity or "groupthink" on children. Individualism is discouraged. Individuals are not allowed to excel except through the group. 5. The Common Core compliant texts and materials/media reveal a political agenda with a pervasive bias against Western civilization, American values, Judeo-Christian morality, national sovereignty, constitutional rights, private property, economic freedom (capitalism), etc. Propaganda replaces truth in Science, History and Economics. Common Core is designed to indoctrinate children into conformity and political activism in accordance with the global/socialist agenda. 6. How can you be so blind as to cooperate with this monstrosity? What is the harm in waiting?	Point 1 - the law states: "nothing in this section prohibits the board from adopting standards drafted by South Dakota educators and professionals which reference uniform content standards, provided that the board has conducted at least four public hearings in regard to those standards." Point 2- The proposed standards were based on the existing standards that were approved in 2007 - the proposed standards are using Webb leveling instead of Bloom's leveling and are written in what was the previous accepted methodology of one desired outcome as opposed to the various levels of advanced, proficient, or basic. Point 3 and 5- Concerns and Complaints against Common Core theory are irrelevant to these proposed standards because they are not Common Core Standards. Point 4 - The emphasis on the proposed tech standards for communication and collaboration are the same as the current standards. For each grade there is a section on communication and the expectation that students are able to work with others through the use of technology. Point 6 - The workgroup is pleased with the teamwork and cooperation that the workgroup showed in working to create and modify standards that are easily understood and relevant to educators. Technology continues to change so rapidly that we need to be diligent in keeping it relevant to the youth of our state.

Exhibit #4 – Catherine Billion – Other	
Comment	Workgroup Response
SD has handed over control of the education of its own children to an entity unknown to many SD citizens. "South Dakota Educational Technology Standards" is a MISNOMER. The standards have been taken directly from the "International Society for Technology in Education" (ISTE), in every single state that adopted Common Core (and thus, they are "National Standards"… read them here, then compare them to SD DOE: http://www.iste.org/docs/pdfs/20-14_ISTE_Standards-S_PDF.pdf). ISTE is directly associated with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO's) Agenda 21 and its Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE) http://iite.unesco.org/about/ "UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova appointed Donald G. Knezek, PhD, CEO of ISTE (YES, the "SD Tech Standards" writer), to the governing board of UNESCO's (IITE) for a two-year period from 2011 to 2013. "UNESCO established IITE in 1997 to support bridging the digital divide in education and building inclusive knowledge societies" (i.e. to carry out its agenda). On Page 5 of the SD Standards: "The Educational Technology Standards Committee developed these standards based on several themes that teachers and students of Educational Technology SHOULD INCLUDE throughout the learning process (WHO SAYS they SHOULD?): The goals at the beginning of the SD Standards assume that every parent should/would embrace their kindergartner and older to become "digital citizens," forcing the use of devices during school, without the guidance/knowledge, by parents, of what exactly their children are being exposed to or sharing. Furthermore, there is NO evidence to support that this format is appropriate for elementary children's development/learning (the promoters of the technology industry would want us to believe this, as would UNESCO, who desires the data). We have yet to receive a statement from the American Pediatric Association on the safety of digital device use by younger children; that evidence will unfortunately become available in retrospect. The ISTE digital citizenship teacher standards discuss respect for "intellectual property, and the appropriate documentation of sources," yet the data collected on our SD students through ongoing online "assessments" is, in fact, "intellectual property" and "source data" and going WHERE? and into WHOSE HANDS? at what cost? What accountability measures do teachers or the industry have in place to assure the data isn't sold to third parties, much like we are all experiencing on our phones and computers? UNESCO is clear about its need for the data… read this from their website: http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=9086&page=29 "THE EVOLVING INTERNATIONALISM AND THE NEW DEMAND FOR INFORMATION {your child's information}: UNESCO's education statistics program has fallen behind the world's growing need for statistics and indicators." PLEASE get educated on the private international organization (UNESCO) whose Global agenda is controlling our SD (and U.S.) educators and the content which our most vulnerable people, our children, are learning at school. Thank you for the opportunity to post commentary.	UNESCO was not involved in the South Dakota Technology standards development process. The South Dakota workgroup did review ISTE, the previous South Dakota Technology Standards, and the South Dakota ELA standards. The final outcome was a unique set of standards created for South Dakota, by South Dakota technology leader to be integrated in all South Dakota K-12 classrooms.