Name	City	Which group do you represent?	Public Comment
Shana Ward	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator	Equations and Inequalities 8.A.1 Give examples of linear equations in one variable with one solution, infinitely many solutions, or no solution. Maybe reword "give examples"..... to IDENTIFY or make it like 8.A.6 KNOW THAT... : 8.A.6 Know that a system of two linear equations can have one solution, infinitely many solutions, or no solution. Will they actually have to "give examples" .... make up there own equations on an assessment? Or will they just identify equations that are of one solution, no solution, infinite solutions.
Karla Dieterle	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	A2.QF.1 Solve quadratic equations with complex number solutions. I have issues with this standard. Why are we only focusing only complex numbers (imaginary numbers)? Shouldn't we also solve quadratics involve in real life. I know you have it in Algebra 1 but I have been teaching for 19 years and I can tell you the students still need to learn how to solve quadratics with real numbers as it is on ACT test and college entrance exams. If they only see it in Algebra 1 you are setting the students up for failure. Are you guys even thinking about the students?
Karla Dieterle	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	I noticed there is no 4th year math section. What about the schools that offer 4th year classes to prepare students for college? Why again are you setting the students up for failure by not preparing them for college? You need to think about all students not just the ones not going to college. We have always had 4th year math standards, why all of a sudden are you not looking at 4th year math standards. You never addressed that in your changes.
Sharon Vestal	Brookings	Higher Education Professional	I noticed that the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practice were completely removed from the proposed math standards. These are a roadmap for high-quality math instruction, so it upsets me that these were removed. In the list of changes, it says that they are woven throughout the standards, but I don't really see that. Would the board consider adding in some practice standards? The recently adopted Computer Science standards have practices listed, and the Science standards list science and engineering practices. It would be beneficial for some best practices to be included in the proposed math standards.
Kevin Smith	Brookings	Higher Education Professional	My main concern is not having the Standards for Mathematical Practice listed. I worked with preservice teachers and the MP standards are a critical part of learning to be a good math teacher. They serve as a reminder for the habits that we should be working to instill in our students across all grade levels. I like that you've thought about how to embed them in the content standards, but I think you should also have them listed separately with an explanation about what they are.
Cindy Kroon	Hartford	K-12 Math Educator, Grandparent	I am concerned about the impact of the changes on school curriculum. Publishers write for large markets, and concentrate on covering the Common Core standards because that is their largest market. The current SD standards were originally adopted and updated with this in mind. Where will we find curriculum that matches the new standards? The SD market is much too small for any publisher to be interested in writing to our custom standards. If adopted, these standards will require SD teachers to basically write their own textbooks adapted to these non-standard standards. SD teachers do not have time to do such extensive curriculum adaptation and supplementation in addition to their already heavy workloads.
Jessica Klimisch	Vermillion	Higher Education Professional, K-8 Math Preservice Teachers Instructor	Standard 2.N.3 includes two separate skills - being able to count by 2s to 50 AND identifying whether the number is odd or even. It may be beneficial to separate these into two separate standards.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Shana Ward	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator	8.A.3 Analyze and solve one-variable linear inequalities with rational coefficients. This standard is new to 8th grade. Concern: text books that have been adopted do not have this standard aligned with 8th grade and do not include it. It is a high school standard for Algebra 1. Why add a standard? It is already difficult enough to cover all the standards. 8.A.4 Understand a system of linear equations to be a set of two or more equations. 8.A.5 Know that the solution to a system of two linear equations is an ordered pair that makes both the equations true. 8.A.6 Know that a system of two linear equations can have one solution, infinitely many solutions, or no solution. 8.A.7 Solve real-world and mathematical problems involving leading to two linear equations in one and/or two variables. Are 8th graders not required to solve a system of linear equations? But only to look at a system and understand if there is one, none, or infinite solutions from a graph or from equations?
Kelly Coates	Rapid City/Box El(	K-12 Math Educator	Positives: More concise and LOVE that the HS standards are more in line with traditional classes as opposed to the more varied old set (building functions, seeing structure, ect.) Dislike: Trying to integrate the mathematical practices was only partially successful. The previous format of those was very clear, much to students' benefit in my opinion. I think we lose something worthwhile by cutting/changing those mathematical practices. Other notes: I know there was a lot of public backlash over the Common Core standards of two rounds of updates ago. I understand partially drifting from those for the sake of public sentiment, but going to a SD exclusive set of standards also makes it more difficult to find curriculum materials from national publishers in direct line with SD standards. We are still mostly in line with national traditions, but it seems unlikely that many publishers will create materials directly in line with our new standards. That creates more work for cross referencing/supplementing for busy teachers. Not sure what I would propose as a fix for that, but thought it was of note.
Nicole Swanson	Brookings	K-12 Math Educator, Student	The 7th grade mathematical standards are missing a lot in the algebra section. I am concerned by the lack of standards on solving equations. Where did these go? Students need to have a grasp of how to solve equations if they are going to move onto the algebra standards that are given them in the 8th grade content. Also do 7th graders need to be able to solve equations from word problems or why isn't this included in the standards. Overall, I missed some of the examples and clarifications that the old standards have. The new ones are shorter to read but not as clear due to this.
Michael Amolins	Harrisburg	K-12 Administrator, K-12 Retired Teacher	A quick guide to major instructional shifts would be extremely helpful for teachers as they review the proposed math standards. For example, shifting matrices into Algebra 2 when previously taught in "4th year math" at the high school level, the addition of measurement standards in middle school, etc. With respect to specific commentary at this time -- there is no mention of long division in the standards until Algebra 2 (Standard A2.PR.11), where the standard states that a student should use long division to divide polynomials. It seems appropriate that students in upper elementary and middle school would first be required to learn long division at a foundational level prior to application in a complex calculation such as this.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Shaun Groen	Sioux Falls	K-12 Math Educator	7.G.1, 7.G.2, & 7.G.3 Circles have 3 standards now (originally only 1) - SA, V now only have 1 - Should a more detailed concept have more areas of measure? 7.A.1 is the exact same as 6.A.10 - usually they change from grade to grade 7.A.4 is the exact same as 6.A.11 - usually they change from grade to grade 7.A.3 nothing about solving 2 step (or multistep) equations in 7th grade 7.G.6 & 7.RP.3 removed the word equation from the standard (in multiple examples) 7.SP.1 box plots were only in 6th and Alg 1 and labeling quartiles and outliers is new to 7th grade 7.G.3 there are two of these, the numbering is off 7.SP.5 there is a type of medium when should say median 7.SP The new SP seems simpler to understand b/c more broken down. 7.A.3 used the word "create" where everything else is write 7.NS.A.2 (old standard reference) In the new standards, 7.A.2, does not use the words distributive property or combine like terms now, but they do in 6th and 8th grade. Describe, calculate, identify (academic language) is missing in current and more prevalent in new standards.
Stephanie Higdon	Rapid City	Concerned citizen/facilitator of K-12 STEM professional learning	I am concerned about many of the standards that have been proposed and the representation of the state of South Dakota in the development of these standards. In the past review over 40 school districts/community members/and/or professional entities were represented, including four high education institutions, and special education teachers. Additionally educators reviewed one grade level standard, in which they taught, or were considered an expert. In this review process there were 18 school districts/and/or professional entities (there are no community members listed, only one higher education institution and no special education teachers). In this recent review process, it is my understanding that educators reviewed grade level bands (K-2, 3-5, 6-8 and high school) in a very short time frame. The Department of Education website indicates there are 217 schools/districts in South Dakota, to include public, private, Tribal and SD special schools. Limiting the number of voices at the table to review these standards only limits opportunities for ALL students in South Dakota to become learners and doers of mathematics. I have talked to several educators who applied to be on this review board. They were told a small advisory board would give comments to the the standards, and be made aware when the standards would be reviewed. This did not happen. Not only were these educators also not made aware when the standards were reviewed, they were also only made aware the proposed standards were completed through a mass communication from the DOE one week after they were posted. To best serve all students in South Dakota, I recommend, that as changes and edits are made to the proposed standards throughout the hearings, more voices are invited to table. Discussions regarding these changes need to include those teaching in a variety of schools and who teach multiple levels of mathematics throughout South Dakota. Additionally more time needs to be provided to ensure the best changes are made for the students to learn mathematics at a deep level. Another recommendation would be to pause this process, and take the time to reevaluate the Department of Education practice to have small, select advisory boards review multiple grade level standards, in a very small amount of time, that impact all of the teachers and students across our state.
Stephanie Higdon	Rapid City	Concerned citizen/Facilitator of K-12 STEM professional learning	I am concerned about the vertical alignment of standards from kindergarten through high school. In the 2017 adopted standards a standard with the numbering system K.G.A.1 or 8.G.A.1 the "G" indicates the same domain, Geometry. This is true kindergarten through high school. In the proposed standards the standard named K.A.1 in kindergarten indicates Arithmetic, whereas in grades 6-12 the "A" in 6.A.1 now indicates Algebra. The same is true for Fractions in grades 2-5 and Functions in grade 8 - high school. Additionally, I wonder why function types have been provided with their own domain, Linear, Exponential and Quadratic. All functions can be interpreted and evaluated similarly. Separating functions into types is disjointed, also taking away previous learning progressions. Vertical alignment of the standards from kindergarten through the high school is important for both teachers and students, so that they can see mathematical progression. Changing these letters causes for confusion and a break in progression.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Melanie Jacobson	Aberdeen	K-12 Math Educator, Higher Education Professional, Parent/Guardian	Good day! I teach high school and college level mathematics in South Dakota and have three children of my own in elementary school and younger. I write to you today with suggestions regarding the measurement and geometry domains of the proposed math standards for grades K-2: K.M.1 Students should not necessarily have to look at an object to describe its measurable traits (think of houses, buildings, and structures out of sight). Perhaps phrasing this standard as "Describe measurable traits of an object such as length, weight, or size." would be more direct. K.M.4 and K.M.5 These standards use "know" as the verb and seem vague/difficult to assess. It seems that kindergarten students are not expected to tell time (because that standard appears in later grades), but this standard begins with "knowing" about a clock. Perhaps these could be re-written to indicate that students can "Identify a clock as a tool that measures time of day," and "Identify a calendar as a tool that organizes days, weeks, months, and years," or "Identify a calendar as a tool that records days, weeks, months, and years." K.G.3 The phrase "in a variety of orientations" should not be parenthetical. Re-write this standard as "Identify and draw two-dimensional shapes (circles, triangles, squares, rectangles, rhombuses, and trapezoids) in a variety of orientations." 1.M.2 This standard would be more clear and concise if it used the word "length." Re-write this standard as "Measure length of an object by lining up same-size units with no gaps or overlaps and counting the number of units." 1.G.1 This standard was more clear in the previous standards. "Distinguish" is a more measurable verb than "understand," and examples of defining and non-defining attributes are helpful. Re-write this standard as "Distinguish between defining attributes (such as triangles are three-sided) and non-defining attributes (such as color, orientation, or size)." 1.G.3 This standard needs to define which regular and irregular two-dimensional shapes are appropriate for this grade. In mathematics, a regular pentagon is different than an irregular pentagon, but I sense this is not the intent of the standard in grade 1. Perhaps phrasing this standard as "Compose and identify two-dimensional shapes including triangles, squares, rectangles, rhombuses, trapezoids, circles, half-circles, and quarter-circles" would be more precise. 1.G.4 This standard needs to be re-written or eliminated. As a high school geometry teacher, I don't know why students in grade 1 need a standard that is specific to the description of a trapezoid and not other two-dimensional shapes such as rectangles. If South Dakota keeps this standard, then please use the correct terminology and define a trapezoid as having four sides with one pair of parallel sides. "Sides that go in the same direction" does not mean parallel. "Sides that go in the same direction" could be taken to mean lines that would eventually meet at a common point. If students are not ready to learn about parallel sides, then please eliminate this standard. 1.G.5 This standard could use a better verb than "understand." Perhaps we want students in grade 1 to be able to "Identify right rectangular prisms (three-dimensional solids with rectangular faces)." 1.G.6 This standard should read, "Partition circles and rectangles into two and four equal parts and describe the parts using the words halves and fourths." 2.G.1 This standard is too generic. I do not know what students can do after reading the text of this standard, nor how I would assess if a student has met the standard. Perhaps phrasing this standard as "Recognize, identify, and describe attributes (such as number of angles and number of sides) of polygons including triangles, quadrilaterals, pentagons, hexagons, and octagons." 2.G.2 This standard has some redundancy. It could be more clear and concise if it was written as, "Describe the differences between quadrilaterals (including squares, rectangles, rhombuses, and trapezoids) using attributes (such as congruent sides, parallel sides, and right angles)." 2.G.3 This is a duplicate of standard 1.G.3 except 1.G.3 expects students in grade 1 to "compose and identify" while students in grade 2 are only expected to "identify." See my comments on 1.G.3 and then determine which grade level is most appropriate for this standard. 2.M.3 This standard needs to be revised so that it is consistent and coordinates with the other measurement standards 2.M.2, 2.M.5, and 2.M.6. 2.M.3 should be re-written to include units of measure instead of tools. 2.M.3 should state, "Measure the length of objects using inches, feet, and yards." Please consider my suggestions and revise these proposed standards before approving them. Thank you for your consideration of my ideas and your work on this project.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Erin Lehmann	Rapid City	Higher Education Professional, Parent/Guardian, Consultant	I have significant concerns about the current draft and its potential impact on teaching and learning in our state. The proposed standards eliminate explicit references to the Standards for Mathematical Practice, claiming they are "embedded." Yet nowhere in the document are practices such as perseverance in solving problems, constructing arguments, critiquing reasoning, or attending to precision identified or described. These practices are essential to developing mathematical thinking, not optional add-ons. Removing them reduces mathematics to procedural tasks rather than conceptual understanding and problem solving. If they are truly embedded, they should be clearly visible and referenced, not implied. Many of the standards rely primarily on procedural verbs like "solve," "add," "identify," or "compare," with no expectation for students to explain, justify, model, reason, or communicate mathematical ideas. This lowers instructional expectations and encourages shallow learning. Rigor requires a balance of procedural fluency, conceptual understanding, and application; a balance missing from the current draft. Key ideas (like fractions, ratio reasoning, functions) are fragmented or mis-sequenced. This contradicts research on learning progressions critical to math understanding. Also, many standards are so broad they cannot be assessed. For example, "Add and subtract fractions" – but no conditions, no complexity, no expectations. When compared to the previous standards, "Add and subtract fractions with unlike denominators by replacing given fractions with equivalent fractions…" This gives clarity and rigor. By doing this, SD wording lowers expectations statewide. Where is the cognitive rigor? These standards lack verbs and expectations of conceptual understanding. There are only "do-level" verbs. This will promote rote learning and reduce math to procedural skills. Big ideas are not referenced: equality as balance, structure of number systems,and function relationships. Without explicit connections, learning stays isolated and superficial. All of this will make it nearly impossible for school districts to adopt curriculum because publishers do not align to these stripped-down standards. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Board revise the standards to restore cognitive rigor, algin with best practices and research from NCTM, NCSM, NAEP, and ACT to prepare South Dakota students for future success. South Dakota students deserve mathematics standards that prepare them to think, reason, and thrive, not just compute.
Michelle Azar	Huron	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	I believe that 5.A.4 - 5.A.7 should be "to the thousandths place" not "to the hundredths place" for adding, subtracting, multiplying, and dividing. I make it a big deal how they get to have the awesome responsibility of knowing one new place in 5th grade for standard form, word form, and expanded form as well as for ordering and comparing, so it seems anticlimactic to only have to operate to the hundredths place.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Melanie Jacobson	Aberdeen	K-12 Math Educator, Higher Education Professional, Parent/Guardian	Good day! I teach high school and college level mathematics in South Dakota and have three children of my own in elementary school and younger. I write to you today with suggestions regarding the measurement and geometry domains of the proposed math standards for grades 3-5: As a matter of consistency and to help with vertical alignment, I notice the Grade 3 standards on area and perimeter (3.M.1 – 3.M.10) are listed in the measurement domain whereas the comparable Grade 5 standards on volume are listed in the geometry domain (5.G.1 – 5.G.8). I feel proposed standards 3.M.1 – 3.M.10 would be more accurately classified as Geometry standards instead of Measurement standards. It would help with vertical alignment to consistently place these area, perimeter and volume standards in the same domain, regardless of grade level. 3.M.4 Remove the word "lengths" from this standard. Units of length are one-dimensional such as cm, inches, feet, and meters. Units of area are two-dimensional such as square cm, square inches, square feet, and square meters. Standard 3.M.4 should read, "Measure areas in square units," and length should not be used as a description of units of area. 3.M.5 It seems this standard was shortened for clarity, but to me some of the meaning was lost. What corresponding operation is this standard referring to? This standard could be re-written to directly refer to the corresponding operation as multiplication like this: "Find the area of rectangles by tiling and relate area to the multiplication of side lengths." 4.M.1 This standard has an unusual use of the word "from." Perhaps it would be more clear to say, "Measure length, weight, mass, and capacity using U.S. customary and metric systems of measurement." 4.G.1 and 4.G.2 are both about the measurement of angles and in my opinion could be more clearly separated into measurement and classification. For instance, 4.G.1 could focus on angle measurement by stating, "Measure angles in degrees using a protractor and understand a degree as 1/360 of a circle." Then 4.G.2. could focus on angle classification by stating, "Classify angles as right, acute, obtuse, or straight. Draw right, acute, obtuse, and straight angles." 4.G.3 Remove the word "angles" from this standard. Angles cannot be equilateral or scalene. These classifications are reserved for triangles. This standard could be written as: "Identify, describe, and draw equilateral, isosceles, scalene, right, acute, and obtuse triangles." This standard would fit in better if it was re-numbered to be near standard 4.G.8 in the "shapes" category. 4.G.5 This standard is well written, although perhaps it should be listed first, before the angle measurement standard. It would make more sense to me to have 4.G.1 define an angle, then 4.G.2 measure an angle, and finally 4.G.3 classify an angle. 5.G.2 This standard needs the variable n as it was written in the previous standards. This standard should read, "Understand an object has a volume of n cubic units if it can be filled with n unit cubes without gaps or overlaps." 5.G.4 is a generic category standard and 5.G.5 – 5.G.8 are sub-standards that fall under the category of relating volume to operations of multiplication and addition. Because 5.G.5 – 5.G.8 are the specific ways we expect students to relate volume to operations of multiplication and addition, I suggest omitting 5.G.4. It is redundant and achieved by the other standards. The first 5.G.11 is a duplicate of 4.G.3 and is better written than 4.G.3. I have suggestions for improving 4.G.3 above, although upon reflection I believe it may be better to omit 4.G.3 entirely and leave this standard to Grade 5. That way, students develop the concept of angle classification in Grade 4 and review angle classification as they learn to classify triangles by angle measure in Grade 5. There are two standards numbered 5.G.11. 5.G.14 This standard has a typo. In both instances, the standard needs to refer to "an ordered pair" instead of "the order pair." The correct terminology is "ordered pair." Please consider my suggestions and revise these proposed standards before approving them. Thank you for your consideration of my ideas and your work on this project.
Becky Larson	Mitchell	K-12 Math Educator	After reading through the proposed standards, I like the changes. I especially like the simplicity and directness of the language. The standards written this way make sense to me, which will assist in having a better understanding of what is expected in my teaching and in my students' learning.
Kenedy Koepsell	Mitchell	K-12 Math Educator	As a first year teacher I do not have much input on these changes. I have only worked with the original standards for a few weeks, so I do not have much to reference as of now. I did look through the 7th grade standards changes since that is what I currently teach and I think the changes align well and are effective as compared to some of the old standards. Thank you!
lee white	mitchell	K-12 Math Educator	Look good to me.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Jennifer Weber	Yankton	Higher Education Professional	It seems to me the loss of the standards for mathematical practice contribute to the fact that the lack of precision of language could be a problem. For example, "numbers within ten" or "go the same direction (parallel)" are not precise and while it might give a language for teachers to use when communicating with parents, I don't believe it captures the absolutes and truth that math should provide.
Sharon Vestal	Brookings	President, South Dakota Council of Teachers of Mathematics	With the huge amount of data that is generated all the time in all areas of our lives, I feel like there needs to be more included in the domain(s) of Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability. Some of the data standards are still in K - 5, but they are under Measurement and I think that Data Analysis and Statistics deserves its own domain. This is particularly important as we prepare our students for future careers, some of which don't even exist yet. Here is a recent article about the importance of Data Literacy in high school, https://www.the74million.org/article/is-calculus-overrated-some-reasons-to-rethink-how-schools-offer-advanced-math/ and here is a link to statistics standards guidelines from the American Statistical Association, https://www.amstat.org/education/guidelines-for-assessment-and-instruction-in-statistics-education-(gaise)-reports. Some of this information should be included in the new standards.
Sharon Vestal	Brookings	President, SDCTM	In the proposed standards you say that they are vertically aligned, but the domains are confusing. For example, in grades K - 5, A represents Arithmetic, but in grades 6 - 8, A represents Algebra, and there is no A in grades 9 - 12, where there are two algebra classes. In grades K - 5, F stands for Fractions, but in 6 - 8 and 9 - 12 F stands for functions. Why can't we just keep the same domains that we had previously. There are so many domains in 9 - 12 and it is confusing.
Keri Tisher	Watertown	K-12 Math Educator	I am a first grade teacher and I appreciate the change in standards to make them easier to understand. I have looked through the proposed standards and I am comfortable with all of the standards that are proposed with the exception of two.

1.A.5 Add a two digit and one digit number (with or without regrouping) using multiple strategies that reflect an understanding of place value.

1.A.6 Subtract a two digit and one digit number (with or without borrowing) using multiple strategies that reflect an understanding of place value.

We have been introducing regrouping and borrowing at the end of first grade which I think is beneficial and good to introduce to first graders. However, having regrouping and borrowing as part of the standard it requires that all my first graders can master these skills. I do not feel that developmentally an average first grader is ready to master this skill. My higher level students may be able to do this but not all my first graders. |
| Megan | Box Elder | Instructional coach | -What happened to the "by memory within 20" standard in mathematical fluency in 2nd grade 2.M.4? We want to keep vertical alignment coordinated as K and 1st have solid pre-requisites. We'd like to keep within 20 with automaticity (memory) there in 2nd grade.
-Check the standards about 2.N.5 and 2.N.6 -should it state to 1,000 vs. to 100 per our current mathematical standards and proposed includes 1st grade to 100. |
| Kate DeVelder | Box Elder | K-12 Math Educator | --What happened to the "by memory within 20" standard in mathematical fluency?
--should 2.N.6 say within 1000, as currently the first grade standard that is similar says to 100, if the 1st grade standard says to 100 to be vertically aligned 2nd grade should be to 1000 |
| Meggie Bennett | Box Elder | K-12 Math Educator | What happened t the "by memory within 20" standard in mathematical fluency standards that spiral from K-2?
Check 2.N.6 should it say to 1,000 not 100? |
| Courtney | Box Elder | K-12 Math Educator | What happened to the "by memory within 20" standard in mathematical fluency? We would like it added back in as 1st grade has a standard of memory within 10. This would help with vertical alignment. Also, is 2.N.5 supposed to be within 1000? It is currently written within 100, but 1st grade's standard is within 100, so it would make sense vertically for 2nd grade to work within 1,000. |

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Melanie Jacobson	Aberdeen	K-12 Math Educator, Higher Education Professional, Parent/Guardian	Hello again! I teach high school and college level mathematics in South Dakota and have three children of my own in elementary school and younger. I write to you today with suggestions regarding the geometry and statistics and probability domains of the proposed math standards for grades 6-8: 6.G.2 needs to be corrected. The word "tiling" should be changed to "filling" or "packing." This standard is for finding volume, and volume is three-dimensional. The proposed standard erroneously uses the word "tiling" which describes two-dimensional area. 6.SP.1 and 6.SP.2 are too generic to be helpful. Standard 6.SP.1 is a definition of statistics. Do we really need a standard for the definition of statistics? Standard 6.SP.2 would be clearer if it used "data sets" instead of just "data." 6.SP.8 seems strange to me. I wonder why students need to pick one measure of variation as "more appropriate" than another. Both range and IQR can contribute to a more complete understanding of the variation in a data set, so I don't feel students need to pick one as better than the other. Instead, they should understand the advantages and disadvantages of each measure of variation. I also dislike the use of the word "shape" in this standard. Perhaps it would be clearer to say, "shape of the data distribution." The 7th Grade Geometry standards are mis-numbered with two standards listed as 7.G.3. 8.G.9 The "(proportional)" parenthetical seems out of place. Similar figures have proportional side lengths, so it seems that is referring to the part of the standard that describes "different sizes." Regardless, perhaps this standard could be rewritten with more precise language that describes similar figures as having congruent angle measures and proportional side lengths. Please consider my suggestions and revise these proposed standards before approving them. Thank you for your consideration of my ideas and your work on this project.
Allison Schmitz	Aberdeen	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	Standard 1.G.4 changes the definition of trapezoid to "at least" 1 parallel side instead of our current definition of "exactly." I understand that both definitions are widely used, but this is a major change and will change how middle and high school teachers teach quadrilateral properties and proofs. Additionally, in our current standards, it isn't taught until 5th grade. Why the 4 year difference?
Allison Schmitz	Aberdeen	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	These new standards are being labled as helping parents help kids with math. Supposedly we are "bringing back the standard algorithms." They were never taken away! Current standard 4.NBT.4 says students will be able to fluently add, subtract, and multiply using the standard algorithm. Division with different strategies is mentioned in 5th grades, but by seventh grade there is no question that students are expected to use long division (6.NS.1 "standard algorithm" AND 7.NS.2 "long division") However, the proposed standards do not mention the standard algorithms even once. A document search shows that the words "algorthm" or "long division" never show up in the document. If the new standards bring back the standard algorithms why does it only ever say "various methods?" Where is the list of methods teachers are required to teach? If it isn't in the standards, it isn't required!
Allison Schmitz	Aberdeen	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	Our current standards have a list of helpful terms on the summary for each grade level. If we are working on defining fluency for each grade level, I would like to see a list of terms and/or notation that each grade level should be able to use fluently. I understand why we want to simplify the language of the standards, but the language of math isn't going to change. The new SS standards have standards that state a list of items students should be able to map and a list of people/events/etc. That students should know. I would like something similar for math For example 4.G.1-3 and 5-8 4.A.10, 4.F.11, 4.M.1 are all about terms that 4th graders should be able to define. A similar list could be made for formulas, properties, and/or algorithms that should be memorized. If we are trying to make standards that are easier to understand, I think having a list of these things instead of multiple standards would make implementing much easier. After the standards are adopted, a supplement could be made with the official definitions similar to what the Virginia DOE has avaliable https://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching-learning-assessment/k-12-standards-instruction/mathematics/instructional-resources/mathematics-vocabulary-word-wall-cards

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Allison Schmitz	Aberdeen	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	There seems to be some content/rigor missing in the new standards: Comparing new 8.F.2 comparing proportional relationships to current 8.F.2 comparing two functions- we are no longer going to compare anything other than proportional relationships. Comparing new 8.F.9 understand a line to have the equation y=mx+b to current 8.F.3 defining y=mx+b AND 8.F.4 construct a function- we are no longer asking 8th graders to write equations for lines. Also a change in wording was made that made functions less clear instead of more clear. Comparing new 8.F.4 functions are an EQUATION OR RULE to current 8.F.4 functions are a RULE- why did we add the word equation? Students have a hard enough time understanding that relations don't have to have equations to be functions. It should say "Functions are a RELATION where each input has exactly one output" as that is the official definition.
Allison Schmitz	Aberdeen	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	I don't understand the new naming system and why it's better than the old system. It seems the same to me other than we changed all the letters. 8.A.1 is 8th grade Algebra in both. I see that we regrouped things, so new letters were needed, but I'm not sure how to do any vertical alignment because the grade levels change domains. For example- algebra 1 has EF for exponential functions but Algebra 2 has EL because it includes logarithms. It should still vertically align though so why cant we call it EL for both? Same with RT and TG- trig is trig. Why is there no MF for middle school? Do we not have anything to be fluent in? In elementary, there are data standards but they are under M- measurement. Shouldn't we have SP in elementary for data? Even if we aren't teaching full statistics and probability those are what the data standards align with.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Sharon Vestal	Brookings	South Dakota Council of Teachers of Mathematics	The following current standards seem to be missing from the proposed high school geometry standards or modified so they are not as rigorous. Many of these focused on proofs, which is essential in building critical thinkers. "G.CO.3: Given a rectangle, parallelogram, trapezoid, or regular polygon, describe the rotations and/or reflections that map the figure onto itself." "G.CO.C.10: Prove theorems about triangles." Proposed standards just say "apply theorems about triangles" and left out the word prove. "G.CO.C.11: Prove theorems about parallelograms." Proposed standards say "apply theorems about quadrilaterals." "G.CO.D.13: Construct an equilateral triangle, a square, and a regular hexagon." "G.SRT.A: Understand similarity in terms of similarity transformations. 1.Verify experimentally and apply the properties of dilations as determined by a center and scale factor. 3.Use the properties of similarity transformations to establish similarity theorems. Theorems must include AA, SAS, and SSS." "G.SRT.B.4: Prove theorems about triangles involving similarity. Theorems must include but not limited to: a line parallel to one side of a triangle divides the other two proportionally, and its converse; the Pythagorean Theorem proved using triangle similarity." "G.GPE.A.1: Derive the equation of a circle of given center and radius using the Pythagorean Theorem; complete the square to find the center and radius of a circle given by an equation." "G.GPE.B.4: Use coordinates to prove geometric relationships algebraically. For example, determine whether a figure defined by four given points in the coordinate plane is a rectangle;…" "G.GMD.A.1: Give an informal argument for the formulas for the volume of a cylinder, pyramid, sphere, and cone. Use dissection arguments, and informal limit arguments." "S.CP.A.4: Construct and interpret two-way frequency tables of data. Use the two-way table as a sample space to decide if events are independent and to approximate conditional probabilities…" "S.CP.A.5: Recognize and explain the concepts of conditional probability and independence in everyday language and situations."

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Kevin Smith	Brookings	Higher Education Professional	I did a deep dive analysis of 4th grade using ChatGPT. You might want to utilize AI to help do some of the analysis as well. It uncovered some important things to consider. Here are a few things to look at: Depth vs Breadth If the proposed standards include every topic under measurement, geometry, data, arithmetic, fractions, decimals, etc., there is a risk of breadth overwhelming depth (i.e., many topics but less time per topic). This doesn't necessarily mean they are misaligned, but they may not reflect the "fewer, deeper" guiding idea fully. Conceptual Understanding Some of the proposed standards use simplified language which may reduce explicit mention of estimating, understanding why algorithms work, or exploring multiple representations. If key phrases like "explain why" or "make sense of" are missing, the conceptual depth could lag. - Using simplified language is fine if it is mathematically correct. - I want to make sure we're emphasizing conceptual understanding in addition to procedural fluency. - Let's be careful not to add more standards because things need to be "covered". Students need depth on topics to truly retain the info and be able to apply it in other situations.
Stephanie Lettau	Sioux Falls	K-12 Math Educator	First off, I am very disappointed in the standards committee. I'm not sure why we chose to go with a smaller standards writing committee that did not include any of the teachers from the bigger east side schools. I know it was certainly not for a lack of applicants. It is alarming that there were only three high school math teachers, and we don't even know what content areas they teach. In regards to the standards, they lack rigor. I do not feel these standards are any more challenging than our current ones. Additionally, in an attempt to clarify standards, they just became less clear. There is additionally wording that does not add to the standard such as Geometry standards G.RT.3. Also, we took what was one standard and made it into 5+ (see Geometry standards G.GF.1 through G.GF.7). If we are truly trying to improve our standards because we think our students need to be doing better, then let's make sure our standards reflect that. These standards do not scream excellence. They read mediocre and "good enough." Arkansas has test scores that are decreasing yearly...I'm not sure why that should make us adopt their standards. We have exceptional educators in the state of South Dakota, and we should use them. Incorporate more people than just those who won't push back or will agree with whatever is said. If we truly want to improve the mathematical understanding of our students in the state, we have to make sure our standards support that. These standards are just another list.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Emily Harms	Sioux Falls	K-12 Math Educator	The proposed rewrite of the South Dakota math standards raises serious concerns about clarity, rigor, and preparation for higher-level math. One glaring issue is the inconsistent use of domain codes—such as "F" representing Fractions in K–5 but Functions in middle and high school—which makes cross-grade referencing and curriculum mapping confusing for teachers and districts. The draft also drastically reduces the document from roughly 91 pages to 43, consolidating many items under the guise of "streamlining," which leaves educators questioning which standards were removed or weakened. Additionally, the proposed rewrite reduces the contributors list from over two and a half pages to about half a page, with fewer than half representing actual classroom teachers. Feedback from high school teachers, particularly from the state's largest district, Sioux Falls, suggests the committee may not be representative of the majority of South Dakota educators, and the standards do not reflect the variety of courses taught or the needs of schools.

A major concern is the omission of 4th-year or advanced high school standards. The current standards explicitly include a 4th-year section with (+) standards for topics like limits, polar coordinates, conics, and permutations/combinations, as well as accelerated Precalculus content, providing essential preparation for STEM majors and Opportunity and Build Dakota scholarships. The proposed rewrite removes these entirely, leaving districts to handle advanced courses locally and offering no accelerated Precalculus standards, which constitutes a substantive loss of statewide guidance.

The draft overuses vague verbs such as understand and know, which reduces cognitive demand and clarity, making it difficult for teachers to design assessments that encourage critical thinking. For example, 8th-grade standard 8.G.1 says "Know the formulas for the volumes of cones, cylinders, and spheres and use them to solve real-world and mathematical problems," which implies memorization rather than conceptual understanding. Similarly, 7.G.2 states "Understand pi to be the proportional relationship between the circumference and diameter of a circle," instead of encouraging students to analyze and apply the proportional relationships of pi in problem solving. Overall, the proposed standards do not require students to think deeply or engage in higher-level reasoning.

Other issues include the removal of real-world applications in 6th-grade geometry, the loss of definitions for mathematical fluency, and the elimination of examples that help elementary teachers know exactly what to teach. Teachers have also flagged potential problems aligning textbooks and other instructional materials with the new structure, which could have both budgetary and classroom impacts. Without an unpacked standards document like the current version and a glossary of key terms to clarify vague language, implementation will likely be inconsistent and confusing. The 8 Mathematical Practices, which are critical for guiding instruction and developing student reasoning, are also missing from the draft.

Despite these concerns, some positive aspects of the proposed rewrite include the clearer naming of standards and improved organization, which makes the document easier to navigate. However, without restoring rigor, explicit examples, higher-order verbs, 4th-year and accelerated standards, and representative teacher input, the rewrite sacrifices clarity, coherence, and student learning opportunities for brevity, putting South Dakota students and teachers at a disadvantage. |

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Heidi Dykstra	Sioux Falls	K-12 Math Educator	As a high school teacher, I am concerned about the broad and fragmented approach to mathematics in the proposed standards. Mathematics is a beautiful and interconnected discipline, and students gain the most understanding when it is presented as a cohesive whole rather than in isolated, choppy sections. The proposed standards treat topics as basic, separate units, which misses the opportunity to show students the patterns, connections, and relationships that exist across different areas of math. This fragmented approach risks diminishing both student engagement and deeper conceptual understanding. I am also concerned about the lack of precise terminology and vocabulary in the proposed South Dakota mathematics standards. Clear and accurate mathematical language is essential for students to develop a deep understanding and to communicate their reasoning effectively. Without consistent use of correct terms, students may develop misconceptions or struggle to connect concepts across different areas of mathematics. The proposed standards also need to include clear expectations for a high school 4th course. All students should be held to high standards, and the current draft sends the message that advanced math in a fourth year of high school is unnecessary. Students are capable of meeting rigorous expectations, and it is our responsibility to prepare them fully for college and future careers. Including standards for the 4th course would ensure students have the opportunity to develop higher-level thinking, problem-solving skills, and a deeper understanding of mathematics before graduation. The proposed mathematics standards need to be re-written to present mathematics as a unified, coherent discipline rather than a series of choppy, disconnected topics. The writing committee should ensure that correct terminology and precise vocabulary are consistently used throughout—from kindergarten standards all the way through high school 4th course standards. In the current draft, the mathematical practice of communicating ideas using accurate language has been largely lost. It feels as though the standards were written to appease non-mathematical adults, which has resulted in many key concepts being underdeveloped or missing entirely.
Alison Bowers	Chamberlain	K-12 Non-Math Educator	As a science teacher, it is incredibly helpful that the SD Science Standards are "NGSS-alike." I can review curriculum, resources, and lesson plans from a variety of sources and know that they are aligned to my content area standards. This saves an enormous amount of time for teachers AND allows us to access free, high-quality resources that we may have to use to supplement existing curriculum or lack of curriculum. As the sole science teacher in a small district, this is critical for me. I am concerned that the proposed standards will be unique enough that schools will struggle to find curriculum and resources (which many schools are already struggling with re: the new social studies standards). I'm also concerned that many of these standards could use an "unpacking." Is the DOE going to bring together a workgroup to do such work? This is another super helpful resource that NGSS already has for our NGSS-alike science standards. Finally, I'm concerned that these standards focus on the use of mathematical algorithms, rather than developing students' actual number sense and mathematical reasoning. My students' base math skills impact their success in high school science classes.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Amy Schander	Yankton	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Guardian	So far, I have reviewed the Algebra I standards and have found multiple examples where changes in wording have made the standards difficult to understand and/or mathematically incorrect. Here are a couple of examples: #1 Current Standard: Identify the effect on the graph of f(x) (linear, exponential, quadratic) replaced with f(x) + k, kf(x), f(kx), and f(x + k) for specific values of k (both positive and negative); find the value of k given the graphs. Experiment with contrasting cases and illustrate an explanation of the effects on the graph using technology. Proposed: Graph and generalize the effect of transformations on linear, absolute value, and quadratic functions including stretches, compressions, vertical, and horizontal, with and without technology. The current standard clearly describes the depth to which transformations should be taught: vertical/horizontal translations, vertical/horizontal reflections, and vertical/horizontal stretches/compressions. The proposed standard ambiguously says "vertical and horizontal". I'm not sure what this means. Is it referring to stretches/compressions only since they are mentioned previously in the standards? I couldn't find another standard that mentions transformations. #2 Current Standard: Summarize categorical data for two categories in two-way frequency tables. Interpret relative frequencies in the context of the data (including joint, marginal, and conditional relative frequencies). Recognize possible associations and trends in the data. Proposed Summarize data from two categorical variables in a frequency table; interpret relative frequencies in the context of the data, recognizing data trends and associations. The proposed standard changes "two-way frequency tables" into "frequency table." A frequency table and a two-way frequency table are two different things. Two-way frequency tables are used for two categories, while frequency tables are used for one category. It is unclear if the proposed standard is trying to change this to "one categorical variable in a frequency table" or if it should be "two categorical variables in a two-way frequency table."

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Stephanie Higdon	Rapid City	concerned citizen	In previous comments and testimony it has been stated that there is a concern in the vertical alignment of the domains in the standards- and how a change in letters from Arithmetic to Algebra causes confusion, and loses the alignment between the standards from one grade to the next. I would like to argue that changing the letter system and keeping the standards as they are written will not rectify the loss of vertical alignment. For this comment, I would like to highlight the loss of alignment within algebraic thinking from K-12 in the proposed standards. In the current standards- as early as Kindergarten students are learning algebraic thinking and reasoning. On page 9 of the SD Math standards- there is a table that demonstrates three problem types that equate to algebra, result unknown, change unknown and start unknown. Additionally, this table provides clear examples of each- thinking at this level is not included in the proposed standards- rather students are expected to only represent addition and subtraction using an equation. There is no expectation for them to begin their algebraic understanding. This understanding misses the mark in the proposed 1st grade standards as well- taking out language about the location of the unknown. In the current standards it is stated clearly that students need to solve word problems with the unknown in "all positions" and represent this unknown in an equation using a symbol (3+x=10 OR x+3=10 OR 7+3=x), clearly demonstrating algebraic thinking. The proposed standards it is not stated that this unknown amount could be in more than one position. This language of the unknown amount in all positions continues into 2nd grade in the current standards, but is again missing in the proposed standards. I propose that mathematics algebraic reasoning and thinking begin in Kindergarten, to demonstrate that students make meaning of parts unknown in this early grade, and that this learning builds up through the middle grades and into high school. In the proposed standards this is lost. This is only one example of how the vertical alignment of learning math has been lost in the proposed standards.

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment

Dr. Kiki Nelsen	Sioux Falls	K-12 Math Educator, Higher Education Professional, HS Math Instructional Coach	Hello Council,
			As a High School Math Instructional Coach, I've reviewed the proposed math standards and compiled feedback from myself and other educators. Overall, our concerns fall into three main categories: the process used to develop the standards, the substance of the standards themselves (including clarity and rigor), and inconsistencies in the chosen organizational structure.
			Concerns Regarding the Development Process
			The process by which these standards were developed raises several significant questions that impact the perceived legitimacy and breadth of expertise involved:
			Limited Teacher Involvement: A core concern is the lack of broad teacher representation in the curriculum writing and review process. We must ask:
			   * Why were more practicing classroom teachers not involved in the initial conversation and drafting?
			   * How many qualified teachers applied but were not selected for the committee?
			Committee Demographics: Transparency regarding the makeup of the writing council is essential. We need to know the demographic breakdown of the individuals involved, including their geographic location (urban/rural), school size, and specific teaching area/grade level. A balanced representation is crucial for standards that must serve all students and districts in South Dakota.
			Source Selection Justification: Clarification is needed on the decision to examine specific states' standards and external organizations' work:
			   * What was the rationale for the specific groupings of standards that were considered?
			   * Given negative data regarding student outcomes, why were Arkansas's standards chosen for consideration?
			   * Is there any incentivization or non-objective reason for the inclusion of work by the Hillsdale professor's Archimedes group?
			Critiques on the Clarity and Substance of the Standards
			The proposed standards present significant issues related to rigor, clarity, and completeness:
			Lack of Clarity and Rigor in Language
			Decreased Mathematical Precision: Attempts to simplify language have, in many cases, decreased proper mathematical language, which will harm students' long-term academic growth. Examples include:
			   * Using non-academic terms like "unlike fractions" instead of "fractions with unlike denominators."
			   * Describing parallel lines as "lines going the same direction."
			   * We strongly recommend including a glossary of academic vocabulary within the document instead of removing essential terms.
			Overuse of "Understand": The term "understand" is vague and is often considered low on Bloom's Taxonomy. It does not clearly define what a student must do to demonstrate mastery.
			Recommendation: Standards should be written using action verbs that indicate application or demonstration of knowledge (e.g., "apply understanding by analyzing..." or "construct an argument to justify...").
			Incomplete Course Offerings
			Missing 4th-Year and Alternative Course Standards: Deleting 4th-year course standards (e.g., Pre-Calculus, Calculus, Statistics) is a significant oversight and, frankly, a cop-out. These courses are vital for college and career readiness. Ironically, most of the states' standards that were used in this revision have 4th year and even specific course standards beyond Algebra II themselves. The council should have added standards for alternative 3rd-year courses (like Technical Math or Quantitative Reasoning), similar to the models used by North Dakota and South Carolina. These courses are essential for students pursuing non-STEM or technical pathways.
			
			Inconsistency in Domain Coding
			
			A major structural issue that will cause confusion across grade bands is the inconsistency in domain codes used throughout the K-12 standards:
			
			|A| Arithmetic or Algebra depending on the grade band.
			|F| Fractions or Functions depending on the grade band.
			|PR| Proportional Relationships (MS), Polynomial, Rational, and Other Functions and Equations (HS)
			
			These shifts in meaning are confusing and will hinder curriculum alignment efforts between elementary, middle, and high school teachers. Codes should remain consistent across all grade levels to represent the same mathematical domain (e.g., a "F" code should consistently indicate either Fractions or Functions, but not both).
			
			Models for Consideration
			
			I recommend revisiting models like North Dakota and South Carolina for structural improvements:

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Keith Moe	Humboldt	K-12 Math Educator	The current 5th grade standard of 5.NF.A.1 states that students don't need to simplify the sum or difference when adding or su
Lindsey Tellinghui	Willow Lake	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Gu	Looking from 3rd grade to 4th grade specifically, in the area of fractions, there is not a specific set of denominators listed. In tl The heading listed in the new standards is just fractions, but decimals are also under this heading but not always named as de Current standard: C. Generate and analyze patterns. 5. Generate a number or shape pattern that follows a given rule. Identify apparent features of the pattern that were not explicit Proposed standard: 4.OA.11 Generate a number or shape pattern that follows a given rule, identifying apparent features of the pattern that are not What is the reasoning for not giving teachers an example of what the standard looks like. This is true for many standards - why not provide teachers with an example of what the standard looks like in the classroom? Finally, why are we outsourcing to an out of state entity? The state spent millions of dollars on ELA PD to be created by Board
Haley Dressler	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator	1.MF.3 Recall from memory addition facts within 10. 1.MF.4 Recall from memory subtraction facts within 10. These standards are not developmentally appropriate. Standards should define what fluency is to ensure consistency across classrooms. 1.MF.1 Fluently add within 20. 1.MF.2 Fluently subtract within 20. This is a large jump for students given kindergarten is fluent within 5.
Crystal Wagner	Black Hawk	K-12 Math Educator	Define what fluent is, for consistency across grade levels. Recall is not appropriate for first grade. I appreciate the wording, it

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
John Mead	Olympia	K-12 Math Educator	This feedback has been uploaded to my google drive and shared as a pdf for ease of reading at https://tinyurl.com/SDFeedbac

The feedback and suggestions in this document are made in reference to the November 10, 2025 draft of Mathematics Standa

K.OA.8 – The CCSS standard K.NBT.1 specifically refers to teen numbers as being composed of ten ones and more ones. Is th
K.M.6 – Does the elimination of the penny as minted coinage impact this standard?
K.M.3 – Out of sequence
K.G.3 – Some of the shapes listed in parentheses are plural, others are singular.

1.OA.6 – Why is the term "borrowing" here instead of regrouping?
1.OA.9 – Restricted to equations of what form? What range of values?
1.G.5 – It appears the word "Partition" at the end of 1.G.5 should be the first word of 1.G.6

2.N.5 – Same question as at K.OA.8. Is the concept of a "hundred" as 10 tens, and of a "thousand" as 10 hundreds implicit wit
2.G.2 – Concepts of parallel lines, angle measure, and congruence have not yet been formally defined. (They are defined in gra

3.OA.2 – The objects are not split into equal groups, a set of objects is split.
3.OA.8 – The range stated here is for the factor, not the product, correct?
3.F.1 – This standard undoes a lot of the work that the CCSS did to emphasize the fact that fractions are numbers that may re
3.M.1 – Area is a number that represents the amount of space inside a 2-dimensional shape.
3.M.7 – The distributive property is not a property of multiplication, but rather of the relationship between addition and multipli
3.M.9 – "distance around" is sloppy.
3.M.16 – Why is decimal notation being introduced here if decimal notation in general is not introduced until Grade 4?

4.OA.1 – missing a word
4.F.1 – Fractions have not yet been linked to division. Here, numerator and denominator should be used in place of divisor and

5.F.1 – How is this different from 4.F.3 and 4.F.5?
5.F.2 – The phrase "referring to the same whole" is omitted vs the CCSS version of this standard. Is this intentional?
5.G.6 – "Threefold whole number products of volume" is phrased oddly. "Use volume, represented by a product of three whole
5.G.7 – Why the change from "edge lengths" to "side lengths"?
5.G.14 – distance from an axis, not movement.

6.NC.1 – Why "comparison" and not "relationship" here? So far comparison has only been used to refer to numerical compariso
6.NC.2 – "fractions, mixed numbers, and decimals" is redundant and actually possibly incorrect. (pi is a decimal, but not ration
6.NC.13 – using their GCF
6.PR.1 – Why the distinction between ratios and rates?
6.A.6 through 6.A.11 – These standards omit the major understanding from CCSS 6.EE.5 about what it means to solve an equa
6.G.6 – Ordered pairs
6.SP.1 – "statistics [is] a branch of mathematics" may be the most controversial statement in the whole document.
6.SP.5, 6.SP.6 – Mode is not a measure of center and should not be listed here.

7.G.2 – pi is a number, not a proportional relationship. It is equal to the unit rate associated with that relationship, which is dist

8.NC.2 – would prefer "radical index" here rather than "root index"
8.RF.3 – This represents a shift from the focus in CCSS. Here, students are asked to explain how slope is constant, while CCSS
8.RF.4 – Curious about the insertion of "equation" here. I get that we're talking about something like f(x) = 2x + 3, but in this equ
8.A.4 – Should read "a system of linear equations to be a set of two or more linear equations" OR "a system of equations to be
8.A.5 and 8.A.6 – These two statements may lead to confusion when taken together. Suggest reversing the order and editing a
"(new) 8.A.5 – Know that a system of two linear equations can have one solution, infinitely many solutions, or no solutions.
(new) 8.A.6 – Know that, if a system of two linear equations has one solution, it is the unique ordered pair which makes both th
8.G.8 – The focus on geometric transformations in the CCSS intentionally makes the inclusion of this type of mathematically i
8.G.9 – As with 8.G.8, this is precisely the type of definition that the focus on isometries along with dilation intends to avoid. If
8.G.10 – The phrase "change in a shape" is misleading. A transformation is a function acting on a set of points. Rotations, refle
8.G.11 – There are more than these three types of rigid transformations (glide reflections in the plane, inversions about a poin
8.G.12 – This is poorly phrased. A dilation is a function acting on a set of points of the form D(x,y) = (ax,ay), where a is the sca
8.G.13 – Is the expectation to describe the sequence of transformations between two congruent figures intentionally removed

A1.F.2 – Should specify whole-number exponents |

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Crystal McMache	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Gu	8.NC.10 Write numbers in scientific notation using positive and negative exponents. I did a search to see where students learn how to add/subtract/multiply/divide using scientific notation and it seems that it wa
Crystal McMache	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Gu	I am concentrating on the 8th grade standards because that is where I have spent the last ten years of my 25 years of teaching 8.RF.4 Understand a function to be an equation or rule that assigns to each input (independent value) exactly one output (depe 8.RF.5 Understand the domain as the set of inputs accepted by the function. 8.RF.6 Understand the range as the set of outputs produced by the function. Is this important for a student to know... definitely! But I am not sure it counts as a standard. What are they to do with this info
Sarah Sever	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator	3.MF.4 Fluently add and subtract multi-digit whole numbers using various strategies. I wish the 3rd grade standard above was written like the 2nd grade standards listed below, but within 1000. The standard above Proposed Change: Fluently add within 1000. Fluently subtract within 1000. 2.MF.1 Fluently add within 100. 2.MF.2 Fluently subtract within 100
Haylie Young	Brookings	K-12 Math Educator	I am referencing the proposed standard 4.F.3. Add and subtract fractions with an unlike denominator using a common denomi
Courtney	Box Elder	Instructional Leader	2.N.6 now has 2nd graders decomposing 4-digit numbers into the thousands. Previously this standard was only up to 1,000. W 2.MF.4 has students recalling from memory subtraction facts within 20. We would like this removed as this is not development
Meggie Bennett	Box Elder	K-12 Math Educator	2.N.6 now has 2nd graders decomposing 4-digit numbers into the thousands. Previously this standard was only up to 1,000. W 2.MF.4 has students recalling from memory subtraction facts within 20. We would like this removed as this is not development
Kate	Box Elder	K-12 Math Educator	2.N.6 now has 2nd graders decomposing 4-digit numbers into the thousands. Previously this standard was only up to 1,000. W 2.MF.4 has students recalling from memory subtraction facts within 20. We would like this removed as this is not development Keep 2.MF.3 as written.
Megan	Box Elder	K-12 Math Educator,	2.N.6 now has 2nd graders decomposing 4-digit numbers into the thousands. Previously this standard was only up to 1,000. W 2.MF.4 has students recalling from memory subtraction facts within 20. We would like this removed as this is not development
Michelle Stumpf	Belle Fourche	K-12 Math Educator	5.F.4. and 5.F.6. - #4 states multiplying fraction and whole number by a fraction --- does this strand include multiplication of mixed numbers and #6 states solving real world multiplication problems with fractions and mixed numbers. Is multiplication of mixed numbers jus 5.OA.7 Divide decimals to the hundredths I need clarification on this one please, it was even unclear with the previous standards. When dividing decimals, is that only de
Shaun Groen	Sioux Falls	K-12 Math Educator	8.N(C).11 is missing from the proposed math standards that were presented in July to the ones that are posted now for review

Name	City	Which group do you represent? Check all	Public Comment
Sherwin Gilbert	Hartford	Parent/Guardian	Health Standards: -more accurately define 'health risk.'What one person perceives as a 'health risk may not be seen as a health risk by another. ---this ambiguity leaves far too much interpretation to the teacher and not enough guidance to ensure consistent education. Math Standards: -how will these changes affect the curriculum's districts are currently using? -how much will these changes cost the DOE / each district? -NAEP 2024 shows average math scores for SD 4th graders and 8th graders with only one year of data trending down over the
Averie Georgas	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator	In 4th grade, we are concerned that we no longer measure or change unit conversions with time, but are expected to solve stor
Amber Grenz	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator, Parent/Gu	As a first-grade teacher, I respectfully disagree with standards 1.MF.3 and 1.MF.4. I do not believe these expectations are devel Despite our school's strong math performance, many of our second-grade students already struggle to meet that standard. Mo I ask that you please reconsider this change. If we want our students to be successful, we must ensure that standards are aligr
Kristi Tlustos	Rapid City	K-12 Math Educator	Hi! I'd like to propose that 1.OA.6 be removed from first grade. This is more of a 2nd grade standard, and adds more than we p

Current Standard			Proposed Stan	Proposed Wording	Consideration	Rationale
Kindergarten			K.A.5	When solving word problems, identify the correct operation needed (add or subtract within ten) and solve using object or drawings	Suggested Wording: Solve word problems by identifying the correct operation needed (add or subtract within ten) and solve using objects or drawings.	Our standards work often revolves around the verb, giving direction about what the student is to be able to do.
Kindergarten	K.OA.4	For any number for 1 to 9, find the number that makes 10 when added to the given number, e.g., by using objects or drawings, and record the answer with a drawing or equation.			Missing: Suggested wording: Describe the relative positions of objects using terms such as above, below, beside, in front of, behind, and next to.	This is a skill that must be explicitly taught, and lays a foundation for future spatial understanding
Grade 1			1.A.9	Given an equation, find an unknown value.	Suggested wording: Given an addition or subtraction equation, find an unknown in any position	Students often focus on the result unknown (the "answer") but need to be able to think flexibly about part/whole relationships and how to solve missing addends, subtrahends, or minuends in addition to the final sum or difference.
Grade 1	1.OA.C.5	Understand counting on as addition and counting back as subtraction e.g. 5, (6,7,8) means 5+3 and 5, (4,3,2) means 5-3			MISSING. Suggested additional standard: Understand counting on as addition and counting back as subtraction	It is important to explicitly understand the meaning of addition and subtraction concepts.
Grade 1			1.A.3	Solve addition and subtraction word problems within 20. Including problems with 3 whole addends.	Needs comma instead of period: "Solve addition and subtraction word problems within 20, including problems with 3 whole addends."	grammatical
Grade 1			1.N.5	Represent two-digit numbers, (Drawings, ten frams, base ten, blocks, place value chart, etc)	Suggested addition: Represent two-digit numbers. (Drawings, ten-frames, connecting cubes, base-ten blocks, place value chart, etc.)	Connecting cubes are more developmentally appropriate for first grades. They need to experience the building and breaking apart of numbers, which is not possible with base-ten blocks, This is a progression of manipulatives.
Grade 1			1.A.6	Subtract a two digit and on digit number (with or without borrowing) using multiple strategies that reflect an understanding of place value.	Suggest revisions: Change the word "borrowing" to "regrouping."	Regrouping is more accurate term, and matches the language of 1.A.5. Regrouping help students understand that the same number can be arranged (re-grouped) in various ways.
Grade 1	1.MD.B.5	Identify nickels and understand that five pennies can be though of a nickel. Identify dimes and understand that ten pennies can be thought of as a dime. Count the alue of a set of coins comprised of pennies, nickels, and dimes.	1.M.5	Find the value of combinations of U.S. coins up to one dollar using pennies and dimes and represent with cent symbol.	MISSING. New standard removes the expectation of nickel from this grade level. Suggested wording: Find the value of combinations of U.S. coins up to one dollar using pennies, nickels, and dimes and represent with cent symbol	Students in grade 1 will count by 1, 5, and 10. We have been including collections of coins including these three coins.
Grade 1	1.G.A.2	Compose and identify regular and irregular two-dimensional shapes (rectangles, squares, trapezoids, triangles, half-circles, and quarter-circles) and compose three-dimensiona shapes (cubes, spheres, right rectangular prisms, right circular cones, and right circular cylinders) to create a composite shape, and compose new shapes from the composite shape. (Students do not need to master formal names such as "right rectangular prism.")	1.G.3	Compose and identify regular and irregular two-dimensional shapes	MISSING. The new standard doesn't spell out which specific shapes to include. Suggested addition: Compose and identify regular and irregular two-dimensional shapes (rectangles, squares, trapezoids, triangles, half-circles, and quarter-circles). ALSO MISSING: no mention of three-dimensional shapes for first grade. Is this an intentional exclusion?	This adds clarity for teachers, and provides consistent instruction so students progress with expected knowledge.
Grade 1	1.G.A.3	Partition circles and rectangles into two and four equal shares, describing the shares using the words halves, fourths, and quarters, and use the phrases half of, fourth of, and quarter of. Describe the whole as two of, or four of the shares. Understand for these expamples that decomposing into more equal shares create smaller shares.	1.G.6	Partition circles and rectanlges into two or four equal parts and describe the parts using words halves and fourths.	MISSING concept: This standard should include ""using the words halves, fourths, and quarters."" ALSO MISSING: The last fundamental part of this concept is missing: more equal shares creates smaller shares.	Quarter is another way to express fourths, and lays a foundation for understanding money.
Grade 2			2.A.2	Solves addition and subtraction problems within 100, using objects, drawings, open number lines, or equations with a symbol for the unknown number.	Suggested addition: Solve addition and subtraction problems within 100, using objects, drawings, open number lines, or equations with a symbol for the unknown number in any position	Students need to be able think flexibly about part/whole relationships and be able to solve any unknown.
Grade 2	2.OA.C.3	Determine whether a group of objects (up to 20) has an odd or even numbers of members, e.g., by pairing objects or counting them by 2s; write an equation to express an even number as a sum of two equal addends.	2.N.3	Counting forward and backwards by 2's to 50 and determine whether the number is odd or even.	Separate skills: Count forward and backwards by 2's to 50. NEW, suggested standard: Determine whether a number is odd or even (e.g. by pairing objects, counting members by 2's, or it can be split into two equal groups.)	Students need to understand the concept of an even number as being the sum of two equal addends, which is more than just pairing the items. This unerstanding of odd and even is intricately related to the understanding of doubling and halving the number.
Grade 2	2.OA.C.4	Use addition to find the total number of objects arranged in rectangular arrays with up to 5 ros and up to 5 columns; write an equation to express the total as a sum of equal addends	2.A.6	Given a rectangular array, use repeated addtion to find the total number of objects	The old standard limited to 5x5, which clarified the depth of the understanding. Is that still expected. Is writing an equation an imporant expectation	Possible wording: Given a rectangular array (up to 5x5), use repeated addition to find the total number of objects; write an addition equation to express the total.
Grade 2			2.MF.1	Fluently add within 100	Add: Fluently add within 100, using various strategies.	The third grade standard is more generous than the second grade expectation, by including "using various strategies. Developmentally, fluency would include multiple ways to find an answer, which develops into recall.

Grade 2			2.MF.2	Fluently subtrat within 100.	Add: Fluently subtract within100, using various strategies.	The third grade standard is more generous than the second grade expectation, by including "using various strategies. Developmentally, fluency would include multiple ways to find an answer, which develops into recall.
Grade 2			2.M.1	Explore length of an object by lining up inch-sixed manipulative with no gaps or overlaps	Missing "s" on manipulatives.	grammatical
Grade 2			2.M.4	Explore length of an object by lining up centimeter and decimeter-sized manipulative with no gaps or overlaps	Missing "s" on manipulatives.	grammatical
Grade 2			2.M.3	Measure the length of objects using rulers and yardsticks	MISSING: Measure the length of objects using rulers, yardsticks, meter sticks, and measuring tapes.	These tools are consistent with the expectations outlined in other measreument standards. A meter stick is not the same as a yardstick.
Grade 2	2.MD.B.6	Represent whole numbers as lengths from 0 on a number line diagram with equally spaced points corresponding to the numbers 0, 1, 2, …, and represent whole-number sums and differences within 100 on a number line diagram			MISSING. Suggested addition: Use number line diagrams to represent whole numbers as lengths from 0, as well as whole-number sums and difference within 100.	It is important to understand the concept of a number line diagram. This is foundational to equivalent fraction understanding in later grades.
Grade 2			2.M.8	Solve problems involving time in 5-minute intervals.	NEW. This helps to clarigy expectations of telling-time to include situational problems, this is a good addition.	
Grade 2			2.M.9	Find the value of combinations of U.S. coins up to $1 and bills up to $100.	EXPANDED. This is a good addition.	
Grade 2					MISSING. There is no expectation of word problems or real-world problems involving money. Possibly: Identify and count coins and bills apply that understanding to solve word problems	We need students to be able to not only count collections of coins, but also apply that knowledge to solve problems.
Grade 2	2.MD.C.8.b	Solve word problems involving dollar bills, quarters, dimes, nickels, and pennies, using dollar and cent symbols appropriately			MISSING. Need to include understanding of dollar sign/decimal point. Suggested addition: Solve word problems involving dollar bills, quarters, dimes, nickels, and pennies, using dollar sign and cent symbols appropriately	Students in grade two will see and read money amounts expressed in both formats. This is a beginning skill for decimal work. Their word problems include dollar signs and cent signs. We need to address misconceptions about this notation early.
Grade 2	2.G.A.2	Partition a rectangle into rows and columns of same-size squares and count to find the total number of them.			Missing. Suggested addition: Partition a rectangle into rows and columns of same-size squares and count to find the total number of them	Understanding partitioning of shapes (rectangles) is building block skill to understanding multiplication and division, as well as area and fractions. Fundamentally, students need to understand that the squares must be the same size, and be able to count a total number of squars.
Grade 3			3.MF.1	Fluently use multiplication strategies to mentally solve multiplication facts through 12	Expaned through 12	
~~Grade 3~~			~~3.MF.3~~	~~Mentally solve multiplication facts within 100 with the corresponding facts.~~	~~This flueney standard is not clear. Students are already expected to be fluent with their mulitplication facts. It likely expects some division proficiency, but the wording is confusing. Is the goal to use/relate division facts to corresponding multiplication facts, within the same fact family?~~	~~It is challenging to asses a student's mental understanding.~~
Grade 3			3.MF.2	Recall from memory multiplication facts (0-12) to include 0, 1, 2, 5, 10.	The clarification about benchmark facts of 0, 1, 2, 5, 10 is appreciated.	
Grade 3	3.OS.D.8	Solve two-step word problems using the four operations using equations with a letter standing for the unknown quantity. Assess the reasonableness of answer using mental computation and estimation strategies including rounding. (This standard is limited to problems posed with whole number answers; students should know how to perform operations in the conventional order when there are no parentheses to specify a particular order [Order of Operations]).	3.A.9	Solve two-step word problems using addition, subtraction, multiplication, and dvision using an equation with a symbol for the unknown quantity.	MISSING. This does not include evaluating an answer for reasonableness, rounding, estimating. Suggested wording to add: Assess the reasonableness of answers using mental computation and estimation strategies including rounding.	While rounding is specifically taught as a procedural skill in 3.N.1, the ability to evaluate the reasonableness of an answer is an important skill that needs to be developed. It is greater than being able to round a given number.
Grade 3			3.N.2	Read and write whole numbers up to 10,000 using standard form, word form, and expanded form.	NEW. This is a good addition	
Grade 3			3.F.1	Understand a fraction as a part of a whole	Is this necessary?	This standard is exactly repeated in the beginning of M.F.4
Grade 3			3.F.4	Understand fractions as part ofa whole, as numbers on a number line, and as multiples of unit fractions	?? The old standards have lots of subpoints and explanation of the boundaries of this skill. Should it include specific number line boundaries, to clarify learning for grade 3? There seams to be a lot of understanding that is oversimplified from old to new.	
Grade 3			3.F.5	Understand two fractions are equivalent (equal) if they represent the same quantity, or the same point on a number line	too broad? Suggestion to add: (fractions with denominators 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8).	Grade 3 expectations in this domain have been limited to fractions with denominators 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8, which is important to clarify.

Grade						
Grade 3			3.M.17	Create tables, bar graphs, circle graphs, and line graphs to represent a given set of data	Missing: this standard does not clarify "scaled" picture graph or bar graph. Suggestion: Create scaled tables, bar graphs, circle graphs, and line graphs to represent a given set of data.	Scale is an important consideration when reading data, and needs to be emphasized in data analysis.
Grade 3			3.M.18	Interpret and analyze one and two step data problems with tables, bar graphs, circle graphs, and line graphs.	Missing: this standard does not clarify "scaled" picture graph or bar graph. Suggestion: Interpret and analyze one and two step data problems with scaled tables, bar graphs, circle graphs, and line graphs.	Scale is an important consideration when reading data, and needs to be emphasized in data analysis.
Grade 3	3.MD.B.4	Generate measurement data by measuing lengths using rulers marked with halves and fourths of an inch. Show the data by making a line plot, where the horixontal scale is marked off in appropriate units-whole numbers, halves, or quarters			MISSING: Measure lengths to halves and fourths of an inch. Suggested additional standard: Measure lengths using rulers to halves and fourths of an inch.	It is important to scaffold this skill explicitly. Developmentally, students need to have practice with gradually increasing difficulty, so it needs to be clarified for teaching.
Grade 3	3.MD.B.4	Generate measurement data by measuing lengths using rulers marked with halves and fourths of an inch. Show the data by making a line plot, where the horixontal scale is marked off in appropriate units-whole numbers, halves, or quarters			MISSING: Making line plots. Suggested additional standards: Make a line plot using a horizontal scale marked off in whole numbers, halves, or quarters.	2nd and 4th grade both have line plot expectations. Second grade is supposed to read them, and fourth is supposed to display and solve problems using 1/2, 1/4, 1/8. Third grade should bridge these expectations.
Grade 3			3.M.7	Use tiling to represent the distributive property of mulitplication	Add: Use tiling with area models to represent the distributive property of multiplication.	This adds clarity to the expectation. This is the connection to the distributive property of multiplication.
Grade 3	3.MD.C.8	Solve real world and mathematical problems involving perimeters of polygons, including finding the perimeter given the side lengths, finding an unknown side length, and exhibiting rectangles with the same perimeter and different areas or with the same area and different perimeters.	3.M.10	Solve real-world and mathematical problems involving perimeter of polygon.	Old standard included expectation to find the unknown side length, but new standards do not have it in either. New standard removed all examples of the real world types of problems to include. Suggestion: Solve real world problems involving perimeters of polygons, including finding the perimeter given the side lengths, finding an unkown side length, and creating rectanlges with the same perimeter and different areas or with the same area and different perimeters.	The missing side lenths need to explicitly be included in 3rd or 4th grade. This sets them up for algebraic understanding. The types of perimeter problems need to be explicitly provided to make sure teachers now the depth of th understanding to expect at this grade level.
Grade 3	3.MD.C.9	Determine the value of a collection of money using dollar sign and decimal point appropriately. Understand that the digits to the right of the decimal represent parts of a whole dollar	3.M.16	Determine the value of a collection of U.S. coins and dollars up to $100.00 using decimal notation	Suggestion: Change "dollars" to bills.	Not all bills are one-dollar. This language would be more accurate.
Grade 4			3.A.1	Use multiplication equation as a comparison	Suggestion: Represent a comparison as a multiplication equation.	This more accurately expresses the mathematical expectations.
Grade 4			3.MF.1	Recall from memory multiplication facts (0-12).	Suggestion: separate into 2 standards. Recall from memory multiplication facts (0-12). Recall from memory division facts (0-12).	This alignes with how the expectations are included at all other levels. These are two separate skills, and division is new to this grade level, so should have its own emphasis.
Grade 4	4.OA.A.3	Solve multistep word problems posed with whole numbers and having whole-number answers using the four operations, including problems in which remainders must be intepreted. Represent these problems using equations with a letter standing for the unknown quantity. Assess the reasonableness of answers using mental computation and estimation strategies including rounding.	4.A.6	Solve multstep word problems using addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, with whole numbers and having whole number answers, including problems in which remainders must be interpreted.	MISSING. This does not include evaluating an answer for reasonableness, rounding, estimating. Suggested wording to add: Assess the reasonableness of answers using mental computation and estimation strategies including rounding.	While round is specifically taught as a procedural skill in 4. N.2, the ability to evaluate the reasonableness of an answer is an important skill that needs to be developed. It is greater than being able to round a given number.
Grade 4	4.NBT.A.2.b	Compare two multi-digit numbers based on values of the digits in each place, using <, >, and = symbols to record the results of comparisons			MISSING. Suggested addition: Compare two multi-digit numbers based on values of the digits in each place, using <, >, and = symbols.	This skill hasn't been addressed since second grade (tens and ones). Foundational understanding of place value is essential for fractions and decimals.
Grade 4			4.MF.2	Fluently add and subtract multi-digit whole numbers using various strategies.	This is a direct repeat of 3rd grade standard, Should 4th grade remove "using various strategies?"	It is challenging to understand the boundaries of each grade level expectations without differentiation in standards
Grade 4			4.A.5	Interpret a remainder of a one-step division problem	NEW. This is an important addition-thank you	
Grade 4			4.A.13	Evaluate a numerical expression including addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division using the order of operations of whole numbers-without parentheses and exponenets	NEW. Old 3rd grade standards had reference to Order of Operations, but new ones do not Is this an intentional move of this expectation?	
Grade 4	4.NF.B.3.d	Solve word problems involving addition and subtraction of fractions referring to the same whole and having like denominators, e.g., by using visual fraction models and equations to represent the problem.			MISSING. Suggestion: add back in this standard	Students need to be able to reference real world problems and use visual models.

Grade 4	4.NF.C.6	Read and write decimal notation for fractions with denominators 10 or 100. Locate these decimals on a number line.	4.F.12	Apply decimal notation for fractions with denominator 10 or 100.	MISSING. The new standard removes the expectation of finding decimals on a number line. Suggestions: Apply decimal notation for fractions with denominators 10 or 100; locate these decimals on a number line.	Understand the progression of decimals and relative values is a foundational understanding.
Grade 4			4.M.1	Measure length, weight, mass, and capacity using U.S. customary and metric systems of units.	MISSING. New stnadard does not explicity include which units to address. Suggestion: add to the end: (including km, m, cm; kg, g; lb, oz.; l, ml; hr, min, sec.)	Without clear expectations, teacher may overlook specific units that will be expected at other grades. This clarifies and levels the playing field for all students to be successful.
Grade 4			4.M.2	Express larger units in terms of smaller units through conversion	This standard needs to include "within a single system of measurement."	Students are not expected to convert from customary to metric, or metric to customary. This had been a source of disagreement among our staff, but looking to the standards helps clarify the expectation. We need this explicitly stated, if this is the intention.
Grad 4			4.G.2	Measure angles, to the nearest degree, using a protractor and identify, describe, and draw right, acute, obtuse, and straight angles.	Consider: "Measure angles in degrees using a protractor and understand a degree as 1/360 of a circle; draw angles of specific measure."	This was improved from the first draft but still is missing the "draw" skill. Asking students to draw specific angles has been an expectation that is not included.
Grade 4			4.G.3	Identify, describe, and draw equilateral, scalene, right, acute, and obtuse angles and triangles.	This is inclusive of one of the skills proposed in 4.G.2. Suggestion: leave this standard as is, but revise 4.G.2	
			4.G.4	Recognize when angles are broken apart the sum of the parts is equal to the angle measure of the whole.	Vocab-additive angle should be included.	This vocabulary provides specificity and promotes the academic langauge of mathematics.
			4.G.8	Identify and describe various quadrilaterals by their properties of parallel and perpendicular lines.	List quadrilaterals that should be identified: square, rectangle, trapezoid, rhombus.	This provides clarity and consistency, to make sure all students are expected to learn the same information.
			4.F.7	Understand a fraction a/b is a multiple of 1/b	Including an example would be helpful	
			4.F.8	Understand a multiple of a/b is a fraction of 1/b	Including an example would be helpful	

November 7, 2025

To Whom It May Concern:

As a high school math teacher with over fifteen years of classroom experience, I am writing to express my support of the adoption of the revised South Dakota Mathematics Standards. These updated standards were developed by a diverse and knowledgeable team of educators and content experts who worked collaboratively to create a set of expectations that are clear, concise, and practical for everyday classroom use. The well-rounded team prioritized clarity, practicality, and rigor throughout the revision process.

The new set of standards provides a framework that is far more user-friendly for teachers, without compromising academic rigor. They promote deep mathematical understanding and problem-solving, enabling students to apply their knowledge to real-world situations. As an educator, I appreciate that these standards encourage meaningful instruction and conceptual mastery rather than the pressure to cover excessive material. By focusing on practical application and critical thinking, the revised standards align closely with what we strive to achieve in our classrooms: preparing students not only to succeed academically but to think analytically and solve problems with confidence. These standards make it easier for teachers to focus on what truly matters: helping students build a lasting understanding of mathematics that connects to their daily lives and future goals.

The new South Dakota Mathematics Standards align closely with modern instructional practices and current best practices in education. They are written with consistent, precise language that promotes a clear understanding of expectations across all grade levels. This consistency supports stronger communication among teachers, students, and parents, ensuring everyone works toward the same learning goals. Additionally, the standards provide flexibility in implementation, allowing teachers to select strategies, materials, and instructional approaches that best meet the needs of their students. This balance of clarity, consistency, and professional autonomy empowers educators to deliver high-quality, engaging math instruction that reflects both state expectations and local classroom realities.

I believe the revised standards represent a significant and positive step forward for education in South Dakota. They provide teachers with a solid, manageable foundation that supports high-quality instruction while maintaining the rigor necessary for student growth and achievement. They are designed to make teaching more intentional, learning more connected, and mathematics more accessible and applicable for all.

For these reasons, I recommend the adoption of the new South Dakota Mathematics Standards and commend the work done to get to this point.

Sincerely,

Megan Wilson

Megan Wilson
High School Math Teacher
Sanborn Central School District