

**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.