

## Fine Arts Workgroup Response to Public Comments

The Fine Arts Standards 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 29, 2015 to review all public comments received prior to that date.

Exhibit #1 – Kim Evander - Educator	
Comment	Workgroup Response
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...	The layout was created in one format and can be adjusted to meet local district needs. Each district has a unique make-up and may require a different arrangement of standards. Districts may go in and cut and paste to reorganize however they see fit to meet district needs.
Exhibit #3 – Dawn Hilgenkamp – Parent	
Comment	Workgroup Response
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.	This standard is really about listing basic parts of the body related to movement. These standards do not involve any sex education and are age appropriate.
Exhibit #6 – Julie Berger – Educator	
Comment	Workgroup Response
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.	This comment is addressing local curriculum decisions that are much more specific than the standards were written to address.

Exhibit #7 – Larry Petersen – Self

Comment	Workgroup Response
<p>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.</p>	<p>This comment is addressing local curriculum that is much more specific than the standards were written to address. Individual educators can go above and beyond the standards to place additional expectations that would positively impact the ensemble. The success of the students is directly related to implementation of the standards in each district, which allows customization in each district through scope/sequence, course offering, and teacher experience.</p>

Exhibit #9 – No Name – Educator

Comment	Workgroup Response
<p>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.</p>	<p>Individual workgroup member comments are marked as Exhibit 12. The following response is from the workgroup as a whole: This comment is addressing local curriculum that is much more specific than the standards were written to address. Individual educators can go above and beyond the standards to place additional expectations that would separate these standards into two separate courses (General and Instrumental). The success of the students is directly related to implementation of the standards in each district, which allows customization in each district through scope/sequence, course offering, and teacher experience.</p>

Exhibit #11 – Elise Fowlkes – Educator

Comment	Workgroup Response
<p>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).</p>	<p>This comment addresses specialized subject areas that may or may not be offered in a district. The standards were written to support all students in all districts. The standards were written to engage students in higher-order thinking and do not emphasize rote memorization. However, teachers of specialized subjects are still able to teach the fundamentals and information necessary for those subjects. The teachers are still able to teach what they feel is important, as long as they also engage students in the artistic processes through these standards.</p>

Exhibit #15– Florence Thompson - Self

Comment	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>	<p>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 standards that we have adopted were based on the existing standards and National Arts Standards and other references. Point 3 and 5 - Concerns and Complaints against Common Core theory are irrelevant to these proposed standards as these are not Common Core Standards. Point 4 - The workgroup emphasized that collaboration and communication are foundational to the arts and developing 21st Century Skills. Point 6 - The workgroup is pleased with the teamwork and cooperation that the fine arts leaders showed in working to create and modify standards that are easily understood and relevant to educators. The Fine Arts standards have not been revised in about 20 years, so time is of the essence.</p>