

Proposed Science Standards - Public Comment

Travis Ehrisman	K-12 Educator	Changing the grade band indicators for middle school and high school from MS and HS to 6-8 and 9-12 seems like an unneeded change. I don't think anyone was confused by the way it is now.
Ashley Armstrong	Parent/Guardian, Science Professional	I appreciate that the standards were reviewed by professionals in the field of education. Those who work with students, understand standards and how they are written, and know the capabilities of their students are the people we should look to for this important matter.
Kaitlynn Krack	K-12 Educator, Science Professional	<p>Currently the State is recommending the removal of the following standard:            Analyze displays of pictorial data to compare patterns of similarities in the embryological development across multiple species to identify relationships not evident in the fully formed anatomy. (SEP: 4; DCI: LS4.A ; CCC: Patterns)</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of this standard. This standard represents one of the most important methods in which zoological animals are classified. Removal of this standard would greatly hinder our students understanding of how we classify organisms. As a zoology teacher, this standard represents a very important portion of knowledge that my students need to understand.</p> <p>Please reconsider the removal of this standard, as it is an important concept, especially to biology and zoology based high school courses.</p>
Tim Klavon	Higher Education Professional	<p>First, I want to first identify myself as a science education instructor at Black Hills State University but I am presenting my comments as a resident of South Dakota and my comments in no way represent the University.</p> <p>After reading through the standards, I find them to be well defined and clearly written. I appreciate the consistency between the current standards and the proposed ones. I am also pleased with the continued alignment with the Framework and the NGSS, with appropriate modifications for the South Dakotan context.</p> <p>I have one minor concern which is that some of the standards (e.g. 1-LS1-2, 6-8-PS4-1, &amp; 9-12-LS3-2) mention very specific modalities of pedagogy. While this may be a way requiring certain approaches, I think it might constrain teachers in unforeseen ways. It may limit the flexibility and creativity of our teachers when their pedagogical content knowledge my lead them away from the prescribed methods. If you wish to push these methods through the SEPs, then I would recommend an appendix describing some of the classroom pedagogies that would the advisory committee finds to be crucial.</p>

<p>Jennifer Fowler</p>	<p>K-12 Educator, Science Professional, Informal Science Educator</p>	<p>The coding system for each standard should not be changed for middle and high school. It is more important for consistency to exist with online and written curriculum resources that teachers will use than with other standards in ELA or Math that Science teachers do not use. Simply adding the current code MS-LS1-1 in a search engine yields an endless list of aligned resources for that standard. Searching the proposed code of 6-8-LS1-1 online or by looking in current purchased resources, offers no matches and it not beneficial to teachers. Losing our current coding system would be a major loss for teachers because alignment to their current and desired materials would be obsolete.</p> <p>The change of the coding system would also not allow SD to have an aligned SD Science Assessment with other states since the standard codes are utilized by assessment companies to identify, create, and share items. To move away from that style of state testing would be a disadvantage because we in SD can have a more rigorous test by being part of a company like Cambium currently.</p> <p>Embedding the Engineering, Technology, and Applications of Science (ETS) standards is beneficial for depth in science classes and for science standard alignment to existing STEM and STEAM classes.</p>
<p>Alison Bowers</p>	<p>K-12 Educator</p>	<p>I do not see any reason to remove this standard from the high school life science standards: HS-LS4-7 Analyze displays of pictorial data to compare patterns of similarities in the embryological development across multiple species to identify relationships not evident in the fully formed anatomy. (SEP: 4; DCI: LS4.A ; CCC: Patterns). This is an important piece of evidence for evolution that students can easily and quickly comprehend. It shows how similarly multicellular organisms begin development and how simple genetic changes during development can lead to different, complex organisms.</p> <p>I also don't really see any reason to change the numbering/naming convention of the standards. It seems like a great way to have educators spend time updating their scope and sequence, curriculum alignment documentation, etc. Is the only purpose of this change to make our standards look different from NGSS?</p>
<p>Tracy Chase</p>	<p>K-12 Educator, K-12 Administrator, Parent/Guardian</p>	<p>After teaching science content for 20 years in the state of South Dakota I feel the NGSS and the Framework for K-12 Science Education, are designed to guide science education at the national level. The documents provide a framework for science education that emphasizes a three-dimensional approach, integrating science and engineering practices, crosscutting concepts, and disciplinary core ideas. The integration and application of engineering and technology moves the standards to a higher level of rigor. I feel the coding and explanation is very logical. The change from MS and HS to 6-8 and 9-12 is more consistant with South Dakota standards. Well done!</p>

Proposed Science Standards - Public Comment

Carly Sparks	K-12 Educator	The language of the standards has been cleaned up and is more understandable. The biggest problem that I see is the change of grade bands MS to 6-8. I would agree with previous comments that I have read that say that this is an unnecessary change. Searching for resources is easier. Lastly, by keeping MS and not 6-8, the standards would more closely follow the NGSS. In the long run, this would be more beneficial for educators using the same language as the NGSS.
Sabrina Henriksen	K-12 Educator	Thank you for changing the coding of the proposed standards back to the HS.PS.##. As a current science teacher that will make the acceptance of the proposed changes easier and integration for new materials faster. These proposed changes make sense as they make the language easier to understand what the intent of the standard is. In the old standards some of that was tricky. Thank you to the committee for your hard work on these changes.