Fine Arts Standards Revisions Day 1 and 2

The outcome for the first two days of the workgroup was three tiered. Members needed to have a clear understanding of what effective arts standards looked like. Members also needed to understand the "why" of standards documents. Participants immersed themselves in research and reviews of standards documents worldwide. Participants also took the time to discuss the importance and value of our current standard document.

The committee began with some introductory activities. Participants spent the first two days looking through research, various state arts standard documents, international arts standards documents and the draft arts national documents. Participants read through, reviewed and discussed a vast array of arts standards resources. Participants read through these documents, discussed them and came to a general consensus regarding the content of these documents.

Revision team members came to a general consensus on what standards meant to them as well as how they wanted standards to serve the learners and educators of South Dakota. This consensus provided the revision team with a clear direction for future revision activities.

Fine Arts Standards Revisions Day 3 and 4

Revision work began on Day 3 of Fine Arts Standards Revisions with the review of SD DOE behavioral norms and expectations. Participants were reminded of the tenets of "accountable" speech, the benefit of avoiding judgments and the gains associated with validating their peers thoughts and ideas without being dismissive.

Committee members then began a quick team building activity. The stage was set for cooperation and teamwork. Participants were encouraged to share with team members, logical and validating exchanges, as opposed to irrational and emotional ones. Team members stayed focused throughout the day and were able to complete many revision related activities.

From that point the committee moved into some survey materials which analyzed and parsed the exact structures and features of effective standards. Discussions took place regarding these elements amongst tables and eventually team members were permitted to share out common themes and ideas with the entire group.

Committee members then took an hour to compare recent changes from the draft document that was analyzed on Day 1 of the revision process to the final version that was released toward the end of the Day 2 training. Participants were validated by their first round of draft revisions and found that their modifications paralleled the changes on the national level.

The remainder of the workgroup time was spent revising, modifying and creating our new state Fine Arts standard draft document. Content and Grade specific groups took a close look at the national

document and created standards based on their knowledge of South Dakota student needs while incorporating the strengths of the current South Dakota Arts standard document.

Fine Arts Standards Revisions Day 5 and 6

The workgroup goals for the final two days involved two separate and distinct items. The team wanted to finish the revision process and make sure they had everything covered within each content area and across grade levels within the arts. The Arts group also wanted to make sure they finished with a document worthy of presentation, that each and every member would be proud to share. After small groups finished sections of content related standards, other groups accessed, assessed and reviewed the various documents created by their peer groups.

Team members dealt with issues of discourse and disagreement via a predetermined voting process related to the specific group involved with the issue. Issues arose regarding the numbering system, inclusion of a content specific glossary, as well as the ideal selection of verbiage for specific standards. By lunch time of the fifth day the team had all the standards they wanted, included in the document, revised, modified and upgraded for our South Dakota document. Towards the end of day 5 the Fine Arts standards revision team had several groups working on various sections of the final document and by the end of day 6 the team had most sections of the final product written and ready for presentation.

We had numerous discussions regarding the future of the document and how it would be presented for review around the state. We agreed to represent our revision group locally throughout the review process.

The day following the final meeting several members put in extra hours to insure the viability and general unified presentation format of the final document. The final incarnation of the standards revision work document was emailed to all members for any last minute revisions. The final document was then submitted to Mr. Shaw for presentation at the state level.

Daniel Henry