

Social Studies, Fine Arts and K-12 Technology Standards Revision Work Groups

Facilitators: Michele Davis, Dan Henry, and Sherry Crofut

Meeting 2: July 8-9, 2014

Social Studies Revision Update: Michele Davis' report

South Dakota has used research-based national standards to inform the newest SD standards. Starting in June we reviewed the latest work by the national partners:

American Bar Association

American Historical Association

Association of American Geographers

Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools

Center for Civic Education

Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago

Constitutional Rights Foundation USA

Council for Economic Education

National Council for Geographic Education

National Council for History Education

National Council for the Social Studies

National Geographic Society

National History Day

Street Law, Inc.

World History Association

Together, the national associations created the C3 Framework – a skill set needed for students to be College, Career, and Civic ready. In June we listened to videos from the writers of C3 Framework, reviewed the current SD Standards, and discussed how the framework and the current SD Standards could inform our next draft of the SD State SS Standards. We also decided on a format to begin with for how we would incorporate standards and outcomes using the C3 Framework.

In July, our task began to get more difficult. We now had to begin the writing stage. The process was the following:

- 1) Start with the current SD Standard and bring that into the new format
- 2) Compare the current SD Standard to the last version of the National Standards for that content area (Geography, Government/Civics, etc.) from 2010.
- 3) Teachers then began to look at the skills of the standards, the appropriateness of them compared to each other, compared to the grade level, and compared to the course SD typically has for that content. Revision occurred writing a new standard for SD students.
- 4) The next task was to look at the C3 Framework, Dimension 2. This is where the framework discusses skills specifically for content areas. The teachers had to decide if the skill was something that needed to be embedded in the standard because it was a skill needed to gain over the course of that content area and grade level—or—if it was an outcome, a way for students to demonstrate understanding of the standard.
- 5) Lastly, teachers went through the C3 Framework, Dimensions 1, 3, and 4. These are the skills that ensure that students will be college and career ready and are skills that are aligned with the Common Core State Standards. This was a more difficult task because it was hard determine where asking questions or where arguing from a source best and most naturally fit a standard. However, the teachers worked through the process and found places where the skills matched a SD Social Studies Standard.

One challenge for teachers working from the past SD SS Standards document was the understanding of common standards language. The 2007 draft had Indicators, Standards, Benchmarks, Examples, etc. In reviewing other states' standards, the 2010 National Standards of the content areas, as well as vocabulary glossaries of education, teachers realized that on the SD Standards document, Indicators were actually the standards, Standards were actually outcomes (and sometimes needed to be a stand-alone standard), and that examples should not be in a standards document—these are curriculum items and should be on a separate document.

What was amazing was the passion the workgroup has for Social Studies, for wanting to create a document they are proud of, and for wanting to create a document that teachers across the state will embrace. What we realized is that this work is especially challenging for Social Studies because of the fact that this group is having to create from many sources; they also realized the importance of using all the sources and that they were willing to work through frustrations and challenges in order to have success. Sam Shaw asked the group if they would be willing to work 2 more days: would that be beneficial, would that allow us to really discuss the content and standards, would it give us the time needed to really look at the vertical alignment piece? Resoundingly the group said that 2 extra days would be incredibly helpful. The group will meet July 28-29 and again Aug. 4-5.

The ah-ha's the group shared was how wonderful the collaboration was, the expertise that each person brought to the table, and the decisions they all were able to make. The draft they created thus far is something they are all proud of. They printed copies and started the vertical alignment discussions between grade levels.

Fine Arts Revision Update: Dan Henry's report

Fine Arts Standards Revisions Day 3 and 4

We began Day 3 of Fine Arts Standards Revisions with the 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.

We then began a quick team building activity. I wanted to set the stage for the group. I chose this because of the intensity present during some of the discussions in our first meeting. I also wanted to set the stage for logical and validating exchanges as opposed to irrational and emotional ones. In retrospect this was an effective activity as we were able to stay focused throughout the day on the task at hand with minimal disruptions.

From that point we moved into some survey materials which analyzed and parsed the exact structure and features of effective standards. We discussed these elements amongst our tables and eventually shared out common themes and ideas with the entire group.

After that activity we 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 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 our 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 current South Dakota art standard document.

K-12 Technology Revision Update: Sherry Crofut's report

Technology Standards Revisions Day 3 and 4

We began Day 3 of Technology Standards Revisions with the SD DOE behavioral norms and expectations. I reminded them that we are passionate people and with that we will sometimes disagree. They are allowed to disagree, but not be disagreeable!

We then began a quick team building activity. I wanted to remind them there is more than one “right” way to accomplish the task at hand. They were required to problem solve an issue in paired groups. Between this and the norms, we set the stage for a fairly frictionless day.

We went back to our livebinder and discussed the crosswalk we had done between the previous SD technology standards and the current ISTE ones.

We broke into grade band groups and they set to work on rewriting the standards. There was natural conversation between groups as to what level skills belonged at. This group was so focused on this task, it was difficult to even get them to take a break. During this time, one of our members created a new

Google Doc that more closely followed what we are thinking the final product will be and shared copies with each of the groups. They worked hard on this task through 6 PM.

Day 4 started with a warm-up activity focused on vocabulary and the glossary they were discussing for the appendix of the standards. They went back to work on the task from the night before, adding in a skills progression from grade to grade.

After lunch, we traded standards with another group to get feedback on the new ones. We also discussed some things they felt were either missing or not covered deeply enough in the current standards. Discussion ensued as to where these things should be placed.

They are going to continue looking at the newly written standards in the month until we meet again, writing out feedback to share in August. They are also working on the glossary and the introduction.

I feel we are on track to finish this work in the days we have remaining.