Public Comments
Fine Art Standards

Fine Arts Exhibit 1

Date Submitted: August 14, 2014
Kim Evander, Educator (teacher, administrator, curriculum director, SPED director, ect)

I would like it organized so music levels were all together, visual arts were all together, etc. For teachers that teach multiple levels, it would be much more convenient. It was very confusing trying to jump around the pdf...

Fine Arts Exhibit 2

Date Submitted: September 3, 2014
No Name Submitted, Parent

Looks good, keep up the good work.

Fine Arts Exhibit 3

Date Submitted: September 4, 2014
Dawn Hilgenkamp, Parent

Pre-Kindergarten kids should not be learning about body parts and body types in school at such a young age. This is something that parents will teach at this age. At this age this is not part of Fine Art. It is not age appropriate. I am not happy with these standards and I do not want them in our schools.

Fine Arts Exhibit 4

Date Submitted: September 10, 2014
Patricia Boyd, Representing an Organization or Agency

Proposed Fine Arts Standards The presentation of the proposed revisions in South Dakota's K-12 Fine Arts Standards is an articulated response to the need for better access to the arts as learning skills, for all teachers at all grade levels. Taken together, designed by grade level to parallel progression through all subjects, they produce a tremendous resource for education in South Dakota. These practices are by no means restricted to visual or performing arts classes, but are used by teachers in all subjects, every day. Learning research and resulting data continue to demonstrate the effectiveness of intentional application of the arts in teaching, across curriculum. These revisions are designed and written to strengthen the foundational aspects of arts instruction K-12. They are also intended to serve as a resource to help teachers design courses of study using grade-level appropriate arts principles and practices to enhance development of observation, solutions, presentation, response and connections. The proposed revisions to fine

arts standards are in line with South Dakota's overall goal of preparing students proficient and ready for career and college. We believe they merit adoption. Thank you for your consideration, Patricia Boyd Executive Director South Dakotans for the Arts

Fine Arts Exhibit 5

Date Submitted: September 11, 2014
Rebecca Cruse, Representing an Organization or Agency

Dear South Dakota State Board of Education:

I would like to urge your approval of the proposed fine arts standards on behalf of the South Dakota Arts Council. As the state arts agency, we are pleased with the concepts and specificity included in the revised standards. We are also impressed with the expertise of the diverse group of professionals involved in the revision process.

As the director of arts education for the SDAC, I had the opportunity to observe and discuss the revision process with the teachers who worked on this over the summer. Their focus and commitment will result in increased functionality, clarity, and collaboration in South Dakota classrooms.

The revisions will benefit teachers and students. Clearly identifying the artistic processes of creating, performing, responding, and connecting within each arts discipline, makes the fine arts standards far more accessible than they are currently. Furthermore, the breakdown of each process with the anchor standards and the specific outcomes expected at each grade level makes for attainable goals in all classrooms, for all teachers. The benefits to arts specialists are obvious, but I believe teachers in all content areas will find these revisions beneficial.

Teaching artists will also be able to use these standards in our Artists in Schools & Communities program. Their residencies will be able to clearly connect to classroom goals.

The SDAC has a long history of support and development of standards-based arts education. Depth of learning in the arts helps children become intelligent, successful adults.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Cruse
Assistant Director South Dakota Arts Council South Dakota Department of Tourism

Fine Arts Exhibit 6

Date Submitted: September 15, 2014
Julie Berger, Educator (teacher, administrator, curriculum director, SPED director, ect)

After reviewing the new "proposed" music standards for South Dakota, I cannot even fathom how to use them. The new standards, based off of the new NAfME music standards, have no actual "standards" written in them. There is no place for building foundations of musical elements. Where does, "Learn a Concert Bb Scale" fall under in the new standards? I can use a standard to tell me how the Bb Concert scale makes me "feel", but nowhere to actually "learn" the scale. The original 5 state standards actually had musical concepts in them: rhythm, notes, scales, musical terminology, etc. Please do not adopt these new standards, as they do not teach anything about musical fundamentals, the building blocks that need to be accomplished before all the new "fluffy" standards can be incorporated.

Fine Arts Exhibit 7

Date Submitted: September 29, 2014
Larry Petersen, Representing Self

First, my comments below are not meant to diminish the efforts and thoughtful attention that the SD committee put forth in presenting this document. I find they align very well with the national standards, but is those national standards that I am disappointed in, and thus the proposed state standards are frustrating. I find it strange that our "standards" have become so vague and experience based, rather than skills based. I found the old standards frustrating because they were so lofty and hard to attain. I find these new standards frustrating because they do not aspire to make skilled musicians as much as they aspire to make music appreciators. I see the value in allowing the music student to become involved in how and why we do what we do as music educators, but how does that develop the musician? Connecting to audiences, explaining why we choose the repertoire we choose, refining rehearsal strategies - these make me question just who these standards are written for. The standards should be guidelines for student progress, not a means to make it easier for me to write my SLO. These new national standards are a continuation of the dumbing down of expectations for our youth. I believe that we in South Dakota should not settle for such vague and undemanding guidelines. While the former national standards set almost unrealistic goals for many of us in South Dakota, I appreciated their lofty aspirations. I believe many of us feel in the age of assessment, we need to word our standards in a manner that will allow us to look like the quality teachers we already are. Unfortunately, this lack of specificity also allows us a loophole when it comes to the skills-based expectations of our students. We can meet almost every standard in this document with a very sub-par ensemble. I don't believe that should be the case. I am hoping we can find some middle ground here and return to more specific guidelines that challenge not only the teacher, but also the student.

Fine Arts Exhibit 8

Date Submitted: November 19, 2014
No Name Submitted, Music Educator Group.

We would like the wording of the Fine Arts Standards to be simplified. It's much easier to understand the previous standards. The Fine Arts standards seem to be geared toward composition and "creating" rather than performing music. We would also like the standards to be content specific by grade level. What is an emerging ensemble at the HS level? We are also looking for clarification on harmonizing instruments. What does that entail?

Fine Arts Exhibit 9

Date Submitted: November 20, 2014
No Name Submitted: Educator (teacher, administrator, curriculum director, SPED director, ect.)

The standards for Elementary Music really need to be broken down into specific standards for General Music and Instrumental Music. As they are written now the standards are much too broad for instrumental music.

Fine Arts Exhibit 10

Date Submitted: January 26, 2015
Sarah O'Donnell, Educator (teacher, administrator, curriculum director, SPED director, ect)

President Kirkegaard, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board, I am Sarah O'Donnell, representing myself as a teacher of South Dakota and as a member of the workgroup that created the proposed Fine Arts Standards. I am writing as a supporter of the proposed Fine Arts Standards. I believe they are a great step forward for the art educators of our state. First, as a member of the workgroup who spent 6 full days this summer writing the standards, I assure you they were not put together without a lot of thought and deliberation. I spent hours with my colleagues determining what standards are right for our students and what would excite and challenge educators in the fine arts. Every standard was meticulously examined for its relevance, relation to our state and culture, and what would be important to improve our educational programs in South Dakota. I decided to be on this committee because I wanted a say in what would be taught in my classroom and it was not a responsibility any of us took lightly or without contemplation. As an educator with the task of teaching kids art, I have continually looked for ways to challenge myself and my students. With the current vague and limited standards, it falls to the teacher to have accountability and higher-level challenges for our students in our content area. In my opinion, we have none of the rigor or student engagement now that we would experience with the proposed standards or teachers in other content areas expect. I feel art is a vital subject to helping a student experience problem-solving and critical thinking and these standards support that. I also appreciate that there is a succinct artistic process across the fine arts. I can finally talk with my colleagues in the arts in common terms to create a more in-depth educational experience for our students. The music teacher, the drama teacher and I would be able to talk about generating and conceptualizing artistic works (as stated in Anchor Standard 1) as part of the creating process across our content areas. They could be composing a song, writing a dramatic piece and creating thumbnails of an abstract painting based on the same ideas. I think this is the most important part of the arts: showing the connections between the arts and real life and therefore showing their value. Thank you and with sincerity, Sarah O'Donnell Deubrook Jr./Sr. High School Art Instructor

Fine Arts Exhibit 11

Date Submitted: February 16 , 2015
Elise Fowlkes, Educator (teacher, administrator, curriculum director, SPED director, ect)

I teach HS Art (Ceramics, Photography, and general art), and have some concerns about the wordiness of the standards, and the rather nebulous language used in some. For example, standard HSp.VA.Cr.11. More concise wording is needed to make each standard more understandable. Some standards would make more sense broken into two. Also, the old standards clearly provide room for students to learn about specific "media, techniques, and processes," however, the new standards seem to minimize this VERY important piece. Although high school students are capable of doing many of the things included in the HS Proficient, and HS Advanced levels, it is important to keep in mind most of these students are at a beginning level when it comes to working with the specific materials, processes, and techniques used in more specialized areas of art (ceramics, photography, sculpture, etc.). Students in my district have extremely limited experience with Art at the elementary level, get some experience at the middle school level. Expecting them to perform at the proficient or advanced HS level of these new standards doesn't seem completely reasonable (some can, but most will need considerable support and practice doing so). My photography students, for example, need to know some very foundational things about camera function, and photography equipment, etc. before they can engage in making artwork, but I don't see a place for this in the new standards (HSp.VA.Cr.2.2 sort of fits... but not really). There are some standards that students will never have time to touch because I see them for such a limited amount of time (HSp.VA.Cr.2.3 for example). Lastly, at the HS level, these standards don't clearly require students to solve specific design problems using organizational principles (see "old" Standard 2, 9-12 benchmarks).

Fine Arts Exhibit 12

Date Submitted: March 4, 2015
Music Standards Workgroup Committee Members, Workgroup members; Kimberly Bruguier, Christy Leichtnam, Alice Oleson

In regards to public comment, exhibit 9, the workgroup was not very clear what was implied by instrumental music in elementary as instruments are an important part of elementary general music as well as band and orchestra. The workgroup members assumed the educator is talking about band and orchestra in elementary grades. The standards for elementary music are essentially for general music which encompasses classroom instruments such as xylophones, ukuleles, drums, and guitars. For elementary level instrumental ensembles it may be best to look at middle school instrumental emerging ensembles.

Fine Arts Exhibit 13

Date Submitted: March 5, 2015
Music Standards Workgroup Committee Member, Workgroup members; Trisha Fisher, Christy Leichtman, Larry Telkamp, Jean Winker, Shyla Balo, Alice Oleson

In Response to Exhibit 8 –
The SD state standards are transitioning to the format of artistic processes, so the group felt we needed to stay consistent across the fine arts board and use these processes. The "creating" factor is a big chunk of the standards. We discussed this a lot this summer. It does not mean you have to use a whole quarter to have each student write a song, it can be as simple as using some creative warm-ups that help them create music. Our students are the next generation of music makers and composers; we want to educate them on different ways to create music and give them tools to generate different styles/genres. There are a lot of five-minute activities that help students really understand how to make music. The "create" section also helps us get out of the bad habit of just learning a song for the next performance. We all know music is more than that.

The "simplified version" includes four main categories: Creating, Performing, Responding, and Connecting. These are all things we as music educators do in our groups that build better performers and lovers of music. The branched out, explanation of these standards is to help define what those categories all entail. There are some programs in the works that will hopefully help give us tools in how to understand and use these new standards. "Traditional and Emerging Ensembles" are meant to cover your core classes like choir and band, but also other groups that may be forming within your school day. For example: an acapella group or small band ensemble. The basic processes of what you teach are in every group you do. Harmonizing Instruments would cover Guitar and Keyboard classes.

Fine Arts Exhibit 14

Date Submitted: March 10, 2015
Brenda Sosa, Standards Workgroup Committee Member, (K-2 Art Teacher and Mother of four children attending a SD Public School, Standards)

As committee members, we spent several days examining each and every single national Fine Arts Standard and adapting the national fine arts standards to fit the needs of SD students and SD fine arts educators. This not only allowed our old standards to be updated, but allow for more specific and concise expectations at each grade level, yet allowing freedom and flexibility in lesson planning. Many of us spent not only many hours as a group collaborating to improve our state standards, but also spent many hours outside of the planned committee sessions researching data and other regional state standards to see how our current and new standards fit within other state requirements.

Fine Arts Exhibit 15

Date Submitted: March 12, 2015
Florence Thompson, Retired School Psychologist, Representing self.

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?