South Dakota World Language Standards
Public Comment

First, Last Name	Group	Comment
Robert Turner	Higher Education Professional	I am happy with the improvements in the standards. I think they are tighter and more applicable. On 4.2, I suggest removing "it to" in the cultural comparisons so that it doesn't imply that we are comparing the language to culture instead of cultures with each other.
Sarah Sinnott	World Language Educator	General commentary: The provided definition of standards states that "South Dakota academic content standards serve as expectations for what students should know and be able to do by the end of each grade." The world language standards do not include any measure of progress for any level or grade. The previous version included the ACTFL graph representing Time as a Critical Component for Developing Language Performance, which offered some degree of measure, but the new version lacks this. While it would be impossible to attach goals consistently to grade levels, the standards should include reference to what is achievable after X number of hours in Y context. This will differ for traditional programs versus immersion programs, for example. This will also differ for in-person versus online programs. This will differ depending on the target language. There are many factors that would affect a learner's achievable proficiency level, but this reality should be addressed. There could be a breakdown for the most common contexts in our state, for example, stating proficiency goals at various points along the curriculum. Without measurable goals, the standards provide little guidance for teachers planning a curriculum. Without measurable goals, there is no way to determine whether a program is meeting the standards. This is especially important when a students' grade in a world language class is often not a reflection at all of their proficiency in the target language. Applicable to all standards: It is unclear why there are two definitions for each standard. This is at best redundant, but the existence of two definitions leads to confusion and misinterpretation. The content of these definitions could be combined to provide better readability and reduce opportunity for misunderstanding. Standard 2: The prior Standards 2.1 and 2.2 were easier to interpret as separate standards and they were not redundant. When presented together, they lead to the assumption that all 3 Ps should be addressed at the same time, and this is not the case. I agree that the word "customs" should be removed from both standards. Grammatical error in Standard 2: two many instances of the word and- interact with respect and cultural competence and understanding. Standard 4: This is perhaps only a matter of word preference, but "nature of language" was a better term than "mechanics of language" for the lay person. Most stakeholders (including world language teachers untrained in linguistics) will interpret mechanics to be only grammar, whereas in reality it includes many more aspects of the language.

09/23/2026

Yamileth Arano Hermida	World Language Educator	I think it would be helpful if the world language standards included an outline of what students should know and be able to do at each grade level or level of Spanish. For example, Spanish 1, Standard 1.1 (Communication) could include an expectation such as "Ask and answer basic conversational questions." I feel like right now, the standards are broad enough that it can be difficult to determine what students should specifically be learning at each level. Having more clearly defined expectations would help teachers better align their instruction, assessments, and curriculum while still allowing flexibility in how they teach the content.
Megan Fischer	World Language Educator	The committee did a fabulous job at updating the standards to bring more clarity especially around the use of the target language. The reorganization of the communication standards and rewording of the cultural competency will be beneficial to all parties involved in implementing the standards. All of the changes are relevant, evidence based and thoughtful.
Loren Bauder	K-12 Educator	I believe the changes will help educators better assess growth in cultural competence. Changes made to standard 5.2 allow for better measurement of growth. I also agree with the proposed changes to standard 2 (2.1 and 2.2). This reduces redundancy and clarifies what outcomes are expected of learners. I believe these changes will help produce more competent global citizens, which as a teacher, is my ultimate goal.
Sarah Bell	K-12 Educator	1.1 - The skill of inference is key to interpretive communication as we do infer meaning based on context and vocab we already know. It feels like a big omission for such a key skill. 1.2 - This feels like a good change. 1.3 - Informing and explaining feel very similar. I don't see how the order of explain and persuade matters enough to change it. 2.1 & 2.2 - I like this change. 4 & 4.1 - Mechanics sounds like a grammar-heavy focus, which is not consistent with national standards and current best practice where grammar should be brought up only in context. Using "nature" makes more sense with the natural flow of language learning and discovering grammar in context. 5 - I like these changes.

Brianna Thier	World Language Educator	I do like that you added "target" when describing the languages. I also appreciate that "mechanics of the language" was added to Standard 4. When I compared our standards to other subjects, I am a little surprised that our drafted standards do not include more specific standards like "correctly conjugating the regular present tense conjugations of -ar,-er, & -ir verbs" or "communicate clearly by demonstrating their speaking/listening/writing/reading skills". As language teachers, we all do practice teaching grammar and encouraging them to communicate in all four ways of communication. I have found, when switching schools, that there are some teachers that do not and the students suffer. If our goal is to prepare them to feel comfortable in taking the biliteracy seal exams and/or go onto college-level language course, I feel like it would benefit our department if we added more specific standards to encourage teachers to prepare students to be successful post-HS. I would love to know what you think about this. If I could do anything to help, I would be more than willing!
Jodi Melius	World Language Educator	I agree with and appreciate the updates to the world language standards. The wording is clear and reflects understanding of the language acquisition process. The changes make the standards more measurable and accurate. Standard 1 - I appreciate the change of order with respect to language learning. Standard 2 - These are probably my favorite changes in wording. The proposed standards are much clearer. Standard 3 - I appreciate the specificity. Standard 4 - I like the change to the word mechanics. Standard 5 - I appreciate the specificity and agree with eliminating the word lifelong to make the standard more measurable.
Pam Kallis	K-12 Educator	"South Dakota academic content standards serve as expectations for what students should know and be able to do by the end of each grade." This quote is from the introduction. It impossible for World Languages to fit standards to grade levels based on varying start dates of study. I wonder why that language is then used in the intro? "Interact with respect and cultural competence and understanding." This is on standard 2. The repetitive "and" makes this sentence awkward and difficult to understand. I applaud the comparison standards. Well done!! I also like the replacement of "Lifelong learning" with "goals and reflection". I teach at a Catholic school that ends at 8th grade. I work with my students on personal goals, but sadly know that some of them choose to end language study once they leave my facility. Thank you for all your work on these standards.
Amanda Nordquist	World Language Educator	I appreciate the changes suggested by the committee. The addition of the phrase "target language" in many of the standards is a good clarifier. I especially like the strengthening and communication of the cultural competence standard (2.2). Finally, the use of the word "mechanics" in standard 4.1 is a much clearer choice in helping readers understand the thought behind that standard.