

Name	Which group do you represent	Please use the space below to provide comment on the proposed South Dakota English Language Arts Standards. Please include the specific standard that you are referencing.
Carli Flemmer	K-12 Educator	11-12.RI.10 - needs to replace "at least grades 9-10" to "at least grades 11-12"
Kristi Tlustos	K-12 Educator	<p>I greatly appreciate the document that explains changes made to ELA standards! It will be helpful to have terms and skills more aligned through the grades. The focus on simplicity and clarity are great and made a positive difference.</p> <p>I have a few things to comment on, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1.RF.3d - I'm struggling to make sense of what students are being asked to do here. What would this look like? It is not specific enough and will cause confusion.</li> <li>- 1.RF.3g - First grade has never had two-syllable words in their standards before... this is more of a 2nd and 3rd grade skill, developmentally. Is there a reason this was added to 1st grade? I am highly trained in all things literacy and strongly disagree with two-syllable words being part of our standards. EXPOSURE to this would be appropriate, but not the ability to break syllables and decode these words.</li> <li>- 1.L.2 - I had hoped this would be changed to a writing standard or foundational standard. It is great that it aligns all the way through 5th now, for writing conventions. At the district level in meetings we have had many many discussions about this standard not really fitting. It's caused some confusion in various areas when designing Pacing Guides, Proficiency Level Descriptors, and other literacy work we've done.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for considering our input!!!!</p>

		<p>K.RI.10 and K.RL.10- I would highly suggest that for this kinder standard that it specifically states that the students should be able to orally comprehend. Comprehension skills in Kinder should be being taught through Oral and listening Comprehension and how the standard is currently written it suggests independent comprehension. I would be more specific in what Kinder students should be able to read but the end of the year but stating "Students will be able to read a variety of decodable texts with CVC patterns and Kindergarten High frequency words."</p> <p>K.RF.4- I would propose that this standard be taken out completely as this is not a foundational skill for Kindergarten, I understand that this may not be able to happen so my suggestion then would be that it needs to be rewritten so that it is clear to all districts even those districts that have limited do not have background knowledge with the Science of Reading. If this is not rewritten it leaves it open to interpretation for districts to continue with assessments that are using terms such as "Leveling" to assess our students with this standard.</p> <p>1.RL.10 and 1.RI.10 I would propose that this standard be taken out completely, I understand that this may not be able to happen so my suggestion then would be that it needs to be rewritten so that it is clear to all school districts in South Dakota even those districts that have limited or do not have knowledge with the Science of Reading. I am specifically refering to the wording of "Grade Appropriate Texts" If this is not rewritten it leaves it open to interpretation for districts to continue with assessments that are using terms such as "Leveling" to assess our students with this standard. I do know that many teachers have used leveled text to determine if their students were reading at grade level or not. As we know leveled text are not an appropriate way to determine grade level proficiency, I would like to see the wording changed so that it is clear to all.</p> <p>My suggestion would be to use language such as "Students in First grade should be able to read decodable texts with appropriate first grade phonics patterns and first grade high frequency words ( CVC,CCVC, CVCC, CVVC, CVCe )" </p>
--	--	--

<p>Joelle Neutzling</p>	<p>Literacy Professional</p>	<p>1.RF.4 This standard needs to be rewritten so that it is clear to all districts even those districts that have limited or do not have knowledge with the Science of Reading. I am specifically referring to the wording of "Grade Appropriate Texts" If this is not rewritten it leaves it open to interpretation for districts to continue with assessments that are using terms such as "Leveling" to assess our students with this standard. My suggestion would be to use language such as "Students in First grade should be able to accurately and fluently read passages with appropriate first grade phonics patterns and first grade high frequency words ( CVC,CCVC, CVCC, CVVC, CVCe )"</p> <p>2.RI.10, 2.RL.10- My suggestion would be that it needs to be rewritten so that it is clear to all school districts in South Dakota even those districts that have limited or do not have knowledge with the Science of Reading. I am specifically referring to the wording of "Grade Appropriate Texts" If this is not rewritten it leaves it open to interpretation for districts to continue with assessments that are using terms such as "Leveling" to assess our students with this standard. I do know that many teachers have used leveled text to determine if their students were reading at grade level or not. As we know leveled text are not an appropriate way to determine grade level proficiency, I would like to see the wording changed so that it is clear to all. My suggestion would be to use language such as "Students in Second grade should be able to read passages with appropriate Second grade phonics patterns and Second grade high frequency words.</p> <p>3.RI.10, 3.RL.10- 5.RI.10, 5.RL.10 My suggestions for the following standard in (K-2) would be that it needs to be rewritten so that it is clear to all school districts in South Dakota even those districts that have limited or do not have knowledge with the Science of Reading. I am specifically referring to the wording of "Grade Appropriate Texts" If this is not rewritten it leaves it open to interpretation for districts to continue with assessments that are using terms such as "Leveling" to assess our students with this standard. I do know that many teachers have used leveled text to determine if their students were reading at grade level or not. As we know leveled text are not an appropriate way to determine grade level proficiency, I would like to see the wording changed so that it is clear to all. My suggestion would be to use language such as "Students can read Grade Level text based on Researched Normed Assessments" ( ORF Passages, Acadience, Dibels)</p>
-------------------------	----------------------------------	--

Public Comment - Proposed ELA Standards

Erin	Literacy Professional	<p>R.L.10 and R.I.10 - These standards need more clarification and direction. It is way too easy for teachers to use text reading level (TRLs) to show proficiency for this standard. With the knowledge of the science of reading, we are trying to move away from this type of assessment. As you know, many districts, schools and teachers in SD do not yet have SOR knowledge and training and will revert to old practices. This exact thing is happening right now in Rapid City. Text reading levels are referenced on the report card as the district needs a "level" to show proficiency. I understand that the standard cannot go away completely as it is part of the college and career readiness standards, but can it be revised even farther to be clear that this does not mean a TRL? I know that certain districts have taken on the work to decide what is grade level text, but what about districts that don't have the correct knowledge of the science of reading? I am fighting this battle not only as a teacher but also as a parent. My daughter's teacher told me that she cannot get a "3" on report cards unless she passes an "I" benchmark assessment in first grade. Having the knowledge and training that I do, I know this is inappropriate, but it all relates back to these two specific standards.</p>
Beth Keeney	K-12 Administrator	<p>Second Grade, 2.RL.2 is the only standard that uses the word "moral". I suggest removing it bc it makes more complex than the other standards in that strand. Keep language consistent.</p> <p>I wish that the writing conventions that are included in the language standards, were actually in the writing standards. Language does not accurately describe the intent of those standards. Teachers often disregard Language Standards because they consider it "talking" and not writing, therefore those standards are missed.</p> <p>The standards should be reviewed strand by strand from K-12 to ensure the language is consistent and that there is a gradual progression over the years.</p>
Teresa	Literacy Professional	<p>After time spent studying the impact handwriting/penmanship has as a predictor of reading success in both LETRS and AIM Pathway Writing classes, I am concerned that there is no proposed standard to address handwriting. I feel this is an oversight to not specifically address this as a stand alone standard.</p>
Meghan	K-12 Educator	<p>There are no names from the Sioux Falls School District.</p>
Laurie Anglin	K-12 Educator	<p>The addition of 2.RF.2 is good. The advanced phonological awareness skills are so important for young readers- especially those who struggle.</p>