

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Public comments were reviewed and deliberated by the social studies standards workgroup through multiple venues. The workgroup evaluated comments between public hearings and also reviewed comments at an in-person meeting in Pierre on July 10, 2015 and through e-mail for additional comments that we received between July 10, 2015 and Aug. 14, 2015. The responses to written comments that opposed the standards or requested changes to the standards are listed below. The workgroup thanks those that provided feedback on the standards.

Exhibit # 2 – Robert E. Wright – Higher Education	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>As a professor of political economy at Augustana College in Sioux Falls, I find in my classes (which include general education courses as well as more specialized courses in history, economics, government, and business) students from South Dakota with a limited understanding of basic business, civics, economic, geographical, and historical concepts, skills, and content knowledge. Having reviewed the current and proposed standards, I can see why! For starters, US history should not be split into pre-Civil War for 8th graders and post-Civil War for 11th graders. Rather, 8th graders should come to have a general understanding of all of U.S. history, including chronology, and a basic introduction to primary source analysis. In 11th grade, students should again cover all of U.S. history but with less emphasis (just a refresher) on the chronology and basic terms and greater emphasis on the analysis of primary sources, along with a basic introduction to some major historiographical debates. The economics standards are a mess ... they do not appear to have been written by an economist. I suggest instead adopting/adapting the microeconomics and macroeconomics sections of the IB (international baccalaureate) programme (leaving off its international economics and development economics sections). That will ensure that our students are up to international standards on the two most important parts of the subject. (Students interested in business, policy, etc. can pick up the rest in college if they have a firm grounding in micro and macro principles.) I won't presume to critique the geography or civics standards but I would not be surprised if specialists found fault with them given what I have seen from my 3 children, all of whom are in middle or high schools in SF. Perhaps other IB subject guides can prove of help there as well.</p>	<p>The debate on when U.S. History concepts should be taught has been discussed extensively. After input from the workgroup and the entire state, a compromise was reached on the timeframe of when pre-Civil War and post-Civil War is taught. Districts have the option to specify their choice and be in accord with state standards.</p> <p>The proposed document does place an emphasis on chronology and the analysis of primary sources. Here are just a few examples:</p> <p>K-12.H.1 through K-12.H.4, K-12.C.2, 8.H.3.2, 8.H.4.4, 8.H.1.1, 9-12.H.4.6</p> <p>These standards are intended to provide students with a general economics background to be civically and economically literate. One of the issues is that the charge of standards development is not to change or dictate graduation requirements. To successfully implement the microeconomics and macroeconomics you are suggesting, a new graduation requirement would likely need to be added. Students wishing to pursue a more rigorous coursework can utilize advanced placement coursework that would fit closer to the IB program which you recommend.</p>

Exhibit # 3 – No Name Submitted

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>It would be more convenient if all sep, ccc, and dci info was presented on the same document or in order with the standards instead of having to search different locations</p>	<p>The dimensions listed here are in relation to the previously adopted science standards (2015) and are unrelated to the social studies standards adoption.</p>
Exhibit # 7 – Tim Woodson	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>Referring to History. I just visited an Elem. school in the state and found the same problem in information we are teaching our children. The facts do not and have not ever supported America schools teaching that Christopher Columbus discovered the 'American' Continent. We need to teach correct/factual information to our children. I will be glad to provide all information on this topic. Let's stop this. He doesn't even deserve any Holiday. I will be a teacher in two years, and will do my best to spark this change in America. v/r Tim Woodson 3039067537</p>	<p>This comment references curriculum decisions. State standards do not identify specific curriculum requirements.</p>
Exhibit # 11 – Jeremy Risty, Educator	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>Upon reviewing the proposed American history standards, my colleagues and I are very concerned about the breadth that we will be expected to cover in American history. In our view, the expectations to cover early American history will preclude the opportunity to adequately cover more modern American history. We feel that more recent history is much more directly relevant and applicable to the lives of our students. This content, however, we feel is being marginalized in these proposed standards.</p>	<p>The compromise reached between diverse views on scope of content allows districts to choose if they want the Comprehensive or Modern US history class taught. An example is listed, below, to address the marginalization comment.</p> <p>Standard 9-12.H.2.7. Critique recent developments in the United States addressing the roles of people, ideas, and groups in terms of foreign &amp; domestic issues.</p> <p>This one standard can be used multiple times throughout the course: The Gilded Age, The Progressive Era, WWI, The Great Depression, The Cold War, The Civil Rights Movement, Post Twin Towers. In all these time periods, you can discuss how ideas and people's roles changed, how foreign relationships changed, investigate domestic issues at that time.</p>
Exhibit # 13 Stephanie Kaufman, Educator	

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>I am a SD high school Government teacher. Overall, the proposed Civics/Government standards provide a good starting point, however I feel there are a few omissions that should be corrected. In the K-12 C.3 section, there needs to be a more general statement about understanding the structure, organization, powers and function of each of the three branches of government. 9-12 C.3.3 is too narrow and should include topics like the nature and extent of executive power and the role of the federal bureaucracy and actual functions of the Executive branch beyond just the role of the Electoral College. C.3.4 should include the state &amp; federal court systems and landmark decisions of the US Supreme Court, in addition to judicial review. C.3.5 should include an understanding of interstate relations as well as state &amp; federal "powers" instead of "levels of authority". K-12 C.4 should read "of America's democratic republic" rather than just "American democracy", because it is a more accurate description of our system. 9-12 C.5.7 may have a typo--should be civil disobedience rather than obedience? I feel there are a few other omissions in general that must be included to make this a complete set of state standards. There should be a specific standard addressing the relationship of individual liberties and the concept of a limited government including civil liberties, property rights, due process of law, and the rights of the accused. There should also be a standard addressing equality before the law and civil rights. There is also no standard for the election process, i.e... primary, caucus, nomination, convention, etc..and the expansion of voter rights and current voter trends/ voter behavior. In addition there should be a standard addressing the federal budget process including fiscal policy of taxation, borrowing, spending and monetary policy of setting interest rates and printing money (buying or selling treasury notes). Our students need to understand our national debt situation and this is not included in this draft of standards. There should also be some mention of an over-arching theme of liberty v. security, especially in light of the changes we have seen since 9/11 in regard to our natural rights and the social contract. Also, the Amendment process is missing. One last note, I found it odd that "through the use of compelling questions" was used at the end of some of the standards such as C.1.1 and C.1.5, C.3.5 and C.4.1. That is not really a standard but rather a teaching practice or method. I thank those who worked on the draft version. It is not an easy task, but I think these additions could make these standards even better.</p>	<p>The standards document is not intended to prescribe specifics of the curriculum. The specifics will be formalized through disaggregation and district curriculum construction. With respect to no inclusion of the "national debt" within the standards, the group constructed standard 9-12 E.3.5, which would include that sub-topic. 9-12 E.3.5 reads: "Describe the ways in which each level of government in the US generates revenue and critique the method of using that revenue for public services." The next specific issue deals with the absence of the "amendment process" in the standards so the group has added the clause, "and subsequent amendments" following the Bill of Rights in 8.C.3.3. to ensure that the amendment process is included. K-12.C.4 has been changed to "of America's democratic republic" from "American democracy."</p> <p>With respect to the comment about omissions, Standard 9-12.C.2.1 covers limited government. Standards 9-12.C.4.2 and 9-12.C.4.4 address issues of liberty, due process, and equality. Standard 9-12.C.5.3 covers the election process and effective civic participation. "Compelling questions" are defined in the glossary and included so as to promote engaged, deep inquiry into the full complexity of relevant issues.</p>

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Exhibit # 14 Jeff Palmer, Educator

Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>I am disappointed that that new US History standards were not approved and that we are further lengthening this approval process. I was part of a group of US History teachers that met in October 2014 and I believe that we were a good cross section of the High School US History teachers from across the state. We were able to come to a compromise that appeased both sides of the argument and I felt very confident in the standards that we ultimately agreed upon. I believe that as South Dakota High School US History teachers we are the experts in the field and that our opinions and decisions would be held in high regard. However this latest delay proves that our compromise was not taken seriously and I feel that we are being undermined. I believe that the proposed standards provide districts with options to keep control at a local level. If districts want to teach US History from the founding of our democracy through the present they have that option and now they have standards that can support their teaching. The proposed standards also allow districts to continue to teach reconstruction to the present with standards to support the instruction just as they have did for the previous seven years. We cannot allow our standards to be held hostage by a few in the minority. These proposed standards were created by educators and refined by the teachers who actually teach the subject in High School. The proposed standards need to be implemented so we can continue to educate students who are career ready, civic ready, and college ready. Thank you.</p>	<p>The compromise reached between diverse views on the issue of scope of content is in the standards document which has been presented to the Board of Education. If approved by the Board, the work group believes it will give districts the option to specify their choice and be in accord with state standards.</p>

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Exhibit # 16 Tim Woodson	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>When will the state stop teaching the incorrect referencing of Christopher Columbus discovering the continent and stop saying that it is correct of America's founding fathers to give claim and honor to him. ??? I will write the U.S. Dept. of Ed. to address this issue as well. There is no reason that Leif Eriksson and his family are not given proper and correct credit of discovering this continent, which we call home now. I will be asking Congress, through the U.S. Dept. of Ed. to get this correct, and to have the holiday renounced and stopped. I will also request through representation in Congress to have our capital district renamed, since this is not correct and is teaching Americans incorrect information, making us look like ignorant fools to the rest of the intelligent world. Thank you very much for your time. Let's make this correct. v/r Tim Woodson 3039067537</p>	<p>This comment references curriculum decisions. State standards do not identify specific curriculum requirements.</p>
Exhibit # 17 Nicole Osmundson, Parent	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>Standards 6.H.1.1-2- Standards seem vague. Which key global/historical events? Could you list 5-6 major events to give a guideline? 8th grade civics standards to include current South Dakota Congress people knowledge. Standard 8H2.4- I like this standard but wondering if a similar standard could be added with the American Revolution? It could read- Associate key individuals with their roles in the American Revolution.</p>	<p>Standards 6.H.1.1-2: These standards were created to allow flexibility. The old standards had a list of events as examples, but some teachers viewed this as a list of what needed to be taught. We wanted to eliminate that confusion by leaving it flexible. There is a work group that will disaggregate these standards that will include more specific examples.</p> <p>Standard 8.C.5.1: This would be up to each individual teacher as to how they want to include Congressional representatives.</p> <p>Standard 8.H.2.4: The American Revolution is taught in the 5th grade. (5H2.2) In addition, the standards are not limited to only the Civil War, and a teacher may include the American Revolution.</p>

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Exhibit # 18 Florence Thompson, Retired School Psychologist	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>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?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The standards workgroup created a unique set of South Dakota standards that are not national standards.</li> <li>2., 3., and 5. Concerns and complaints against Common Core are irrelevant to these proposed standards because they are not Common Core Standards.</li> <li>4. These standards do not mandate collaboration and are written in a manner that allows the teacher and school district to utilize the amount of collaboration or individual work necessary to meet the standards.</li> <li>6. The workgroup is pleased with the teamwork and cooperation that the Social Studies workgroup members showed in working to create and modify standards that are easily understood and relevant to educators.</li> </ol>

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Exhibit # 19 Ben Jones	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>Thanks for the opportunity to address the board at its last meeting in Pierre. I appreciated that my concerns regarding a full American History course instead of only the second half of US history currently required, received a full airing and consideration. I grew concerned however with the notion of allowing for "local control" regarding Social Studies standards and the indication that some districts may make different choices. If the Board of Education allows local control for Social Studies, why not Math, Science, and the other subject areas? I would think, and I could be mistaken, but that allowing options of standards in 11th grade US History would invite the question of having options for other subjects. I also wanted to emphasize that by having two options for the content of a HS History course, it would make it difficult for students to know if they are prepared for college history and related humanities courses and for college faculty to know what to expect from former SD High Students enrolled in their humanities and social science courses. Whatever the board's decision on this issue, myself and some other history educators from around the state intend on forming the South Dakota Council for History Education soon and look forward in partnering with the Dept of Education to assist K-12 History educators in switching over to the new standards, whatever they may be. Regards, Ben Jones, Ph.D. Dean College of Arts and Sciences, Dakota State University I appreciate your work and time on these tough issues and look forward to more and better history education in South Dakota.</p>	<p>Due to the diverse views on whether a comprehensive or modern course was best for the interests of students in South Dakota the workgroup came to a compromise solution. In either course, students will be engaged in skills of historical inquiry with districts free to determine the scope of course content.</p> <p>In other subjects, options are available to take a variety of course pathways that meet graduation requirements which results in a wide array of standards that could be met.</p>

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Exhibit # 21 Catherine Billion	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>SD DOE is in a position to hand over control of the education of its own children to an entity unknown to many SD citizens (UNESCO, The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization under “Agenda for the 21st Century” Sustainable Development Program). The NCSS “College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework For Social Studies State Standards” are not South Dakota’s. They are universal standards, therefore not unique to our SD learners. Many “stakeholders” who stand to advance their own agendas, had their hand in writing these standards (NSSSA, National Geographic, NCHE, NCGE, NHD, Center For civic Education, CUFA, and CRFC, to name a few). What is very apparent about the process that SD DOE has undergone to “adopt” (not “re-write”) the standards/curriculum/assessments for our children, is the “top-down approach” used. These national sets of standards were imposed, initially, with Common Core Math and English, which paved the disordered “process path” for now adopting the “complete set” of national standards (NGSS: science, ISTE: ed tech, NCSS: social studies, and forthcoming FoSE: Future of Sex Ed- National Sexuality Education Standards). Ironically, as the National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers, with virtually no approval/awareness of citizens, adopted the universal Common Core Standards in the United States prior to their even being written/published, now the Science, Social Studies, Tech Ed, and Sex Ed curricula and assessments are already written, prior to the SD DOE even voting to adopt these national standards by which they were written! This process undermines South Dakotan’s intelligence and values (e.g. The proposed universal NGSS curriculum materials for every grade level are currently on display for viewing at the Sioux Falls School District Instructional Planning Center through May 22. I personally viewed the materials Wednesday, and highly encourage each of you to do so); *note, these curriculum materials are currently proposed prior to SD DOE even approving/voting on the standards by which they were written! The obvious global education agenda (UNESCO) with its materials/assessments has placed SD teachers in a difficult spot, to have to “adapt” the materials to fit South Dakota students’ unique, individual needs, yet simultaneously attempting to help them achieve on the National Smarter Balanced Assessment. They don’t have time to do both. We are South Dakotans with South Dakota characteristics: values, economy, geography, science, values, all VERY unique to every other state in our nation, yet the private stakeholders (non-elected, national, non-governmental organizations: NGSS, ISTE, NCSS, FoSE, and Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium, who stand to make billion of dollars from this educational shift), and who are dictating the standards/curriculum/assessments, in concert with each other in all subject areas, are in control of what our SD students are being taught. It is unethical, and because of the digital format of the books, content can be manipulated /changed overnight. I urge you to reject the proposed Social Studies Standards, in order to preserve the freedom SD teachers enjoy, to teach what is good, true, and beautiful in social science in this great state. I am grateful for the freedom and opportunity to voice my opinion. Catherine Billion Sioux Falls</p>	<p>These are not universal standards designed by UNESCO, Common Core or C3 framework. The standards were written by South Dakota educators to revise the state's social studies standards of 2007. Assessments for social studies standards have not been written. The state, not the national government, could still choose to write them. Individual districts, not the state or social studies standards committee, select which textbooks they use.</p>

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Exhibit # 23 Jay Vogt, Representing SD State Historical Society Board of Trustees	
Comments	Workgroup Response
<p>The South Dakota State Historical Society Board of Trustees adopted the following resolution at their May 28, 2015, meeting.</p> <p>Resolution            “The South Dakota State Historical Society Board of Trustees strongly urges the South Dakota Department of Education Social Studies Standards Working Group to adopt guidelines at its July 2015 meeting in Rapid City to:</p> <p>(1) Promote the study of South Dakota history in South Dakota high schools, in addition to the fourth grade, and;</p> <p>(2) Promote the study of the first hundred years of American history, especially the American founding and the framing of the Constitution, in South Dakota high schools.”</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Jdv            Jay D. Vogt</p>	<p>The public comment does not request a change, but rather a request to promote the expanded study of SD history and first hundred years of American history. The proposed standards provide a minimum requirement which do not restrict teaching of SD history to specific timeframes or geographic areas unrelated to SD History or the first hundred years of American History.</p> <p>Examples: Geography standards (9-12.2.2, 9-12.G.3.2 and 9-12.5.1), 9-12 Civics/Government standards (9-12.C.1.3 and all of 9-12 Anchors 9-12.C.2.1 - 2.6) and US History standards (US 9-12.1.4 and US 9-12.1.5) allow teachers to use the history of South Dakota to help explain and learn concepts in each respective area. Page 5 of the proposed standards document shares a statement that supports how South Dakota teachers should be and will be supported, following standards adoption, by both the state and districts to address both the US/South Dakota History concern and the founding and US Constitution concern.</p>

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

### Exhibit # 24

#### Comments

Dear President Kirkegaard and the members of the South Dakota Board of Education,

We are writing to you regarding the U. S. history standards for South Dakota’s high school students. We encourage you to take this opportunity to define 1 credit of US History as the comprehensive course (1776 to the present), rather than allowing districts to select a “modern only” standard.

Over the years that the current standard has been in place, one of the results has been students matriculating at our universities who are less prepared for college level work in U. S. history courses than their predecessors. Our current students are challenged when asked to think historically. By that we mean they are unfamiliar with the use of sources, the identification of bias, analysis of information, understanding context, and the development and practice of research that aid them both inside and outside the discipline of history. These practices build and refine critical thinking skills necessary for all professions and are therefore useful in many careers. Learning to “do” history builds skills not only for history class, but also for students’ professional and personal lives. When they arrive at college without sufficient skills along these lines, their chances for success with other courses are diminished as well.

Furthermore, and perhaps even more importantly, knowledge of history informs their citizenship. It is vital for citizens to understand their rights and their obligations in our Republic. Recently the South Dakota Supreme Court held, “The constitutional language and intent of the framers guarantee the children of South Dakota a constitutional right to an education that provides them with the opportunity to prepare for their future roles as citizens, participants in the political system, and competitors both economically and intellectually.” The emphasis is in the original. These thoughts comport with the intent of the framers of our Republic, the drafters of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and those who sought to expand those ideals to others in what ultimately became the Civil War. Civil War veterans heavily influenced the founding of this state and the drafting of our constitution. They maintained these ideals by placing them in our state’s constitution. Our education standards should strive to meet their goal.

It is our view that the current standard that covers early American history in 8th grade and modern American history in 11th grade is inadequate to the task. To begin to understand early American history requires knowledge of the terms, the dates, the major events and context, which is best done in 8th grade, but to fully understand that distant era also requires age appropriate explanations, analysis that comes with maturity, and contextualization that can only come with greater command of language. We encourage the board to leave 8th grade American history as it is, while placing early American history in the first half of the 11th grade year. Doing so is not duplicative, but rather re-engages the more mature student with increasingly complex material that builds upon their existing knowledge. By doing so, we hope that students will have greater success understanding their history and ultimately employing it as a citizen. Rarely is there an opportunity to improve something so dramatically for so many students, with so little expense. By simply defining the standard of 1 credit of U. S. history in high school as the comprehensive history course, we believe we will see an improvement in college preparedness for thousands of children. Because history skills are used in many disciplines, this change will enhance successful student performance, not only in history classes, but also in all the social sciences and humanities subjects. The AP U. S. history course already is designed to be comprehensive and we are advocating that all our students receive the same content. Those students not going on to college will also benefit for all the reasons the South Dakota Supreme Court described, for they will be better able to understand their rights and their obligations as citizens through the exercise of their critical thinking skills.

For these reasons, we urge you to make comprehensive American history the only way to earn 1 credit of U.S. history for South Dakota’s high school students. We make this recommendation independently of our respective institutions and the South Dakota Board of Regents.

#### Workgroup Response

Due to the diverse views on whether a comprehensive or modern course was best for the interests of students in South Dakota the workgroup came to a compromise solution. In either course, students will be engaged in skills of historical inquiry with districts free to determine the scope of course content.

## Social Studies Standards Workgroup Response to Public Comments

Exhibit # 24 Continued.	
Comments	Workgroup Response
Benjamin F. Jones, Ph.D. Dean and Associate Professor of History College of Arts & Sciences: Dakota State University	
Kurt Hackemer, Ph.D. Chair and Professor Department of History, Philosophy & Native Studies: University of South Dakota	
William Prigge, Ph.D. Head and Associate Professor of History Department of History, Political Science, Philosophy and Religion: South Dakota State University	
Steven A. Usitalo, Ph.D. Professor of History Chair, Department of History, Sociology, Political Science and Geography: Northern State University	
Steven J. Bucklin, Ph.D. Professor of History Department of History, Philosophy & Native Studies: University of South Dakota	
Michael J. Mullin, Ph.D. Professor of History N.E.H. Chair of Regional Heritage Augustana College	
Robert E. Wright, Ph.D. Nef Family Chair of Political Economy Augustana College	
Kurt E. Kemper, Ph.D. Professor of History: Dakota State University	
Brad Tennant, Ph.D. Professor of History American Studies Program Director: Presentation College	
Charles Vollan, Ph.D. Associate Professor of History: South Dakota State University	
Robert Wellman Campbell, Ph.D. Former Associate Professor of History: Black Hills State University	
Thomas Agostini, Ph.D. Research Fellow, The Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of George Washington & Assistant Professor of History: South Dakota State University	
Sara Lampert, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of History Department of History, Philosophy, and Native Studies: University of South Dakota	
Elise Boxer, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of History Department of History, Philosophy and Native Studies: University of South Dakota	
Stephen Jackson, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of History: The University of Sioux Falls	
Thomas Arnold, Ph.D. Instructor of History: Black Hills State University	
Jon K. Lauck, Ph.D. Adjunct Professor of History, University of South Dakota: Member South Dakota State Historical Society Board of Directors	
Member Senator Karl Mundt Archives Board of Directors	
Jennifer Lacher-Starace, M.S Instructor of Secondary Education Department of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership: South Dakota State University	