

AGENDA

EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee

Monday, March 21, 2016
10:00 a.m.
Room 433, Blatt Building

- | | | |
|------|--|-------------------------------|
| I. | Welcome and Introductions | Dr. Bob Couch |
| II. | Approval of Minutes of November 16, 2015 Meeting | Dr. Bob Couch |
| III. | Report on Military Connected Students | Bunnie Ward |
| IV. | Parent Survey Results, 2015 | Dr. Kevin Andrews |
| V. | Update: 2016-17 Budget | Bunnie Ward
Melanie Barton |
| VI. | Update on Community Block Grants | Bunnie Ward |
| VII. | Adjournment | |

Subcommittee Members:

Dr. Bob Couch, Chair
Rep. Dwight Loftis
Rep. Joe Neal
Ellen Weaver

Neil C. Robinson, Jr.
CHAIR

Daniel B. Merck
VICE CHAIR

Anne H. Bull

Bob Couch

Mike Fair

Raye Felder

Barbara B. Hairfield

Nikki Haley

R. Wesley Hayes, Jr.

Dwight A. Loftis

John W. Matthews, Jr.

Joseph H. Neal

Molly Spearman

Patti J. Tate

Ellen Weaver

Melanie D. Barton
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Minutes
EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee Meeting
November 16, 2015
10:00 A.M., Room 403 Blatt Building

Subcommittee Members Present: Dr. Bob Couch (Chair); Rep. Dwight Loftis; and Ms. Deb Marks

EOC Staff Present: Kevin Andrews; Melanie Barton; Bunnie Ward; Hope Johnson-Jones; and Dana Yow

Welcome and Introductions

Dr. Couch opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

Approval of the Minutes of November 9, 2015

There being no changes, the minutes were approved as distributed.

EIA Testimony – Mr. Ken May, SC Arts Commission

As a continuation from the November 9, 2015 meeting, Mr. Ken May, Executive Director of the SC Arts Commission, briefed Subcommittee members. He provided an update on progress made during 2015-16, as a result of the increase in EIA funding. Students in high poverty are least likely to have access to or receive arts education. Due to challenges with access, the Arts Commission has collaborated with community partners to develop strategies to reach students when they are not in school.

With new funding, the Arts Commission has: (1) expanded the number of ABC sites; (2) implemented arts education programs with partners through a competitive grant process; (3) piloted a three-week summer STEAM camp in Clarendon County; (4) reserved some of the funds to develop additional metrics and evaluation; and (5) restored one FTE position that had been cut.

Dr. Couch noted arts education should include nontraditional art forms that incorporate technology, media, and trades such as welding. Rep. Loftis also commented that arts education should be integrated throughout academic curricula. Ms. Marks reiterated that art transfers to other content areas such as computing and opportunities to further support arts in rural communities should be pursued.

EIA Budget Discussion

Bunnie Ward provided an update on questions Subcommittee members asked SCDE. Dr. Couch asked if the Abbeville lawsuit and current issues related to it should be considered as the Subcommittee deliberates on EIA funding. Mrs. Barton responded the Subcommittee should take a broader, more holistic view of education funding and the needs of the entire state. Rep. Loftis supported Mrs. Barton's recommended approach.

Dr. Couch suggested as part of this broader perspective, enhanced collaboration between the Department of Commerce and the education community to identify ways to provide additional employment and economic opportunities in rural areas. One strategy is expanded

implementation of STEM Premier because industry and businesses can easily identify and recruit students from rural areas, providing access and opportunity for all students. Rep. Loftis echoed Dr. Couch and supported statewide expansion of Stem Premier. Ms. Marks noted she supported STEM Premier, but fundamental, basic education should not be overlooked in the process. Dr. Couch agreed.

Rep. Loftis requested additional information about the state's progress in using project-based and applied learning. Students need to understand the context and application for instruction to make their education relevant.

Mrs. Barton presented EOC staff recommendations and the Board of Economic Advisors' economic forecast. She noted any recommendations regarding assessments were on hold due to lack of information. Primary reason for the information gap is assessment procurements have not been finalized and announced.

Regarding college readiness benchmarks, Ms. Marks requested additional research be conducted to consider other state's approaches, in addition to Kentucky's approach.

Dr. Couch noted Project Lead the Way should also be explored because it also addresses the need for additional computer science education.

Regarding National Board certification, Rep. Loftis asked the SC Department of Education to provide an update. Mellanie Jinnette, Chief Financial Officer for SCDE, noted the number of teachers participating in this program statewide was decreasing since the state is no longer paying for the application fee. Rep. Loftis questioned if there was another way to incentivize teachers. Ms. Jinnette responded there were other approaches, such as structuring teacher salary around pay bands. She added that recertification for national board is being changed from ten years to five years. This change will likely result in further decrease in teacher participation. Dr. Couch noted a significant decline in the teacher supply of 20 to 25 percent will occur in the next five years.

Rep. Loftis questioned how education funding could be streamlined to provide flexibility to districts while also maintaining necessary accountability. Dr. Couch noted accountability is often included at the program level (ex. CATE Industry Equipment, High Schools that Work, Industry Certifications).

Subcommittee members supported EOC staff recommendations, including any additional EIA revenue be allocated to the "Aid to Districts" line item. Mrs. Barton suggested providing flexibility to local districts, as long as additional funding was used to enhance and support students' skills and knowledge reflected in the SC Profile for the High School Graduate.

There being no other business, the Subcommittee adjourned.

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Subcommittee: EIA and Improvement Mechanisms

Date: March 21, 2016

INFORMATION

Educational Performance of Military-Connected Children

PURPOSE/AUTHORITY

Act 289, the Military Family Quality of Life Enhancement Act, was enacted in 2014. The law requires the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) to develop an annual report on the educational performance of military connected children:

The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education, is directed to establish a comprehensive annual report concerning the performance of military connected children who attend primary, elementary, middle, and high schools in this State. The comprehensive annual report must be in a reader-friendly format, using graphics wherever possible, published on the state, district, and school websites, and, upon request, printed by the school districts. The annual comprehensive report must address at least attendance, academic performance in reading, math, and science, and graduation rates of military connected children.

CRITICAL FACTS

EOC staff worked with staff from the SC Department of Education, the Department of Defense State Liaison Office, and the Virginia Board of Education on the report.

TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS

Report issued annually in March or April.

ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR EOC

Cost: No fiscal impact beyond current appropriations

Fund/Source:

ACTION REQUEST

For approval

For information

Approved

ACTION TAKEN

Amended

Not Approved

Action deferred (explain)

2016

EDUCATIONAL
PERFORMANCE OF
MILITARY-
CONNECTED
CHILDREN

Draft Report



SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE



PO Box 11867 | 227 Blatt Building | Columbia SC 29211 | WWW.SCEOC.ORG

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction1

Acknowledgements3

Summary of Findings and Recommendations.....5

Section I: Recent Developments 7

Section II: Military-Connected Student Population.....15

Section III: Military-Connected Student Performance19

Appendices

A: Resources for Military-Connected Students and Families25

B: Impact Aid Section of Every Student Succeeds Act28

C: State of Virginia Law: Uniformed Services-Connected Students.....38

D: Military-Connected Students by District, January 2016.....39

Introduction

March 21, 2016

In 2014, the General Assembly passed Act 289, the Military Family Quality of Life Enhancement Act. The Act's purpose is to "enhance many quality of life issues for members of the armed forces" (Act 289 Preamble). Part V requests the SC Education Oversight Committee (EOC) to develop an annual report on the educational performance of military connected children:

The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education, is directed to establish a comprehensive annual report concerning the performance of military connected children who attend primary, elementary, middle, and high schools in this State. The comprehensive annual report must be in a reader-friendly format, using graphics wherever possible, published on the state, district, and school websites, and, upon request, printed by the school districts. The annual comprehensive report must address at least attendance, academic performance in reading, math, and science, and graduation rates of military connected children.

Based upon Act 289's direction, this report does not address military-connected students educated in Department of Defense schools, private schools and home school settings. The EOC evaluation team worked closely with the military and education community as it developed this report. Professionals, who directly support military families, including school liaison officers and organizations that support the National Guard and Reserves, provided input and reviewed report drafts. Both the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) and Defense Manpower Data Center provided data. The 2016 report provides:

- An overview of the federal Impact Aid Program;
- Recent policy developments that impact the identification and reporting on military-connected students;
- Details regarding the demographics of military-connected students;
- An update on the academic performance and school attendance of military-connected students.

Acknowledgements

The EOC is grateful for the assistance of local, state and national organizations and staff in the development of this report. Report contributors include:

Dino Teppara, SC Department of Education

Cynthia Hearn, SC Department of Education

Wanda Davis, SC Department of Education

Kevin Bruch, Department of Defense State Liaison Office

Melissa Luchau, Virginia Board of Education

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Finding 1: Using federal Fiscal Year 2014-15 US Department of Education data, twelve school districts in South Carolina applied for Impact Aid funding under Sections 8002 and 8003.¹ Estimated FY 2015 payments were approximately \$1.1 million. If the Impact Aid Program was fully funded at the federal level, payments to South Carolina districts would be \$13.6 million. Total payments represented about 7,835 federally-connected students, with a majority of those students enrolled in Berkeley, Charleston, Richland 2 and Sumter school districts.

Finding 2: The federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) includes modifications to the reporting of military-connected students and Impact Aid. Impact Aid changes will improve the timeliness of payments, adjust the Basic Support formula, eliminate the Federal Properties “lockout” provision and provide additional budget certainty for districts.

The reporting requirement will provide more consistent, easily identifiable data regarding military-connected students with a parent on active duty. As student identification improves, additional supports may be implemented to assist students who live with perpetual challenges due to frequent moves, parental and sibling deployments and transitions that include reintegration and dealing with profoundly changed parents.

Recommendation 1: The State of Virginia passed a law last year requiring the Virginia Department of Education to provide non-identifiable aggregate data on newly-enrolled military-connected students that will be made available to local, state and federal entities. Virginia’s reporting policy should be explored further as an approach that will support further the unique needs of military-connected students while also meeting ESSA reporting requirements.

Finding 3: As a state, South Carolina continues to underreport the number of military-connected students. It is important to note that based upon Act 289’s direction, this report does not address military-connected students educated in Department of Defense schools, private schools and home school settings. Data provided by the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA), indicates there were 12,335 military-connected students with at least one active duty parent in November 2015.² January 2016 data provided by the SC Department of Education (SCDE) indicates there are 7,763 military-connected students, representing a 37 percent underreporting of the DoDEA estimate. However, SCDE reported 7,308 military-connected students in 2014 and 7,763 military-connected students with an active duty parent in January 2016. This represents a six percent increase in reported military-connected students. Since the actual number of military-connected students reported by DoDEA decreased from 13,597 to 12,335, it is possible the six percent increase in military-connected students is due to improved reporting by the districts.

¹ FY 2015 SCDE data for Impact Aid was not available. Most recent SCDE data for Impact Aid was FY 2013.

² The **Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA)** is a civilian agency of the United States Department of Defense that manages all schools for military children and teenagers in the United States and also overseas at American military bases worldwide.

Recommendation 2: While there is a modest six percent increase in reporting of military-connected students, SCDE should continue its efforts to improve reporting of military connected students since 37 percent of military connected students in the state are not being reported in PowerSchool.

Finding 4: Approximately 90 percent of military-connected students attend school in the following districts: Richland 2, Berkeley, Dorchester 2, Beaufort, Lexington 1, Sumter, Kershaw, Oconee, Charleston and the SC Public Charter School District.

Finding 5: Military-connected students in South Carolina continue to outperform their peers on state-administered tests.

- On average, an additional 9.6 percent of military-connected students tested as “ready” or “exceeding” on ACT Aspire in reading, and an additional 7.8 percent of military-connected students tested as “ready” or “exceeding” on ACT Aspire in mathematics. On the science test of SCPASS the performance gap was even larger; on average an additional 12 percent of military-connected students tested as “met” or better. In eighth grade, an additional 11.9 percent of military-connected students tested as “met” or better on SCPASS science and an additional 11.3 percent of military-connected students tested as “ready” or “exceeding” on ACT Aspire reading.
- On the EOCEP tests, military-connected students continue to outperform all students statewide. However, the gap between military-connected students and all students statewide may be narrowing. The average difference between military-connected students and all students statewide is 3.8 points.

I. Recent Developments

Impact Aid Background

The Impact Aid Program was signed into law in 1950; approximately 1,300 school districts enrolling more than 11 million students receive Impact Aid funding. Impact Aid was incorporated into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1994. It reimburses school districts for the loss of local tax revenue due to the presence of the Federal Government. Federal activities reduce local taxes because Federal property is removed from the tax rolls and/or the school district is educating students with no or reduced tax revenue associated with federally-connected students. Examples of federal impaction include: military installations, Indian Trust, Treaty and Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act Lands, civil service activities such as veterans hospitals, Federal agencies and national parks, and low-rent housing properties owned by the Federal Government.

Each school district must submit an Impact Aid application annually to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE). USDE allocates funding in multiple installments until all available funds are distributed. The Impact Aid Program has not been fully funded since 1969. Local school districts can qualify for Impact Aid through various sections of the Program. States are restricted from reducing state aid for a federally-connected school district because of its receipt of Impact Aid Funding. However, if a state has a school finance formula designed to equalize expenditure for all school districts in that state, and if the state meets several other criteria, the state can reduce the amount of state funding allocated to a specific school district based on its Impact Aid payment. This equalization policy currently does not apply to South Carolina's Education Finance Act.

Section 8002 reimburses school districts that have lost significant local revenue due to federal ownership of land within school district boundaries. Section 8003 payments for federally-connected students compensate school districts for educating students whose parents or legal guardians reside and/or work on federal property, including children of members of the uniformed services, and children who reside on Native American Lands. Section 8003 is the largest component of the Impact Aid Program. Federally-connected children are defined as children whose parent(s):

- live on Indian trust, treaty land or ANSCA land,
- are members of the uniformed services and reside on a military installation,
- are members of the uniformed services but who reside off the military installation,
- reside in Federal low-rent housing (not Section 8 housing),
- both live and work on Federal property

- work or live on federal property.

Section 8003(D) provides payments to school districts for the additional costs associated with educating military and Indian Lands students with disabilities, identified as those with an active Individual Education Plan. Funding has to be spent on an IDEA-eligible activity. Section 8004 funding is available to districts with children residing on Indian Lands. Affected districts must establish Indian Policies and Procedures to ensure the school district meets certain requirements. Payments for districts to meet capital or construction needs of Federal students are allowable under Section 8007.

**Table 1
School District Eligibility for Impact Aid Funding³**

Section	Description	School District Eligibility
Section 8002 (Federal Property)	Eligible federal lands include: national parks and grasslands, national laboratories, Army Corps of Engineers projects, military testing grounds, expansions of military installations and environmental waste sites.	Property was acquired by the Federal Government after 1938 and the assessed valuation of the property, when it was acquired by the Federal Government, is at least 10% of the school district's total assessed value.
Section 8003 (Basic Support Payments for Federally-Connected Children)	A district can choose one of the following two options to count students: (1) use a USDE-approved form for counting each enrolled child or (2) use SourceCheck, a USDE-approved means of counting the members of a school district's federally-connected children. It is provided to a parent's employer, a housing officials and a tribal official.	A school district must educate at least 400 Federal students in average daily attendance or have at least a 3% average daily attendance of Federal students.
Section 8003(D) (Children with Disabilities)		Military and Indian Lands students with disabilities with an active IEP.
Section 8004 (Children Residing on Indian Lands)	Districts with children residing on Indian Lands must establish Indian Policies and Procedures to ensure district meets certain requirements.	
Section 8007 (Construction)	Payments for districts to meet capital or construction needs of Federal students.	Two different allocations: 60% is dedicated for competitive grants and 40% is allocated in formula payments to eligible school districts.

Source: National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, "The Basics of Impact Aid."

³National Association for Federally Impacted Schools, "The Basics of Impact Aid." May be accessed at: http://media.wix.com/ugd/423d5a_751601531b7c42948bf292f68a8c8a77.pdf.

Actual payments to a school district are complicated due to the program not being full funded since 1969. It is estimated there is a 45 percent unmet needs. Payments are reduced and distributed on a needs-based formula. The Learning Opportunity Threshold (LOT) is the percentage that shows how dependent a school district is on Impact Aid funding. As the LOT percentage increases, a school district's payment also increases.

School districts with a total student enrollment of fewer than 1,000 students in average daily attendance and have a per-pupil expenditure that is less than the state or national average per-pupil expenditure qualify for an automatic 40 percent of the Learning Opportunity Threshold. In addition, districts may qualify for additional funding if they are considered to be heavily impacted by the presence of the Federal government.

Using federal Fiscal Year 2014-15 USDE data, twelve school districts in South Carolina applied for Impact Aid funding under Sections 8002 and 8003.⁴ Estimated FY 2015 payments were approximately \$1.1 million. Data from the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools are included below. SCDE data are not included because the most recent data available is from Fiscal Year 2012-13.

If the Impact Aid Program was fully funded at the federal level, payments to South Carolina districts would be \$13.6 million. Total payments represented about 7,835 federally-connected students, with a majority of those students enrolled in Berkeley, Charleston, Richland 2 and Sumter school districts.

Table 2
Impact Aid Section 8003 Payment Estimates, FY 2015⁵

School District	Learning Opportunity Threshold	Estimated FY 2015 Payment	Maximum FY 2015 Payment	Total Federally-Connected Students Average Daily Attendance
Section 8002 – Federal Property Payments				
Anderson 4		\$216,608	\$3,165,436	
Section 8003 – Basic Support Payments				
Aiken	2%	\$5,019	\$308,402	368.19
Beaufort	0%			0
Berkeley	10%	\$306,137	\$3,252,767	2525.51
Charleston	4%	\$59,367	\$1,744,148	1419.06
Dorchester 2	0%			0
Florence 3	0%			0
Marion	0%			0
Richland 1	1%	\$942	\$136,912	149.72

⁴ FY 2015 SCDE data for Impact Aid was not available. Most recent SCDE data for Impact Aid was FY 2013.

⁵ National Association for Federally Impacted Schools, "2015 Blue Book (8003)." May be accessed at: http://media.wix.com/ugd/423d5a_5bc3ae0d915648a08deffe8209c850ae.pdf.

Richland 2	8%	\$174,405	\$2,344,149	1731.69
Sumter	12%	\$292,120	\$2,648,458	1554.67
Barnwell 29	40%	\$18,493	\$49,713	86.64
TOTAL		\$1,073,091	\$13,649,985	7835.48

Source: National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, "2015 Blue Book (8003)."

Every Student Succeeds Act

There have been recent changes to Impact Aid and the identification of military-connected students due to the passage of the federal Every Child Succeeds Act (ESSA) in December of 2015. Appendix B includes Impact Aid section of ESSA. ESSA requires the disaggregation of student-level data, including the identification, collection and reporting of military-connected students. ESSA also addresses Impact Aid. Funding authorization for Impact Aid is stagnant for the first three years of the four-year authorization. However, some changes to Impact Aid were made:

- technical and formula changes to federal properties that have already reduced program subjectivity and increased timeliness of payments were made permanent;
- the Federal Properties "lockout" provision that prevented eligible federally-impacted school districts from accessing Impact Aid funding was eliminated;
- adjusted the Basic Support formula to ensure equal proration when appropriations are sufficient to fund the Learning Opportunity Threshold;
- included a hold harmless provision to provide budget certainty to school districts facing a funding cliff or significant changes to their federally-connected student enrollment.⁶

ESSA also requires the state identification, collection and reporting of military-connected students in Title I, Part A, Section 1011:

"(ii) For all students and disaggregated by each subgroup of students described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(xi), homeless status, status as a child in foster care, and status as a student with a parent who is a member of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code) on active duty (as defined in section 101(d)(5) of such title), information on student achievement on the academic assessments described in subsection (b)(2) at each level of achievement, as determined by the State under subsection (b)(1).⁷

⁶ National Conference of State Legislatures, "Summary of the Every Student Succeeds Act, Legislation Reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act." May be accessed at: http://www.ncsl.org/documents/capitolforum/2015/onlineresources/summary_12_10.pdf.

⁷ Every Student Succeeds Act. May be accessed at: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1177/text#HBCB1043F254B467C880CA4632EB8661D>.

This federal requirement will provide more consistent, easily identifiable data regarding military-connected students with a parent on active duty. As student identification improves, additional supports may be put into place to assist students who live with perpetual challenges presented by frequent moves, parental and sibling deployments, and transitions that include reintegration and dealing with profoundly changed parents. The well-being of these children depends heavily on a network of supportive adults who are trained to identify early signs of emotional or physical challenge.

Virginia – Model Reporting Policy

States have started to improve their identification and reporting on military-connected students. The State of Virginia passed a law last year requiring the Virginia Department of Education to provide non-identifiable aggregate data on newly-enrolled uniformed services-connected students that will be made available to local, state, and federal entities. The primary purpose of the law is to meet the needs of military-connected students. It will also be helpful for districts to determine their eligibility for non-general fund and Impact Aid funding. Appendix C includes the Virginia law.

A "uniformed services-connected student" is defined as a student enrolled in a public school whose parent is serving in either (i) the active component of the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Services or (ii) the reserve component of the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Guard.

The Virginia Department of Education student records collection system provides the mechanism for identifying uniformed services-connected students. A field was added to the student records collection system for identification of uniformed services-connected students. Beginning fall 2015, the Virginia Department of Education provides non-identifiable aggregate data on uniformed services-connected students available to local, state, and federal entities for the purposes of becoming eligible for non-general fund sources and receiving services to meet the needs of uniformed services-connected students. Uniformed services-connected students are not an "accountability subgroup," and the new law expressly prohibits the use of the data on such students for the purposes of student achievement, the Standards of Accreditation, student-growth indicators, the school performance report card, or any other school rating system. The military student identifier does not take the place of Impact Aid collection in Virginia. Since Impact Aid requires more extensive information than the identifier, Virginia determined it would be "overly burdensome" to require all school districts to ask the more detailed Impact Aid questions.⁸

⁸ Luchau, Melissa; Virginia Department of Education. "Implementing Virginia's Military Student Identifier." May be accessed at:

While the federal Every Student Succeeds Act requires the identification and collection of military-connected student data, South Carolina has an established mechanism for collecting this information. The South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) manages PowerSchool, the student identification system that is provided to school districts. It is the primary source for student data and is often used for state and federal reporting requirements. In PowerSchool, a “Parent Military Status” field includes a drop-down list with eight possible student status options:

- (blank) – Neither Parent nor Guardian is serving in any military service.
- 01 – A Parent or Guardian is serving in the National Guard but is not deployed.
- 02 – A Parent or Guardian is serving in the Reserves but is not deployed.
- 03 – A Parent or Guardian is serving in the National Guard and is currently deployed.
- 04 – A Parent or Guardian is serving in the Reserves and is currently deployed.
- 05 – A Parent or Guardian is serving in the military on active duty but is not deployed.
- 06 – A Parent or Guardian is serving in the military on active duty and is currently deployed.
- 07 – The student’s Parent or Guardian died while on active duty within the last year.
- 08 – The student’s Parent or Guardian was wounded while on active duty within the last year.⁹

This field remains unchanged from the 2014-15 school year. In last year’s report, the EOC recommended this field be revised to reflect criteria for qualification for federal impact aid and provide more information regarding students that may be helpful for district and school staff. In a previous section, Virginia’s approach to a state-assigned code to identify military-connected students was discussed. Virginia’s student data system includes three codes for military-connected students:

- 1 = student is not military connected
- 2 = Active duty; student is a dependent of a member of the Active Duty Forces (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Services)
- 3 = Reserve; student is a dependent of a member of the National Guard or Reserve Forces (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Guard).¹⁰

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/student_family/military/va_council/meetings/2015/092915_military_id_entifier_implementation.pdf.

⁹ SC Department of Education, “PowerSchool Data Collection Manual, January Update 2015-16.” May be accessed at: http://www.ed.sc.gov/scdoe/assets/File/data/information-systems/power-school/SC_PS_Data%20Collection-Specific_Fields_Combos_Jan%202016%20Update.pdf.

¹⁰Luchau, Melissa; Virginia Department of Education. “Implementing Virginia’s Military Student Identifier.” May be accessed at:

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/student_family/military/va_council/meetings/2015/092915_military_id_entifier_implementation.pdf.

If accurately and consistently entered, SCDE's "Parent Military Status" field appears to provide additional information that is not collected in Virginia's student data system. However, by state law, Virginia requires the data be entered three times during the school year – fall, spring and end-of-year. Currently, South Carolina does not have a state law that requires the collection and entry of military-connected student data.

II. Military-Connected Student Population

National, state and local district collection of military-connected student data is inconsistent. ESSA requires the disaggregation of student-level data, including military-connected students. When this requirement is fully implemented, data collection should become more consistent and accurate. As a state, South Carolina continues to underreport the number of military-connected students. Data provided by the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA), indicates there were 12,335 military-connected students with at least one active-duty parent in November 2015.¹¹ January 2016 data provided by the SC Department of Education (SCDE) indicates there are 7,763 military-connected students, representing a 37 percent underreporting of the DoDEA estimate. However, SCDE reported 7,308 military-connected students in 2014 and 7,763 military-connected students with an active duty parent in January 2016. Appendix D provides more detail about number of military-connected students by school district. This represents a six percent increase in reported military-connected students. Since the actual number of military-connected students reported by DODEA decreased from 13,597 to 12,335, it is possible the six percent increase in military-connected students is due to improved reporting by the districts.

Table 3
Estimated Number of Military-Connected Students
with Active-Duty Parent, 2012-2016

Active Duty	Sept. 2012 DODEA	Nov. 2015 DODEA	2016 SCDE	2014 SCDE
Air Force	3,826	4,766		
Army	5,855	3,832	7,763	7,308
Marines	1,980	2,275		
Navy	1,936	1,462		
TOTAL	13,597	12,335	7,763	7,308

Sources: SC Department of Education; DoDEA

As of January 2016, approximately 957 military-connected students have at least one parent who is deployed, including National Guard, Reserves and active duty military personnel. In addition, 26 military-connected students were reported to have a parent who was on active duty but died within the last year; another 39 military-connected students have a parent who was on active duty and wounded within the last year. Improved reporting of this data is needed so district and school staff can identify students who may need additional support services. As noted in the prior section, military-connected students live with perpetual challenges presented by frequent moves, parental and sibling deployments, and additional transitions that include reintegration and dealing with profoundly changed parents. The well-being of these children

¹¹ The Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) is a civilian agency of the United States Department of Defense that manages all schools for military children and teenagers in the United States and also overseas at American military bases worldwide.

depends heavily on a network of supportive adults who are trained to identify early signs of emotional or physical challenge. Appendix A provides a list of resources for military-connected students and families.

Table 4
Military-Connected Students,
by Parental Military Branch and Deployment Status, January 2016

Military Connection	Number	Percent
National Guard - Not Deployed	835	8.72
Reserves - Not Deployed	716	7.48
National Guard - Deployed	164	1.71
Reserves - Deployed	94	0.98
Active Duty Military - Not Deployed	6,999	73.12
Active Duty Military - Deployed	699	7.30
Active Duty Military - Deceased in last year	26	0.27
Active Duty Military - Wounded in last year	39	0.41
Total	9,572	

Source: SC Department of Education

Of the 9,572 military-connected students (including active duty, Reserves and National Guard) reported by school districts to SCDE, approximately 90 percent of the students attend one of the ten school districts in Table 5 included below. South Carolina's largest military installations are located in Charleston, Beaufort, Richland and Sumter counties.

The Charleston Air Force Base and the Naval Weapons Station in Goose Creek comprise Joint Base Charleston (JBC). Joint Base Charleston is one of 12 DoD Joint Bases and is host to over 60 DoD and Federal agencies. The 628th Air Base Wing delivers installation support to a total force of over 90,000 Airmen, Sailors, Soldiers, Marines, Coast Guardsmen, civilians, dependents, and retirees across four installations including Charleston AFB and Naval Weapons Station Charleston. The base maintains \$7.5 billion in base property and capital assets spanning three seaports, two civilian-military airfields, 38 miles of rail, and 22 miles of coastline total almost 24,000 acres. A few unique programs include operation of three locomotives critical to moving crucial munitions, MRAPS, and tanks, as well as participation in the Global Threat Reduction Initiative. Joint Base Charleston also offers unique installation support missions including the Harbor Security Patrol, the Transportable Isolation System (TIS), and the Cooper River Dredging.¹²

¹² Accessed at: <http://www.charleston.af.mil/units/index.asp>.

Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, home of the Marine Corps' Atlantic Coast fixed-wing, fighter-attack aircraft assets, is located in the heart of the South Carolina Lowcountry and is among the United States military's most important and most historically colorful installations. Consisting of some 6,900 acres 70 miles southwest of Charleston, South Carolina on Highway 21, the installation is home to seven Marine Corps F/A- 18 squadrons. Two additional Navy F/A-18 squadrons joined the Fighbertown community in March 2000, strengthening the installation's economic contribution to the local area. Three versions of the F/A-18 Hornet are found aboard MCAS Beaufort, the F/A-18 Hornet A/Cs and the F/A-18 D.¹³ The Marine Corps Recruit Depot is located nearby at Parris Island, which is also located in Beaufort County.

Both Fort Jackson and Shaw Air Force Base are located in the Midlands. Located in Richland County, Fort Jackson is the Army's main production center for Basic Combat Training. Approximately 50 percent of the Army's Basic Combat Training is completed at Fort Jackson, with more than 36,000 troops trained each year. Fort Jackson is home to the U.S. Army Soldier Support Institute, the Armed Forces Army Chaplaincy Center and School, the National Center for Credibility Assessment (formerly the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute), and the Drill Sergeant School, which trains all Active Duty and Reserve instructors.

Located about 40 miles east of Columbia, South Carolina, Shaw Air Force Base, S.C., is home to the 20th Fighter Wing, and headquarters, Ninth Air Force, U.S. Air Forces Central, Third Army and U.S. Army Central. The 20th FW is a unit of Ninth AF and Air Combat Command. With responsibility for the installation as host unit, the 20th FW supports nearly 30 associated units. The base is located on more than 3,569 acres within the city limits of Sumter, S.C. The base also has custodial responsibility for approximately 12,500 acres at Poinsett Electronic Combat Range Complex southwest of Sumter and for 23.5 leased acres at the Lake Wateree Recreational Area, 38 miles northwest of Sumter, near Camden, S.C.¹⁴

Table 5
School Districts with the Largest Military-Connected Student Populations, 2015 - 2016

District	Number	Percent of Students Statewide
Richland 2	1,985	20.7
Berkeley	1,627	17.0
Dorchester 2	1,600	16.7
Beaufort	1,055	11.0
Lexington 1	897	9.4
Sumter	651	6.8
Kershaw	310	3.2
Oconee	164	1.7
Charleston	162	1.7

¹³ Accessed at: <http://www.beaufort.marines.mil/About.aspx>.

¹⁴ Accessed at: <http://www.shaw.af.mil/AboutUs/FactSheets/Display/tabid/6148/Article/663885/shaw-air-force-base.aspx>.

SC Public Charter School District	140	1.5
Total	8,591	

Source: SC Department of Education

III. Military-Connected Student Performance

This section provides academic and attendance data for military-connected students for school year 2014-15 including:

- student achievement as measured by the ACT Aspire for third through eighth grades in English language arts and mathematics;
- student achievement as measured by SCPASS on science for students in grade four through eight;
- student achievement as measured by the End-Of-Course Evaluation Program (EOCEP);
- high school graduation rates; and
- student attendance.

Academic Data

The academic achievement of military-connected students was compared to the academic achievement of all students in South Carolina for students in third through eighth grades with ACT Aspire for reading and mathematics and SCPASS for science. For high school students, student performance on the South Carolina End-of-Course Evaluation Program (EOCEP) was considered.

Student Achievement in Grades Three through Eight

According to the company's website, ACT Aspire is a "vertically aligned system of summative and periodic assessments" linked to ACT's College and Career Readiness Benchmarks and predicts a student's performance on the ACT, the college readiness assessment.¹⁵ The test measures student's readiness for college in five areas: English, math, reading, science, and writing.

Military-connected students performed significantly better than their peers in reading, mathematics and science. On average, an additional 9.6 percent of military-connected students tested as "ready" or "exceeding" on ACT Aspire in reading, and an additional 7.8 percent of military-connected students tested as "ready" or "exceeding" on ACT Aspire in mathematics. On the science test of SCPASS the performance gap was even larger; on average an additional 12 percent of military-connected students tested as "met" or better. In eighth grade, an additional 11.9 percent of military-connected students tested as "met" or better on SCPASS science and an additional 11.3 percent of military-connected students tested as "ready" or "exceeding" on ACT Aspire reading.

¹⁵ <http://www.act.org/content/act/en/products-and-services/act-aspire.html>

Table 6
Performance of Military-Connected Students (MCS) Compared to Statewide Average on
State-Administered Tests, 2014-15

Grade Level	ACT Aspire Reading				ACT Aspire Mathematics			
	Number MCS Tested	Percent MCS Ready or Exceeding	State Percent Ready or Exceeding	Difference	Number MCS Math	Percent Ready or Exceeding	State Percent Ready or Exceeding	Difference
3	825	41.6	31.8	9.8	827	69.2	58.0	11.2
4	786	43.4	32.8	10.6	787	59.3	49.4	9.9
5	669	42.6	33.6	9.0	668	58.2	48.2	10.0
6	737	45.9	36.9	9.0	736	57.1	53.2	3.9
7	677	44.6	36.9	7.7	677	40.9	36.4	7.5
8	657	58.0	46.7	11.3	655	39.2	32.0	7.2

Source: SC Department of Education

SCPASS Science				
Grade Level	Number MCS Science	Percent Met or Above	State Percent Met or Above	Difference
4	789	82.9	69.9	13.0
5	667	78.9	66.3	12.6
6	737	75.0	63.6	11.4
7	676	79.3	68.2	11.1
8	656	77.1	65.2	11.9

Source: SC Department of Education

Student Performance in End of Course Exams

In 2014, the mean score for military-connected students was typically six points higher than the mean score for all South Carolina students. On the EOCEP tests, military-connected students continue to outperform all students statewide. However, the gap between military-connected students and all students statewide may be narrowing. The average difference between military-connected students and all students statewide is 3.8 points.

Table 7
End-of-Course Assessment Performance of
Military Connected Students and All Students in South Carolina

Academic Year	Military Connected Students			All South Carolina Students	
	Number of Students	Mean	Letter Grade	Mean	Letter Grade
Algebra 1					
2013	398	83.5	C	78.2	C
2014	535	85.7	B	79.8	C
2015	668	85.7	B	82.6	C
English 1					
2013	350	81.3	C	75.3	D
2014	537	82.2	C	76.0	D
2015	636	83.6	C	79.4	C
Biology					
2013	310	84.2	C	78.1	C
2014	451	85.4	B	79.2	C
2015	580	86.5	B	82.3	B

Source: SC Department of Education

High School Graduation Rate

The federally-approved way of computing a graduation rate is to identify a cohort of students who were ninth grade students in a specific year and calculate the percentage of that cohort that graduates three years later. Students are removed from the cohort when they transfer to other degree-granting institutions or programs. Students who transfer into a district are added to the cohort.

For military-connected students this process was not possible because enrollment history of these students was not available. The EOC evaluation team could not know when students were initially in the ninth grade and could not document transfers into or out of a cohort of students who were initially in the ninth grade three years prior. Available data identifies students by grade level and graduation status. For students who were identified as being in

twelfth grade during the 2014-15 timeframe, the EOC evaluation team could identify: (1) those students who graduated, (2) those who received a certificate or did not graduate, and (3) those students who transferred to other degree-granting institutions and were removed from the graduation cohort. Based on this information, the graduation rates for military-connected students are included below.

Table 8
Four-Year High School Graduation Rates for Military-Connected Students (MCS) and
Statewide Graduation Rates

Year	Total Number of MCS	Percent MCS Graduates	State Four Year Graduation Rate
2013	237	96.5	77.5
2014	309	97.4	80.1
2015	407	95.3	80.3

Attendance Data

Student attendance rates were computed using information provided by SCDE. Within any year, the number of students reported by school districts as military connected with an active duty parent is only 63 percent of the number reported by the Defense Manpower Data Center. The average percent of school days absent for all districts that reported military-connected students is 4.2 percent. There are nine districts with at least 30 reported military-connected students who average more than 4.2 percent absent days; these districts are shaded in the table below. At 5.6 percent, Spartanburg 7 reports the highest absence rate and Florence 1 has the lowest absence rate.

Table 9
Percent of Days Absent in School Districts with
at least 30 Military-Connected Students

District	Number of MCS Students	Percent of Days Absent
Average for All Districts	9571	4.2
Spartanburg 7	30	5.6
Colleton	65	5.1
Greenville	58	5.0
Aiken	83	4.9
Pickens	127	4.8
Beaufort	1054	4.8
Charleston	162	4.5
Kershaw	310	4.4
Dorchester	1600	4.3
Berkeley	1627	4.2
Hampton 1	74	4.1
Lexington 1	897	4.0
Sumter	651	3.9
Oconee	164	3.9
Edgefield	62	3.8
Richland 2	1985	3.8
Richland 1	89	3.7
Horry	56	3.4
SC Public Charter School District	140	3.1

Appendix A Resources for Military-Connected Students and Families

The Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) is a civilian agency of the United States Department of Defense that manages all schools for military children and teenagers in the United States and also overseas at American military bases worldwide. This information is also helpful for local school districts to understand the needs of students and how to support them in a comprehensive manner. DoDEA's Website "Keeping Students at the Center" <http://slmodules.dodea.edu/>.

School Liaison Officers serve as a primary point of contact for students and their families transitioning to new communities and schools. They are also a resource for schools and school districts. To view a list of school liaison officers by branch, go to <http://www.dodea.edu/Partnership/schoolLiaisonOfficers.cfm>. Below is a list of additional information regarding school liaison officers by installation:

Fort

Jackson: http://www.fortjacksonmwr.com/school_liaison and http://www.militaryinstallations.dod.mil/MOS/f?p=MI:CONTENT:0:::P4_INST_ID,P4_CONTENT_TITLE,P4_CONTENT_EKMT_ID,P4_CONTENT_DIRECTORY:4210,Education,30.90.120.30.30.0.0.0.0,12

Beaufort: <http://www.mccs-sc.com/mil-fam/slp.shtml> and http://www.militaryinstallations.dod.mil/MOS/f?p=MI:CONTENT:0:::P4_INST_ID,P4_CONTENT_TITLE,P4_CONTENT_EKMT_ID,P4_CONTENT_DIRECTORY:4240,Education,30.90.120.30.30.0.0.0.0,12.

Joint Base Charleston: <http://www.charleston.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123469714> and http://www.militaryinstallations.dod.mil/MOS/f?p=MI:CONTENT:0:::P4_INST_ID,P4_CONTENT_TITLE,P4_CONTENT_EKMT_ID,P4_CONTENT_DIRECTORY:7195,Education,30.90.120.30.30.0.0.0.0,12.

Shaw Air Force

Base: http://www.militaryinstallations.dod.mil/MOS/f?p=MI:CONTENT:0:::P4_INST_ID,P4_CONTENT_TITLE,P4_CONTENT_EKMT_ID,P4_CONTENT_DIRECTORY:4270,Education,30.90.120.30.30.0.0.0.0,12

Military Impacted School Association is a national organization of school superintendents. MISA supports school districts with a high concentration of military children by providing detailed, comprehensive information regarding impact aid and resources for families and schools.

<http://militaryimpactedschoolsassociation.org/>

The **Military Interstate Children's Compact Commission (MIC3)** provides consistent policy in every school district and in every state that voluntarily joins MIC3. MIC3 addresses key

educational transition issues such as enrollment, placement, attendance, eligibility and graduation.

<http://www.mic3.net>

For more information about South Carolina's role in MIC3, go to <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/lpa/mic.cfm>.

South Carolina Military Kids is part of the National OMK initiative designated to provide support to the children and youth of families that are impacted by global contingency operations. This includes those served by Army installations, Air Force, Navy and Marine bases, and those families, children and youth who are geographically dispersed.

https://www.clemson.edu/extension/4h/kids_families/militarypartners/

The **Military Child Education Coalition (MCEC)** focuses on ensuring quality educational opportunities for all military children affected by mobility, family separation, and transition. A 501(c)(3) non-profit, world-wide organization, the MCEC performs research, develops resources, conducts professional institutes and conferences, and develops and publishes resources for all constituencies.

www.militarychild.org

Military OneSource is a confidential Department of Defense-funded program providing comprehensive information on every aspect of military life at no cost to active duty, National Guard, and reserve members, and their families.

Information includes, but is not limited to, deployment, reunion, relationships, grief, spouse employment and education, parenting and childhood services. It is a virtual extension to installation services.

The program also provides free resources to schools, including books and videos with relevant topics that help students cope with divorce and deployment.

www.militaryonesource.mil

South Carolina Programs

The **International Baccalaureate** Program helps students develop skills to create a better and peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect. For more information, including a list of South Carolina schools participating in the IB Program, go to <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/programs-services/127/>.

Four-year-old kindergarten is available in the state and is offered in public schools and private child care centers. State-funded prekindergarten for four-year-olds serves children in the “most

at-risk” category, where family income falls 185% below poverty level or the family is Medicaid eligible. Families may also be eligible for other services such as Even Start, Head Start, state-funded family literacy programs, Social Security, food stamps, Medicaid or temporary assistance to needy families (TANF).

Children also qualify in case of a documented developmental delay, an Individual Education Plan (IEP) requiring pre-kindergarten, incarceration of a parent, placement in a foster home, or a child who is homeless. Documentation of family or child “most at-risk” conditions must be kept on file for review. Children who participate in free and reduced meal programs at the center/school they attend may also qualify, if income eligibility is verified on each child and records are kept on file for review.

Some districts use local funds to serve children who are not in the “at risk” category. Several districts serve all children who request services. A few districts charge a fee for non-qualifying children, but state regulations prohibit any fees for “at risk” children.

State law says that “students may enter kindergarten in the public schools of this State if they will attain the age of four on or before September first of the applicable school year.”

Appendix B

Impact Aid Section of Every Student Succeeds Act

TITLE VII—IMPACT AID

SEC. 7001. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) **IMPACT AID IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2012.**—Section 563(c) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1748; 20 U.S.C. 6301 note) (also known as the “Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012”), as amended by section 563 of division A of Public Law 113–291, is amended—(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (4); and (2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3), as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(b) **REPEAL.**—Section 309 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76; 20 U.S.C. 7702 note) is repealed.

(c) **TITLE VII REDESIGNATIONS.**—Title VIII (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) is redesignated as title VII and further amended—(1) by redesignating sections 8001 through 8005 as sections 7001 through 7005, respectively; and
(2) by redesignating sections 8007 through 8014 as sections 7007 through 7014, respectively.

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Title VII (as redesignated by subsection (c) of this section) is further amended—

(1) by striking “section 8002” each place it appears and inserting “section 7002”; (2) by striking “section 8003” each place it appears and inserting “section 7003”; (3) by striking “section 8003(a)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7003(a)(1)”; (4) by striking “section 8003(a)(1)(C)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7003(a)(1)(C)”; (5) by striking “section 8003(a)(2)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7003(a)(2)”; (6) by striking “section 8003(b)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7003(b)”; (7) by striking “section 8003(b)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7003(b)(1)”; (8) by striking “section 8003(b)(2)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7003(b)(2)”; (9) by striking “section 8014(a)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7014(a)”; (10) by striking “section 8014(b)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7014(b)”; and (11) by striking “section 8014(e)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7014(d)”.

SEC. 7002. PURPOSE.

Section 7001, as redesignated by section 7001 of this Act, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “challenging State standards” and inserting “the same challenging State academic standards”.

SEC. 7003. PAYMENTS RELATING TO FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.

Section 7002, as redesignated and amended by section 7001 of this Act, is further amended—(1) in subsection (a)(1)(C), by striking the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting the following: “(C) had an assessed value according to original records (including facsimiles or other reproductions of those records) documenting the assessed value of such property (determined as of the time or times when so acquired) prepared by the local officials referred to in subsection

(b)(3) or, when such original records are not available due to unintentional destruction (such as natural disaster, fire, flooding, pest infestation, or deterioration due to age), other records, including Federal agency records, local historical records, or other records that the Secretary determines to be appropriate and reliable, aggregating 10 percent or more of the assessed value of—”; (2) in subsection (b)— (A) in paragraph (1)(C) by striking “section 8003(b)(1)(C)” and inserting “section 7003(b)(1)(C)”; (B) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following: “(B) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of Federal property eligible under this section that is within the boundaries of 2 or more local educational agencies that are eligible under this section, any of such agencies may ask the Secretary to calculate (and the Secretary shall calculate) the taxable value of the eligible Federal property that is within its boundaries by— “(i) first calculating the per-acre value of the eligible Federal property separately for each eligible local educational agency that shared the Federal property, as provided in subparagraph (A)(ii); “(ii) then averaging the resulting per-acre values of the eligible Federal property from each eligible local educational agency that shares the Federal property; and “(iii) then applying the average per-acre value to determine the total taxable value of the eligible Federal property under subparagraph (A)(iii) for the requesting local educational agency.”; (3) in subsection (e)(2), by adding at the end the following: “For each fiscal year beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act, the Secretary shall treat S. 1177—275 local educational agencies chartered in 1871 having more than 70 percent of the county in Federal ownership as meeting the eligibility requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (C) of subsection (a)(1).”; (4) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following: “(f) SPECIAL RULE.—For each fiscal year beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act, a local educational agency shall be deemed to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(1)(C) if the agency was eligible under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 8002(f) as such section was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act.”; (5) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following: “(g) FORMER DISTRICTS.— “(1) CONSOLIDATIONS.—For fiscal year 2006 and each succeeding fiscal year, if a local educational agency described in paragraph (2) is formed at any time after 1938 by the consolidation of 2 or more former school districts, the local educational agency may elect to have the Secretary determine its eligibility for assistance under this section for any fiscal year on the basis of 1 or more of those former districts, as designated by the local educational agency. “(2) ELIGIBLE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—A local educational agency referred to in paragraph (1) is— “(A) any local educational agency that, for fiscal year 1994 or any preceding fiscal year, applied, and was determined to be eligible under, section 2(c) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Congress) as that section was in effect for that fiscal year; or “(B) a local educational agency— “(i) that was formed by the consolidation of 2 or more districts, at least 1 of which was eligible for assistance under this section for the fiscal year preceding the year of the consolidation; and “(ii) which includes the designation referred to in paragraph (1) in its application under section 7005 for a fiscal year beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act or any timely amendment to such application. “(3) AMOUNT.—A local educational agency eligible under paragraph (1) shall receive a foundation payment as provided for under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (h)(1), except

that the foundation payment shall be calculated based on the most recent payment received by the local educational agency based on its status prior to consolidation.”; (6) in subsection (h)(4), by striking “For each local educational agency that received a payment under this section for fiscal year 2010 through the fiscal year in which the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012 is enacted” and inserting “For each local educational agency that received a payment under this section for fiscal year 2010 or any succeeding fiscal year”; (7) by repealing subsections (k) and (m); (8) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (j); (9) in subsection (j) (as redesignated by paragraph (8)), by striking “(h)(4)(B)” and inserting “(h)(2)”; (10) by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (k); and S. 1177—276 (11) in subsection (k)(1) (as redesignated by paragraph (10)), by striking “section 8013(5)(C)(iii)” and inserting “section 7013(5)(C)(iii)”.

SEC. 7004. PAYMENTS FOR ELIGIBLE FEDERALLY CONNECTED CHILDREN.

Section 7003, as redesignated and amended by section 7001 of this Act, is further amended— (1) in subsection (a)(5)(A), by striking “to be children” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “or under lease of off-base property under subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, to be children described under paragraph (1)(B), if the property described is— “(i) within the fenced security perimeter of the military facility; or “(ii) attached to, and under any type of force protection agreement with, the military installation upon which such housing is situated.”; (2) in subsection (b)—(A) in paragraph (1)—(i) by striking subparagraph (E); and (ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively; (B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraphs (B) through (H) and inserting the following: “(B) ELIGIBILITY FOR HEAVILY IMPACTED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—“(i) IN GENERAL.—A heavily impacted local educational agency is eligible to receive a basic support payment under subparagraph (A) with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (a)(1) if the agency—“(I) is a local educational agency—“(aa) whose boundaries are the same as a Federal military installation or an island property designated by the Secretary of the Interior to be property that is held in trust by the Federal Government; and “(bb) that has no taxing authority; “(II) is a local educational agency that—“(aa) has an enrollment of children described in subsection (a)(1) that constitutes a percentage of the total student enrollment of the agency that is not less than 45 percent; “(bb) has a per-pupil expenditure that is less than—“(AA) for an agency that has a total student enrollment of 500 or more students, 125 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure of the State in which the agency is located; or “(BB) for any agency that has a total student enrollment of less than 500 students, 150 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure of the State in which the agency is located or the average per-pupil S. 1177—277 expenditure of 3 or more comparable local educational agencies in the State in which the agency is located; and “(cc) is an agency that has a tax rate for general fund purposes that is not less than 95 percent of the average tax rate for general fund purposes of comparable local educational agencies in the State; “(III) is a local educational agency that—“(aa) has a tax rate for general fund purposes which is not less than 125 percent of the average tax rate for general fund purposes for comparable local educational agencies in the State; and “(bb)(AA) has an enrollment of children described in subsection (a)(1) that constitutes a percentage of the total student enrollment of the agency that is not less than 30 percent; or “(BB) has an enrollment of

children described in subsection (a)(1) that constitutes a percentage of the total student enrollment

of the agency that is not less than 20 percent, and for the 3 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, the average enrollment of children who are not described in subsection (a)(1) and who are

eligible for a free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act constitutes a percentage of the total student enrollment of the agency that is not less than 65 percent; “(IV) is a local educational agency that has a total student enrollment of not less than 25,000 students, of which—“(aa) not less than 50 percent are children described in subsection (a)(1); and “(bb) not less than 5,000 of such children are children described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1); or “(V) is a local educational agency that—“(aa) has an enrollment of children described in subsection (a)(1) including, for purposes of determining eligibility, those children described in subparagraphs (F) and (G) of such subsection, that is not less than 35 percent of the total student enrollment of the

agency; “(bb) has a per-pupil expenditure described in subclause (II)(bb) (except that a local educational agency with a total student enrollment of less than 350 students shall be deemed to have satisfied such per-pupil expenditure requirement) and has a tax rate for general fund purposes which is not less than 95 percent of the average tax rate for general fund purposes for comparable local educational agencies in the State; and “(cc) was eligible to receive assistance under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2001. “(ii) LOSS OF ELIGIBILITY.—“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), a heavily impacted local educational agency that met the requirements of clause (i) for a fiscal year shall be ineligible to receive a basic support payment under subparagraph (A) if the agency fails

to meet the requirements of clause (i) for a subsequent fiscal year, except that such agency shall continue to receive a basic support payment under this paragraph for the fiscal year for which the ineligibility determination is made.

“(II) LOSS OF ELIGIBILITY DUE TO FALLING BELOW 95 PERCENT OF THE AVERAGE TAX RATE FOR GENERAL FUND PURPOSES.—In the case of a heavily impacted local educational agency described in subclause (II) or (V) of clause (i) that is eligible to receive a basic support payment under subparagraph (A), but that has had, for 2 consecutive fiscal years, a tax rate for general fund purposes that falls below 95 percent of the average tax rate for general fund purposes of comparable local educational agencies in the State, such agency shall be determined to be ineligible under clause

(i) and ineligible to receive a basic support payment under subparagraph (A) for each fiscal year succeeding such 2 consecutive fiscal years for which the agency has such a tax rate for general fund purposes, and until the fiscal year for which the agency resumes such eligibility in accordance with clause (iii).

“(III) TAKEN OVER BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION.—

In the case of a heavily impacted local educational agency that is eligible to receive a basic support payment under subparagraph (A), but that has been taken over by a State board of education in any 2 previous years, such agency shall be deemed to maintain heavily impacted status for 2 fiscal years following the date of enactment

of the Every Student Succeeds Act.

“(iii) RESUMPTION OF ELIGIBILITY.—A heavily impacted local educational agency described in clause (i) that becomes ineligible under such clause for 1 or more fiscal years may resume eligibility for a basic support payment under this paragraph for a subsequent fiscal year only if the agency meets the requirements of clause (i) for that subsequent fiscal year, except that

such agency shall not receive a basic support payment under this paragraph until the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which the eligibility determination is made.

“(C) MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR HEAVILY IMPACTED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—S. 1177—279

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), the maximum amount that a heavily impacted local educational agency is eligible to receive under this paragraph for any fiscal year is the sum of the total weighted student units, as computed under subsection (a)(2) and subject to clause (ii), multiplied by the greater of—

“(I) four-fifths of the average per-pupil expenditure of the State in which the local educational agency is located for the third fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made; or “(II) four-fifths of the average per-pupil expenditure of all of the States for the third fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made. “(ii) CALCULATION OF WEIGHTED STUDENT UNITS.—“(I) IN GENERAL.—“(aa) PERCENTAGE ENROLLMENT.—For a local educational agency in which 35 percent or more of the total student enrollment of the schools of the agency are children described in subparagraph (D) or (E) (or a combination thereof) of subsection (a)(1), and that has an enrollment of children described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of such subsection equal to at least 10 percent of the agency’s total enrollment, the Secretary shall calculate the weighted student units of those children described in subparagraph (D) or (E) of such subsection by multiplying the number of such children by a factor of 0.55. “(bb) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding item (aa), a local educational agency that received a payment under this paragraph for fiscal year 2013 shall not be required to have an enrollment of children described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (a)(1) equal to at least 10 percent of the agency’s total enrollment and shall be eligible for the student weight as provided for in item (aa).

“(II) ENROLLMENT OF 100 OR FEWER CHILDREN.—

For a local educational agency that has an enrollment of 100 or fewer children described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall calculate the total number of weighted student units for purposes of subsection (a)(2) by multiplying the number of such children by a factor of 1.75.

“(III) ENROLLMENT OF MORE THAN 100 CHILDREN BUT LESS THAN 1000.—For a local educational agency that is not described under subparagraph (B)(i)(I) and has an enrollment of more than 100 but not more than 1,000 children described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall calculate the total number of weighted student units for purposes of subsection (a)(2) by multiplying the number of such children by a factor of 1.25.

“(D) MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR LARGE HEAVILY IMPACTED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—“(I) FORMULA.—Subject to clause (ii), the maximum amount that a heavily impacted local educational agency described in subclause (II) is eligible to receive under this paragraph for any fiscal year shall be determined in accordance with the formula described in paragraph (1)(C).

“(II) HEAVILY IMPACTED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—A heavily impacted local educational agency described in this subclause is a local educational agency that has a total student enrollment of not less than 25,000 students, of which not less than 50 percent are children described in subsection (a)(1) and not less than 5,000 of such children are children described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1). “(ii) FACTOR.—For purposes of calculating the maximum amount described in clause (i), the factor used in determining the weighted student units under subsection (a)(2) with respect to children described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1) shall be 1.35.

“(E) DATA.—For purposes of providing assistance under this paragraph, the Secretary shall use student, revenue,

expenditure, and tax data from the third fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the local educational agency

is applying for assistance under this paragraph.

“(F) DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE TAX RATES FOR GENERAL FUND PURPOSES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), for the purpose of determining the average tax rates for general fund purposes for local educational agencies in a State under this paragraph, the Secretary shall use either—

“(I) the average tax rate for general fund purposes for comparable local educational agencies, as determined by the Secretary in regulations; or “(II) the average tax rate of all the local educational agencies in the State. “(ii) FISCAL YEARS 2010–2015.—“(I) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal years 2010 through 2015, any local educational agency that

was found ineligible to receive a payment under subparagraph (A) because the Secretary determined that it failed to meet the average tax rate requirement for general fund purposes in subparagraph (B)(i)(II)(cc), shall be considered to have met that requirement, if its State determined, through an alternate calculation of average tax rates for

general fund purposes, that such local educational agency met that requirement. “(II) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS AFTER 2015.— For any succeeding fiscal year after 2015, any local educational agency identified in subclause

S. 1177–281 (I) may continue to have its State use that alternate methodology to calculate whether the average

tax rate requirement for general fund purposes under subparagraph (B)(i)(II)(cc) is met.

“(III) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law limiting the period during which the Secretary may obligate funds appropriated for any fiscal year after 2012, the Secretary shall reserve a total of \$14,000,000 from funds that remain unobligated under this section from fiscal years 2015 or 2016 in order to make payments under this clause for fiscal years 2011 through 2014.

“(G) ELIGIBILITY FOR HEAVILY IMPACTED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AFFECTED BY PRIVATIZATION OF MILITARY HOUSING.—

“(i) ELIGIBILITY.—For any fiscal year, a heavily impacted local educational agency that received a basic support payment under this paragraph for the prior fiscal year, but is ineligible for such payment for the current fiscal year under subparagraph (B) due to the conversion of military housing units to private housing described in clause (iii), or as the direct result of base realignment and closure or modularization as determined by the Secretary of Defense and force structure change or force relocation, shall be deemed to meet the eligibility requirements under subparagraph (B) for the period during which the housing units are undergoing such conversion or during such time as activities associated with base closure and realignment, modularization, force structure change, or force relocation are ongoing.

“(ii) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of a payment to a heavily impacted local educational agency for a fiscal year by reason of the application of clause (i), and calculated in accordance with subparagraph (C) or (D), as the case may be, shall be based on the number of children in average daily attendance in the schools of such agency for the fiscal year and under the same provisions of subparagraph (C) or (D) under which the agency was paid during the prior fiscal year.

“(iii) CONVERSION OF MILITARY HOUSING UNITS TO PRIVATE HOUSING DESCRIBED.— For purposes of clause (i), ‘conversion of military housing units to private housing’ means the conversion of military housing units to private housing units pursuant to subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, or pursuant to any other related provision of law.”; (C) in paragraph (3)—(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) In the case of a local educational agency providing a free public education to students enrolled in kindergarten through grade 12, that enrolls students described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D) of subsection (a)(1) only in grades 9 through 12, and that received a final payment for fiscal year 2009 calculated under section 8003(b)(3) (as such section was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act) for students in grades 9 through 12, the Secretary shall, in calculating the agency’s payment, consider only that portion of such agency’s total enrollment of students in grades 9 through 12 when calculating the percentage under clause (i)(I) and only that portion of the total current expenditures attributed to the operation of grades 9 through 12 in such agency when calculating the percentage under clause (i)(II).”; (ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “subparagraph (D) or (E) of paragraph (2), as the case may be” and inserting “subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (2), as the case may be”; and (iii) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) RATABLE DISTRIBUTION.—For fiscal years described in subparagraph (A), for which the sums available exceed the amount required to pay each local educational agency 100 percent of its threshold payment, the Secretary shall distribute the excess sums to each eligible local educational agency that has not received its full amount computed under paragraphs (1) or (2) (as the case may be) by multiplying— “(i) a percentage, the denominator of which is the difference between the full amount computed under paragraph (1) or (2) (as the case may be) for all local educational agencies and the amount of the threshold payment (as calculated under subparagraphs (B) and (C)) of all local educational agencies, and the numerator of which is the aggregate of the excess sums, by “(ii) the difference between the full amount computed under paragraph (1) or (2) (as the case may be) for the agency and the amount of the threshold payment (as calculated under subparagraphs (B) or (C)) of the agency, except that no local educational agency shall receive more than 100 percent of the maximum payment calculated under subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (2).

“(E) INSUFFICIENT PAYMENTS.—For each fiscal year described in subparagraph (A) for which the sums appropriated are insufficient to pay each local educational agency all of the local educational agency’s threshold payment described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall ratably reduce the payment to each local educational agency under this paragraph.

“(F) INCREASES.—“(i) INCREASES BASED ON INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—If additional funds become available under 7014(b) for making payments under paragraphs (1) and (2) and those funds are not sufficient to increase each local educational agency’s threshold payment above 100 percent of its threshold payment described in subparagraph (B), payments that were reduced under subparagraph (E) shall be increased by the Secretary on the same basis as such payments were reduced. “(ii) INCREASES BASED ON SUFFICIENT FUNDS.—If additional funds become available under section 7014(b) for making payments under paragraphs (1) and (2) and those funds are sufficient to increase each local educational agency’s threshold payment above 100 percent of its threshold payment described in subparagraph (B), the payment for each local educational agency shall be 100 percent of its threshold payment.

The Secretary shall then distribute the excess sums to each eligible local educational agency in accordance with subparagraph (D).

“(G) PROVISION OF TAX RATE AND RESULTING PERCENTAGE.— As soon as practicable following the payment of funds under paragraph (2) to an eligible local educational agency, the Secretary shall provide the local educational agency with a description of—“(i) the tax rate of the local educational agency; and “(ii) the percentage such tax rate represents of the average tax rate for general fund purposes of comparable local educational agencies in the State as determined under subclauses (II)(cc), III(aa), or (V)(bb) of paragraph (2)(B)(i) (as the case may be).”; and (D) in paragraph (4)—(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “through (D)” and inserting “and (C)”; and (ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subparagraph (D) or (E)” and inserting

“subparagraph (C) or (D)”; (3) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following: “(2) EXCEPTION.—Calculation of payments for a local educational agency shall be based on data from the fiscal year for which the agency is making an application for payment if such agency—“(A) is newly established by a State, for the first year of operation of such agency only; “(B) was eligible to receive a payment under this section for the previous fiscal year and has had an overall increase in enrollment (as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, or the heads of other Federal agencies)—“(i)(I) of not less than 10 percent of children described in—“(aa) subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (a)(1); or “(bb) subparagraphs (F) and (G) of subsection (a)(1), but only to the extent that such children are civilian dependents of employees of the Department of Defense or the Department of the Interior; or “(II) of not less than 100 of such children; and “(ii) that is the direct result of closure or realignment of military installations under the base closure process or the relocation of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense as part of the force structure changes or movements of units or personnel between military installations or because of actions initiated by the Secretary of the Interior or the head of another Federal agency; or “(C) was eligible to receive a payment under this section for the previous fiscal year and has had an increase in enrollment (as determined by the Secretary)—“(i) of not less than 10 percent of children described in subsection (a)(1) or not less than 100 of such children; and “(ii) that is the direct result of the closure of a local educational agency that received a payment under subsection (b)(1) or (b)(2) for the previous fiscal year.”; (4) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “section 8014(c)” and inserting “section 7014(c)”; (5) in subsection (e)—(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); (B) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following: “(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any local educational agency eligible to receive a payment under subsection (b) whose calculated payment amount for a fiscal year is reduced by 20 percent, as compared to the amount received for the previous fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay the local educational agency, for the year of the reduction and the following 2 years, the amount determined under paragraph (2). “(2) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—Subject to paragraph (3), A local educational agency described in paragraph (1) shall receive—“(A) for the first year for which the reduced payment is determined, an amount that is not less than 90 percent of the total amount that the local educational agency received under subsection (b) for the previous fiscal year; “(B) for the second year following such reduction, an amount that is not less than 85 percent of the total amount that the local educational agency received under subparagraph (A); and “(C) for the third year following such reduction, an amount that is not less than 80 percent of the total amount that the local educational agency received under subparagraph (B). “(3) SPECIAL RULE.—For any fiscal year for which a local educational agency would receive a payment under subsection (b) in excess of the amount determined under paragraph (2), the payment received by the local educational agency for such fiscal year shall be calculated under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b).”; and (6) by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 7005. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO CHILDREN RESIDING ON INDIAN LANDS.

Section 7004(e)(9), as redesignated and amended by section 7001 of this Act, is further amended by striking “Affairs” both places the term appears and inserting “Education”.

SEC. 7006. APPLICATION FOR PAYMENTS UNDER SECTIONS 7002 AND 7003.

Section 7005, as redesignated and amended by section 7001 of this Act, is further amended— (1) in the section heading, by striking “**8002 AND 8003**” and inserting “**7002 AND 7003**”; (2) by striking “or 8003” each place it appears and inserting “or 7003”; (3) in subsection (b)—(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “, and shall contain such information,”; and (B) by striking “section 8004” and inserting “section 7004”; and (4) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “section 8003(e)” and inserting “section 7003(e)”;

SEC. 7007. CONSTRUCTION.

Section 7007, as redesignated and amended by section 7001 of this Act, is further amended— (1) in subsection (a)— (A) in paragraph (3)(A)(i)—(i) by redesignating the first subclause (II) as subclause (I); (ii) in subclause (II), by striking “section 8008(a)” and inserting “section 7008(a)”; and (B) in paragraph (4), by striking “section 8013(3)” and inserting “section 7013(3)”; and (2) in subsection (b)—(A) in paragraph (3)(C)(i)(I), by adding at the end the following: “(cc) Not less than 10 percent of the property acreage in the agency is exempt from State and local taxation under Federal law.”; and (B) in paragraph (6)—(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “, in such manner, and accompanied by such information” and inserting “and in such manner”; (ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and containing such additional information as may be necessary to meet any award criteria for a grant under this subsection as provided by any other Act”; and (iii) by striking subparagraph (F).

SEC. 7008. FACILITIES.

Section 7008(a), as redesignated by section 7001 of this Act, is amended by striking “section 8014(f)” and inserting “section 7014(e)”.

SEC. 7009. STATE CONSIDERATION OF PAYMENTS IN PROVIDING STATE AID.

Section 7009, as redesignated and amended by section 7001 of this Act, is further amended— (1) by striking “section 8011(a)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7011(a)”; (2) in subsection (b)(1)—(A) by striking “or 8003(b)” and inserting “or 7003(b)”; and (B) by striking “section 8003(a)(2)(B)” and inserting “section 7003(a)(2)(B)”; and (3) in subsection (c)(1)(B), by striking “and contain the information” and inserting “that” after “form”.

SEC. 7010. FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.

Section 7010, as redesignated and amended by section 7001 of this Act, is further amended— (1) in subsection (c)— (A) in paragraph (1), in the paragraph heading, by striking “8003(a)(1)” and inserting “7003(a)(1)”; (B) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking “section 8009(b)” and inserting “section 7009(b)”; and (2) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “section 8014” and inserting “section 7014”.

SEC. 7011. ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Section 7011(a), as redesignated by section 7001 of this Act, is amended by striking “or under the Act” and all that follows through “1994”.

SEC. 7012. DEFINITIONS.

Section 7013, as redesignated by section 7001 of this Act, is amended—(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and Marine Corps” and inserting “Marine Corps, and Coast Guard”; (2) in paragraph (4), by striking “and title VI”; (3) in paragraph (5)(A)—(A) in clause (ii), by striking subclause (III) and inserting the following: “(III) conveyed at any time under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to a Native individual, Native group, or village or regional corporation (including

single family occupancy properties that may have been subsequently sold or leased to a third party), except that property that is conveyed under such Act—“(aa) that is not taxed is, for the purposes of this paragraph, considered tax-exempt due to Federal law; and “(bb) is considered Federal property for the purpose of this paragraph if the property is located within a Regional Educational Attendance Area that has no taxing power;”; and (B) in clause (iii)—(i) in subclause (II), by striking “Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act” and inserting S. 1177—287 “McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411)”; and (ii) by striking subclause (III) and inserting the following: “(III) used for affordable housing assisted under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.); or”.

SEC. 7013. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 7014, as amended and redesignated by section 7001 of this Act, is further amended— (1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$32,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the seven succeeding fiscal years” and inserting “\$66,813,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019, and \$71,997,917 for fiscal year 2020”; (2) in subsection (b), by striking “\$809,400,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the seven succeeding fiscal years” and inserting “\$1,151,233,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019, and \$1,240,572,618 for fiscal year 2020”; (3) in subsection (c)—(A) by striking “section 8003(d)” and inserting “section 7003(d)”; and (B) by striking “\$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the seven succeeding fiscal years” and inserting “\$48,316,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019, and \$52,065,487 for fiscal year 2020”; (4) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; (5) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (4))—(A) by striking “section 8007” and inserting “section 7007”; and (B) by striking “\$10,052,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001, \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the five succeeding fiscal years” and inserting “\$17,406,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019, and 18,756,765 for fiscal year 2020”; and (6) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (4))—(A) by striking “section 8008” and inserting “section 7008”; and (B) by striking “\$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the seven succeeding fiscal years” and inserting “\$4,835,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019, and \$5,210,213 for fiscal year 2020”.

Appendix C
State of Virginia Law: Uniformed Services-Connected Students, 2015

SB 1354 (Reeves) and HB 2373 (Ramadan)(2015)

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia is amended by adding a section numbered **22.1-287.02** as follows:
§ **22.1-287.02**. Uniformed services-connected students.

A. For purposes of this section, a "uniformed services-connected student" means a student enrolled in a public school whose parent is serving in either (i) the active component of the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Services or (ii) the reserve component of the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Guard.

B. The Department of Education shall establish a process for the identification of newly enrolled uniformed services-connected students by local school divisions. Local school divisions shall identify newly enrolled uniformed services-connected students in accordance with such process.

C. Nonidentifiable, aggregate data collected from the identification of uniformed services-connected students shall be made available to local, state, and federal entities for the purposes of becoming eligible for nongeneral fund sources and receiving services to meet the needs of uniformed services-connected students residing in the Commonwealth.

D. Data collected from the identification of uniformed services-connected students shall not be a public record as defined in § **2.2-3701**. No person shall disclose such data except as permitted under the provisions of the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (20 U.S.C. § 1232g) and related regulations. No such data shall be used for the purposes of student achievement, the Standards of Accreditation, student-growth indicators, the school performance report card, or any other school rating system.

Appendix D
Military-Connected Students (MCS) by District, January 2016

District	Number of MCS	Percent	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Abbeville	1	0.01	1	0.01
Aiken	83	0.87	84	0.88
Anderson 1	5	0.05	89	0.93
Anderson 2	4	0.04	93	0.97
Anderson 3	1	0.01	94	0.98
Anderson 4	18	0.19	112	1.17
Bamberg 1	2	0.02	114	1.19
Barnwell 45	1	0.01	115	1.20
Beaufort 1	1055	11.02	1170	12.22
Berkeley 1	1627	17.00	2797	29.22
Charleston	162	1.69	2959	30.91
Cherokee	5	0.05	2964	30.97
Chester 1	7	0.07	2971	31.04
Chesterfield	5	0.05	2976	31.09
Clarendon 2	15	0.16	2991	31.25
Colleton 1	65	0.68	3056	31.93
Darlington	4	0.04	3060	31.97
Deaf & Blind School	3	0.03	3063	32.00
Dillon 4	1	0.01	3064	32.01
Dorchester 2	1600	16.72	4664	48.73
Dorchester 4	2	0.02	4666	48.75
Edgefield	62	0.65	4728	49.39
Fairfield	6	0.06	4734	49.46
Florence 1	51	0.53	4785	49.99
Georgetown	11	0.11	4796	50.10
Governor's School for Math and Science	6	0.06	4802	50.17
Greenville 1	58	0.61	4860	50.77
Greenwood 50	9	0.09	4869	50.87
Hampton	74	0.77	4943	51.64
Horry	56	0.59	4999	52.23
Kershaw	310	3.24	5309	55.46
Lancaster	12	0.13	5321	55.59
Laurens 55	4	0.04	5325	55.63
Laurens 56	7	0.07	5332	55.70
Lee	1	0.01	5333	55.71
Lexington 1	897	9.37	6230	65.09
Lexington 2	8	0.08	6238	65.17
Lexington 5	10	0.10	6248	65.27
Marion 10	5	0.05	6253	65.33
McCormick	2	0.02	6255	65.35
Newberry	27	0.28	6282	65.63
Oconee	164	1.71	6446	67.34
Orangeburg 3	3	0.03	6449	67.37
Orangeburg 4	1	0.01	6450	67.38
Orangeburg 5	29	0.30	6479	67.69
Pickens	127	1.33	6606	69.01

District	Number of MCS	Percent	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Richland 1	89	0.93	6695	69.94
Richland 2	1985	20.74	8680	90.68
SC Public Charter School District	140	1.46	8820	92.14
Saluda	2	0.02	8822	92.16
Spartanburg 1	2	0.02	8824	92.19
Spartanburg 2	2	0.02	8826	92.21
Spartanburg 5	4	0.04	8830	92.25
Spartanburg 6	2	0.02	8832	92.27
Spartanburg 7	30	0.31	8862	92.58
Sumter	651	6.80	9513	99.38
Union	8	0.08	9521	99.47
Williamsburg	8	0.08	9529	99.55
York 1	9	0.09	9538	99.64
York 2	11	0.11	9549	99.76
York 3	17	0.18	9566	99.94
York 4	6	0.06	9572	100.00

The Education Oversight Committee does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or handicap in its practices relating to employment or establishment and administration of its programs and initiatives. Inquiries regarding employment, programs and initiatives of the Committee should be directed to the Executive Director 803.734.6148.

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Subcommittee: EIA and Improvement Mechanisms

Date: March 21, 2016

INFORMATION

Results of the 2015 Parent Survey

PURPOSE/AUTHORITY

Section 59-28-190 of the Parental Involvement in Their Children's Education Act requires the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) to "survey parents to determine if state and local efforts are effective in increasing parental involvement." In addition Section 59-18-900 of the Education Accountability Act (EAA) requires that the annual school report cards include "evaluations of the school by parents, teachers, and students" as performance indicators to evaluate schools. The tool that has been adopted by the EOC and administered by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) to meet these statutory requirements is the annual parent survey.

CRITICAL FACTS

The parent survey was commissioned by the EOC and designed by the Institute for Families in Society at the University of South Carolina in 2001. The survey is designed to determine parent perceptions of their child's school and to evaluate the effectiveness of state and local parental involvement programs. Since 2002 the South Carolina Department of Education has annually administered the survey, and the EOC has provided an annual review of the survey results. The attached report reflects the results of the 2015 administration of the parent survey and compares the results on key issues with the 2015 administration of the teacher survey. The report also documents the results of new items on the parent survey regarding bullying.

TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS

Study began in January 2016 and completed in March 2016

ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR EOC

Cost: No fiscal impact beyond current appropriations

Fund/Source:

ACTION REQUEST

For approval

For information

Approved

ACTION TAKEN

Amended

Not Approved

Action deferred (explain)

2016

DRAFT

Results of the 2015 Parent Survey

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Executive Summary	1
Part One – Administration of the 2015 Parent and Teacher Surveys.....	5
Part Two – Respondents of the 2015 Parent Survey	7
Part Three – Results for Items of the 2015 Parent Survey	13
Part Four – Results of the 2015 Teacher Survey	25
Appendices	37
A. Copy of the 2015 Parent Survey	
B. Items of the 2015 Teacher Survey	

Acknowledgements

The Education Oversight Committee (EOC) acknowledges the ongoing assistance of Cynthia Hearn and Ling Gao of the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) in providing data files, timely updates and important information on the annual administration of the parent survey. The EOC also appreciates the parents, teachers, and students who took the time to complete and return their annual surveys, because their perspectives are critical in evaluating public schools. Finally, the EOC is also grateful for principals and administrators who encouraged participation in the survey, and who oversaw the administration of the survey.

Executive Summary

Background: The parent survey was designed in 2001 to meet the requirements of the Education Accountability Act (EAA) and the Parental Involvement in Their Children's Education Act. Section 59-18-900 of the EAA requires that the annual school report card include "evaluations of the school by parents, teachers, and students" as performance indicators to evaluate schools. In addition Section 59-28-190 of the Parental Involvement in Their Children's Education Act requires the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) to "survey parents to determine if state and local efforts are effective in increasing parental involvement." The tool that has been adopted by the EOC and administered by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) to meet these statutory requirements is the annual parent survey.

Since 2002 the SCDE has administered the parent survey to a sample of parents whose children attended public schools in South Carolina. From its inception, the parent survey contains items regarding parent perceptions of the learning environment in the school, home and school relations, and the social and physical environment of the school. Additional questions document characteristics of the parents and the children of the parents responding to the survey. The 2015 parent survey contained many of the same items as the 2014 parent survey. Three items were added for the 2015 survey to obtain information about student bullying.

The parents of students in the highest grade at all elementary, middle and high schools are surveyed. In high schools and career centers, parents of all 11th graders are surveyed. In schools with a grade configuration that spans multiple levels, parents of children in multiple grades are surveyed. For example, in a school with a grade span of grades 6 through 10, parents of children in grades 8 and 10 are surveyed. For parents in schools with a grade span of K-12, parents of children in grades 5, 8 and 11 are surveyed. Parents in schools containing grades 2 or lower (K-1, K-2, and 1-2 configurations) are not surveyed. Annually, the EOC has analyzed the results of the parent survey and issued reports. The reports are online at www.eoc.sc.gov.

Survey Responses: In 2015 the number of parent surveys completed and returned totaled 62,192, an increase of 2,899 surveys (4.9 percent) from the prior year. Estimates are that between 32.3 and 38.3 percent of all eligible parents surveyed responded to the 2015 parent survey. In 2015 the percentage of parents who completed the survey who identified themselves as Hispanic was 6.4 percent, compared to 5.7 percent in 2014. The percentage of survey respondents who are Hispanic has increased each of the past five years.

An analysis of the respondents to the 2015 parent survey concluded that the survey responses typically overrepresented the perceptions of parents who had children in elementary schools and underrepresented the perceptions of parents who had children in high school. Furthermore, the respondents typically obtained higher educational achievements and had greater median household

incomes than the general population of South Carolina. As in prior years, the “typical” parent responding to the survey was a white female having attended or graduated from college and having a household income of greater than \$35,000. Furthermore, when compared to the enrollment of students in public schools, parents of African American students were underrepresented in the responses.

Parent Survey Results: The results of the 2015 parent survey demonstrate that parent satisfaction levels with the three characteristics measured - the learning environment and social and physical environment of their child’s school—were consistent with the prior year’s results. Significant changes are estimated as an annual increase or decrease of three or more percent. Satisfaction is defined as the percentage of parents who agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the learning environment, home and school relations, and social and physical environment of their child’s school. After parent satisfaction with home and school relations declined from 2013 to 2014 and the number of missing responses for this item increased by a comparable amount, parent satisfaction in 2015 did not differ from 2014. The percentage of parents satisfied in 2014 was 71.7, and the percentage of parents satisfied in 2015 was 73.1 percent.

Percentage of Parents Satisfied with Each Characteristic: 2012-2015

Characteristic	2015	2014	2013	2012	Difference between 2015 and 2014
Learning Environment	87.6	86.7	87.0	87.2	0.9
Home and School Relations	73.1	71.7	83.3	82.9	1.4
Social and Physical Environment	85.3	84.4	84.3	84.1	0.9

Parents who responded to the 2015 annual survey reported levels of parental involvement comparable to previous years and identified work schedules as their greatest obstacle to involvement.

Parent Reported Obstacles to Parental Involvement in 2015

Work Schedule	56.2%
Lack of timely notification of volunteer opportunities	24.3%
School does not encourage involvement	10.8%
Family and health problems	14.9%
Lack of child or adult care services	14.5%
Transportation	10.8%
Involvement not appreciated	10.8%

Items parents perceive as impediments to parental involvement that are at least partially within the control of the schools are the processes by which schools notify parents of volunteer opportunities, the means by which the school encourages or enables interaction between parents and the school, and the approach of the school toward parental involvement.

In previous reports of the parent survey, analyses were performed relating parent satisfaction to school report card grades. Since report card grades were not available for 2015, teacher survey results were analyzed, and were related to parent satisfaction with the overall learning environment of the school. Five categories of parent satisfaction were created (quintiles), from lowest to highest, with each category containing approximately one-fifth of schools. For nearly all teacher survey items, as the level of parent satisfaction with the learning environment of their child's school increased, so did the percent of teachers who viewed the school favorably. The largest difference between teachers in schools with the highest and lowest parent satisfaction with the school learning environment was with respect to home and school relations, and the smallest difference between teachers in schools with the highest and lowest parent satisfaction ratings of the school learning environment was with respect to working conditions.

Percentage of Teachers Who Strongly Agree that they are Satisfied with the Overall Measure of Each Characteristic by Parental Satisfaction with the School Learning Environment:

Characteristic	Lowest Parent Satisfaction	2nd Quintile	3rd Quintile	4th Quintile	Highest Parent Satisfaction
Learning Environment	45	57	64	69	77
Home and School Relations	25	34	44	52	65
Social and Physical Environment	44	57	63	69	77
Working Conditions	47	55	60	65	72

See Tables 26, 27, 28, and 29

Results Regarding Bullying: Approximately 19 percent of parents reported that their child had been bullied. When bullying occurred, parents most frequently reported that it occurred in the classroom or in some other location in the school. Sporting events were the location with the fewest reports as a location for bullying, followed by online and/or texting during school hours.

Approximately 13 percent of teachers reported that they were bullied by another adult at their school and approximately 90 percent of teachers reported that they either agreed or strongly agreed that they had been bullied by a student at school.

PART ONE

Administration of the 2015 Parent and Teacher Surveys

The design and sampling methodology for the parent survey were established in 2001. The EOC contracted with the Institute of Families in Society at the University of South Carolina to design the survey and to recommend a medium for distributing the survey. To maintain complete anonymity and to maximize the return rate, the Institute recommended that the survey be mailed to a sample of parents along with a postage paid, return envelope. While the sampling methodology proposed by the Institute was implemented, the parent survey has never been mailed to parents due to budgetary restrictions. Instead, schools have been given the responsibility for distributing and collecting the forms. Generally, schools send the surveys home with students. Some schools have held parent meetings or special meetings at school during which the surveys were distributed.

Rather than surveying all parents of public school students, the parents of students in the highest grade at all elementary, middle and high schools are surveyed. In high schools and career centers, parents of all 11th graders are surveyed. In schools with a grade configuration that spans multiple levels, parents of children in multiple grades are surveyed. For example, in a school with a grade span of grades 6 through 10, parents of children in grades 8 and 10 are surveyed. For parents in schools with a grade span of K-12, parents of children in grades 5, 8 and 11 are surveyed. Parents in schools containing grades 2 or lower, which include primary schools, child development schools and schools with configurations like K, K-1, and K-2 are not surveyed. The parent survey is typically administered during the second semester of each school year.

A copy of the 2015 survey is in the Appendix A. The 2015 administration of the parent survey occurred over the following time period and involved the following actions.

March 4, 2015	All schools received survey forms.
April 3, 2015	Date for parent survey forms returned to school.
April 9, 2015	Last day for schools to mail completed forms to contractor.

Source: SC Department of Education

A school survey coordinator, a staff person designated by the school principal, distributed and collected the parent surveys at each school according to instructions provided by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE). According to SCDE, an independent contractor hired by the agency to mail to each school the following:

- ✓ An administrative envelope containing;
 1. A letter to the principal from the Education Oversight Committee (EOC),
 2. Two sets of instructions for administering the surveys,
 3. A page of shipping instructions, and
 4. One pre-addressed, bar-coded UPS shipping label (used to return completed surveys to contractor, freight prepaid).
- ✓ Parent survey envelopes. Each envelope contains a letter from the State Superintendent of Education and a parent survey form.
- ✓ Student survey forms.¹

The name of each school was printed on the survey forms to assist parents who were completing surveys for multiple schools. Schools were also advised to “distribute the parent surveys as soon as

¹ “Administration of the 2015 Report Card Surveys,” South Carolina Department of Education.

possible” after delivery. The cost of printing, shipping, processing and scanning the parent surveys was approximately \$115,000.²

Each school’s designated survey coordinator then distributed envelopes containing the parent survey and letter from the state Superintendent of Education to each classroom teacher within the designated grade being surveyed. Teachers gave each student an envelope and instructions to take the envelope home for their parents to complete and then return the completed survey to school in the sealed envelope. The envelopes were designed to maintain the confidentiality and anonymity of all parents. Parents were given the option of mailing the completed survey directly to SCDE with parents incurring the cost of the mailing or of returning the survey to the school. The school survey coordinator was expressly advised that mailing of the envelopes directly to the parents was allowed with all costs to be borne by the school. Information did not exist to document if any schools mailed the parent surveys to parents.

Upon receiving the completed parent surveys, the school survey coordinator then mailed the forms to the independent contractor for scanning and preparation of the data files. Individual school results were tabulated by SCDE. The overall parent satisfaction scores of three questions relating to the school’s overall learning environment, home and school relations, and social and physical environment were printed on the 2015 annual school report cards. For each school, SCDE aggregated the responses to all survey questions and provided the data files to the district office.

The 2015 parent survey contained a total of fifty-eight questions. Forty-seven questions were designed to elicit information on parental perceptions and parental involvement patterns. For the first twenty-three questions, parents were asked to respond to individual statements using one of the following responses: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree or Don’t Know. These twenty-one questions focused on three key components: learning environment, home and school relations, and the physical and social environment of their child’s school. These components and individual activities reflect the framework devised by Dr. Joyce Epstein of the National Network of Partnership Schools.

Parents were asked five questions about their participation in various parental involvement activities both in and outside of the school. Parents were also asked whether each of a list of seven items were potential barriers to their involvement in their child’s education. New to the 2015 survey were three items focused on whether parents believed their child was bullied at school in the previous year, where the bullying occurred, and whether the bullying was verbal or physical. Finally, parents were asked to provide specific information about themselves, their child, and their household. Parents were asked four questions about their child: their child’s grade in school, gender, race/ethnicity, and grades on his or her last report card. Four questions sought information about the parent: his or her gender, race/ethnicity, highest level of education and total yearly household income.

For this year, analyses of the parent survey were performed in conjunction with responses of teachers to the annual teacher survey. The teacher survey also includes items on the learning environment in the school, home and school relations, and the social and physical environment of the school. The teacher survey also includes items regarding teacher perceptions of their working conditions, including the physical conditions that impact their teaching, the non-academic tasks associated with being a teacher, the working conditions in their school, and other items. All items are presented with the following responses available: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree, and Don’t Know.

The teacher surveys were administered online to all teachers in all grade levels. A link to the survey was available on the front page of the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) web-site from March 4, 2015 to April 3, 2015.

² Communication from South Carolina Department of Education to EOC staff.

PART TWO

Respondents of the 2015 Parent Survey

As reflected in Table 1, the total number of parent surveys returned in 2015 was 62,192, which was 2,899 (4.9 percent) more than the number returned in the prior year. This increase reverses a trend of decreasing parent responses from 2011 to 2014. The current year response total is 15.6 percent lower than the highest response total (73,755), which was obtained in 2011.

Table 1
Total Number of Parent Surveys Returned

Year	Surveys
2015	62,192
2014	59,293
2013	66,787
2012	69,581
2011	73,755
2010	69,474

Using two methods of determining response rates and the total number of parent surveys returned, two response rates were calculated in Table 2. The first method compares the number of responses to the number of surveys distributed, and the second method compares the number of responses to the number of students in grades 5, 8, and 11 (grades 5 and 8 are typically the highest grades in elementary and middle school, and grade 11 is the high school grade targeted for administration of the parent survey). From these separate calculations, it appears that between 32.3 and 38.3 percent of all eligible parents surveyed responded to the 2015 parent survey. In the prior year using the same two methodologies, the response rate was between 31 and 37 percent.

Table 2
Determining the Response Rate

	Sample Size	Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Method 1: Surveys Distributed	192,663	62,192	32.3%
Method 2: ADM ⁶ of 5, 8 and 11 th grades	162,254		38.3%

Parents completing the survey were asked seven questions about their child:

1. What grade is your child in? (3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th or 11th)
2. What is your child's gender?
3. What is your child's race/ethnicity?
4. What grades did your child receive on his/her last report card?
5. Has your child been bullied at school this year?
6. If yes, was your child bullied:
 - In Classroom
 - Other location at school
 - At sporting events
 - On-line/texting during school
 - On the bus
 - After school

7. If yes, was you child bullied
- Physically
 - Verbally
 - Both

The following definition of bullying was provided on the survey:

Bullying is when 1 or more students tease, threaten, spread rumors about, hit, shove, or hurt another student over and over again physically. It is not bullying when 2 students of about the same strength or power argue or fight or tease each other in a friendly way.

Parents were also asked four questions about themselves and their family:

1. What is your gender?
2. What is your race/ethnic group?
3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
 - Attended elementary/high school
 - Completed high school/GED
 - Earned associate degree
 - Attended college/training program
 - Earned college degree
 - Postgraduate study/and/or degree
4. What is your family's total yearly household income?
 - Less than \$15,000
 - \$15,000 - \$24,999
 - \$25,000 - \$34,999
 - \$35,000 - \$54,999
 - \$55,000 - \$75,000
 - More than \$75,000

Responses to these questions revealed the following about the parents who completed the 2015 parent survey (Table 3).

Table 3
Respondents to the 2015 Parent Survey
(n=62,192)

Gender

Male	14.8%
Female	85.2%

Race

African-American	30.1%
Caucasian/white	59.0%
Hispanic	6.4%
All Other	4.5%

Education

Attended elementary/high school	9.8%
Completed high school/GED	11.2%
Earned Associate Degree	22.5%
Attended college/training program	22.3%
Earned college degree	20.4%
Postgraduate study/and/or degree	13.9%

Household Income

Less than \$15,000	12.6%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	13.2%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	14.0%
\$35,000 - \$54,999	13.4%
\$55,000 - \$75,000	16.4%
More than \$75,000	30.4%

Their Child Enrolled in:

Grades 3-5	44.9%
Grades 6-8	36.4%
Grades 9-11	18.8%

Their Child's Gender:

Male	45.1%
Female	54.9%

Their Child's Ethnicity:

African-American	30.6%
Caucasian/White	57.0%
Hispanic	6.6%
All Other	5.8%

Their Child's Grades:

All or mostly A's and B's	63.2%
All or mostly B's and C's	25.9%
All or mostly C's and D's	9.0%
All or mostly D's and F's	1.9%

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

As in prior years, the “typical” parent responding to the survey was a white female having attended or graduated from college. Over 60 percent of the respondents who answered the question about income reported earning over \$35,000. The percentage of respondents that identified themselves as Hispanic has steadily increased from 5.0 percent in 2010 to 6.6 percent in 2015.

To determine if the survey responses were representative of elementary, middle and high school parents, the following analysis was done. First, 51,520 parents who returned the 2015 survey indicated that their child was in 5th, 8th, or 11th grade. Defining grade 5 as elementary schools, grade 8 as middle school and grade 11, high school, approximately 44 percent of parents who completed the survey were elementary school parents, 36 percent middle school, and 20 percent high school (Table 4). As compared to the prior year, the percentage of surveys reflecting the perceptions of elementary school parents declined by 2 percent, middle school parents remained the same, and the percentage of parents of high school students increased by 2 percent (from 18 to 20).

The representativeness of the 2015 parent surveys returned of the population of students was investigated by comparing the grade level and ethnicity of students enrolled in the 2014-15 academic year to the grade level and ethnicity of students as reported by parents in the 2015 parent survey. Considering only students in grades 5, 8, and 11, 44 percent of the parent surveys indicated their child was enrolled in grade 5, yet according to the 135-day Average Daily Membership (ADM) enrollment, only 34 percent of students are in grade 5. The percentage of parents who reported their child was enrolled in grade 8 is nearly identical to the percentage of student enrolled in grade 8 according to the ADM. The percentage of parents who reported their child was enrolled in grade 11 (20 percent) is much smaller than the percentage of students enrolled in grade 11 from the ADM (31 percent). Elementary school students are, then, over-represented in the parent surveys returned and high school students are under-represented in these data.

**Table 4
Parental Respondents by Child’s Grade**

Grade of Child	Surveys Returned	% of Surveys from Grades 5, 8, & 11	2014-15 135-day ADM	% of ADMs for Grades 5, 8 & 11
Grade 5	22,586	44%	55,230	34%
Grade 8	18,660	36%	57,044	35%
Grade 11	10,274	20%	49,980	31%
TOTAL	51,520		162,254	

When asked about their child’s race or ethnicity, 57.0 percent of the parents responded that their child’s ethnicity was white, 30.6 percent African American and 6.6 percent Hispanic. With respect to the ethnicity of children in the public schools of South Carolina in 2014-15, parents whose children are African American were underrepresented by 6.7 percent, and parents whose children are Hispanic were underrepresented by 1.4 percent in the respondents (Table 5).

**Table 5
Ethnicity of Children**

	2015 Parent Survey	Student Enrollment All Public Schools 2014-15³	Difference
White	57.0%	52.0%	5.0%
African American	30.6%	37.3%	(6.7%)
Hispanic	6.6%	8.0%	(1.4%)
Other	5.8%	2.7%	3.1%

Note: "Other" includes American Indian/Alaskan, Asian, Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander and Two or more races.

With respect to educational attainment, 34.1 percent of parents who responded to the survey in 2015 had earned a bachelor or postgraduate degree. For comparison purposes, the United States Census Bureau projected that 25.1 percent of persons 25 years old and over in South Carolina had earned a bachelor's degree or higher in 2009.⁴

Regarding the annual household income of the respondents, in 2015 60.2 percent of the parents who completed the survey reported having an annual household income in excess of \$35,000. For comparison purposes, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, the median household income in South Carolina from 2009-2013 was \$44,779.⁵

Conclusions

- A total of 62,192 parent surveys were completed and returned in 2014, which was 2,899 (4.9 percent) more than the number returned in the prior year. This increase in response reversed a 3-year trend of declining parent response.
- Using two methods of calculating a response rate, one method that underestimated and one that overestimated the total number of parents eligible to take the survey, the response rate to the 2015 parent survey was between 32 and 38 percent, which is slightly higher than the response rate of 31 to 37 percent in 2014.
- An analysis of the respondents to the 2015 parent survey found that the survey responses typically overrepresented the perceptions of parents in elementary schools and underrepresented the perceptions of parents who have children in high school.
- Respondents typically obtained higher educational achievements and had greater median household incomes than the general population of South Carolina.
- The percentages of respondents by racial/ethnic group were within 7 percent of the make-up of the South Carolina population.
- African-American parents were more underrepresented in the 2015 survey (6.7 percent) than in the 2014 survey (2.9 percent).

⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, "State and County Quick Facts" <<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/45000.html>>, accessed April 13, 2015.

⁵ Ibid.

PART THREE

Results for Items of the 2015 Parent Survey

The parent survey was designed to determine: (1) parent perceptions or satisfaction with their child's public school and (2) parental involvement efforts in public schools. The following is an analysis that documents the actual parent responses to questions focusing on parental satisfaction and parental involvement.

Parent Perceptions of Their Child's School

The information below summarizes the results of the 2015 parent survey. At the school level, responses to these questions can reveal the strengths and weaknesses of parental involvement initiatives at the individual school site. Statewide, the data provide policymakers information on the overall effectiveness of policies and programs in promoting parental involvement. The following analysis focuses on parent perceptions or satisfaction with the learning environment, home and school relations, and the social and physical environment of their children's schools. In analyzing responses, "significant change" is defined as a change of three percent or more in satisfaction.

A. Learning Environment

Five questions in the parent survey ask parents to reflect upon the learning environment of their child's school. Questions 1 through 4 are designed to elicit parental agreement with specific aspects of the learning environment at their child's school, focusing on homework, expectations, and academic assistance. Question 5 offers parents the opportunity to report on their overall satisfaction with the learning environment at their child's school. For each school with a sufficient number of parent survey responses, the aggregate parental responses to question 5 are included on the annual school report.

Table 6 summarizes the total responses to these five questions for all parents who completed the 2015 parent survey. Overall, 87.6 percent of parents responded that they were satisfied with the learning environment of their child's school. The percentage of parents who disagreed or strongly disagreed was highest for questions 4 and 5. Approximately 17 percent of parents either did not believe or did not know if their child received extra help when needed.

Table 6
Parent Responses to the 2015 Learning Environment Questions
(Percentage of Parents with each Response)

Question	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. My child's teachers give homework that helps my child learn.	89.2	8.3	2.5
2. My child's school has high expectations for student learning.	92.2	5.8	2.0
3. My child's teachers encourage my child to learn.	91.8	5.2	3.0
4. My child's teachers provide extra help when my child needs it.	82.8	11.0	6.2
5. I am satisfied with the learning environment at my child's school	87.6	10.7	1.7

Table 7 compares the percentage of parents who responded that they agreed or strongly agreed to these questions each year from 2011 through 2015. The pattern over time is high parental satisfaction with the learning environment, with the highest levels of parental satisfaction for all items in 2015.

Table 7
Percentage of Parents Who Agree or Strongly Agree they are
Satisfied with each Learning Environment Question: 2011 through 2015

Learning Environment Questions	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
1. My child's teachers give homework that helps my child learn.	89.2	88.9	89.6	89.9	86.7
2. My child's school has high expectations for student learning.	92.2	91.6	91.7	91.7	88.9
3. My child's teachers encourage my child to learn.	91.8	91.2	91.5	91.8	88.7
4. My child's teachers provide extra help when my child needs it.	82.8	81.9	81.7	81.9	78.7
5. I am satisfied with the learning environment at my child's school	87.6	86.7	87.0	87.2	84.3

Parents of elementary school students view the learning environment of the school more favorably (90.2 percent) than do parents of either middle (84.9 percent) or high school (85.3 percent) students (Table 8). The difference between the parent responses for parents of middle and high school students are not large enough to suggest these groups differ in their perceptions of their child's school. Parents of elementary school students do appear to view the learning environment of their child's school most favorably.

Table 8
I am Satisfied With the Learning Environment at My Child's School.
(Percentage of Parents by School Type: Elementary, Middle or High School)

School Type	Number of Responses	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
Elementary	29,675	90.2	8.6
Middle	21,076	84.9	13.1
High	9,698	85.3	12.2

B. Home and School Relations

The next eleven questions on the parent survey determine parent perception of home and school relations by focusing on the relationship between the parent and their child's teacher and between the parent and the school. Question 11 offers parents the opportunity to report on their overall satisfaction with home and school relations at their child's school. For each school with a sufficient number of parent responses, the aggregate parental responses to question 11 are included on the annual school report card.

Table 9 summarizes the total responses to these eleven questions for all parents who completed the 2015 parent survey.

Table 9
Parent Responses to the 2015 Home and School Relations Questions
(Percentage of Parents with each Response)

Home and School Relations Questions	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. My child's teachers contact me to say good things about my child	58.1	39.8	2.1
2. My child's teachers tell me how I can help my child learn.	64.1	33.4	2.5
3. My child's teachers invite me to visit my child's classrooms during the school day.	49.5	45.5	5.0
4. My child's school returns my phone calls or e-mails promptly.	81.9	12.8	5.3
5. My child's school includes me in decision-making.	69.6	24.2	6.2
6. My child's school gives me information about what my child should be learning in school.	76.9	20.9	2.2
7. My child's school considers changes based on what parents say.	51.6	24.9	23.5
8. My child's school schedules activities at times that I can attend.	78.8	16.9	4.3
9. My child's school treats all students fairly.	70.2	16.6	13.1
10. My principal at my child's school is available and welcoming.	81.8	9.7	8.5
11. I am satisfied with home and school relations at my child's school	73.1	14.4	12.5

Overall, 73.1 percent of parents were satisfied with home and school relations at their child's school, which is 1.4 percent more than the percentage in 2014. An examination of questions 1 through 10, which ask parents more specific questions about their personal experiences at their child's school, reveals the following, which is consistent with results of the 2014 survey:

- Parents overwhelmingly agreed that the principal at their child's school was available and welcoming.
- Slightly more than 80 percent of the parents agreed that their child's school returned phone calls or e-mails promptly and scheduled activities at times that parents could attend.
- Approximately four out of ten parents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their child's teachers contacted them to say good things about their child or invited the parents to visit the classroom during the school day.
- Approximately one third of the parents disagreed that their child's teachers told them how to help their child learn.
- Approximately one-fourth of parents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their child's school included parents in decision-making or considered changes based on parental input.
- Approximately one-half of parents disagreed, strongly disagree, or did not know if their child's school considered changes based on parental input.

- Approximately one in three parents did not believe or did not know if students were treated fairly at their child’s school.

As documented in Table 10, the trend is that parental satisfaction with home and school Relations increased from 2011 through 2013, declined dramatically in 2014, and changed little from 2014 to 2015. The dramatic decline in satisfaction from 2013 to 2014 is not accompanied by a corresponding increase in the percentage of parents expressing dissatisfaction with home and school relations. Instead, there was a substantial increase from 2013 to 2014 in the percentage of parents who indicated they did not have an opinion of the home and school relations. The percentage of parents who indicated they did not have an opinion did not change dramatically from 2014 to 2015.

Table 10
Percentage of Parents Who Agree or Strongly Agree they are Satisfied with Home and School Relations: 2011 through 2015

	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
Agree or Strongly Agree	73.1	71.7	83.3	82.9	80.2
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	14.4	14.6	13.3	13.7	13.9
Don't Know	12.5	13.7	3.4	3.4	5.9

The pattern of parental satisfaction with home and school relations is similar to the pattern of parental satisfaction with the learning environment (Table 11). The percentages of parents of students in middle school and high school who view the home and school relations favorably (68.8 and 70.3 percent, respectively), are nearly the same. Both, however, are lower than the percentage of parents of students in elementary school who view home and school relations favorably (77.5 percent).

Table 11
I am Satisfied with Home and School Relations at My Child’s School.
(Percentage of Parents by School Type: Elementary, Middle or High School)

School Type	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
Elementary	77.5	10.9
Middle	68.8	18.0
High	70.3	17.2

C. Social and Physical Environment

Five questions on the parent survey focus on the social and physical environment of schools. These questions are designed to elicit parent perceptions of the cleanliness, safety, and student behavior at their child’s school. Question 5 asks parents to report on their overall satisfaction with the social and physical environment of their child’s schools. For each school with a sufficient number of parent responses, the aggregate parental responses to question 5 are included on the annual school report card.

Table 12 summarizes the total responses to these five questions for all parents who completed the 2015 parent survey. Nine in ten parents agreed or strongly agreed that their child’s school was kept neat and clean and that their child felt safe at school. On the other hand, over one out of three parents either did not believe or did not know whether students at their child’s school were well behaved, and 15.5 percent of parents did not know or did not believe that their child’s teachers cared about their child as an individual.

Table 12
Parent Responses to the 2015 Social and Physical Environment Questions
(Percentage of Parents with each Response)

Social and Physical Environment Questions	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. My child's school is kept neat and clean.	90.5	6.1	3.4
2. My child feels safe at school.	89.1	8.2	2.6
3. My child's teachers care about my child as an individual.	84.6	8.5	7.0
4. Students at my child's school are well behaved.	64.9	21.1	14.0
5. I am satisfied with the social and physical environment at my child's school.	85.3	10.8	3.9

Table 13 presents the 2015 results of the South Carolina parent survey with the results of parent surveys administered since 2011. The data document that parental responses to the five questions regarding the social and physical environment of their child's school are consistent with the prior year's results. Over time, parent satisfaction with the social and physical environment of their child's schools as reflected in the responses to these five questions has generally increased. The only question for which parental satisfaction declined was with respect to student safety, which decreased by 2.1 percent.

Table 13
Percentage of Parents Who Agree or Strongly Agree they are
Satisfied with each Social and Physical Environment Question: 2011 through 2015

Social and Physical Environment Questions	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
1. My child's school is kept neat and clean.	90.5	90.6	91.5	91.3	90.0
2. My child feels safe at school.	89.1	91.2	91.0	90.9	89.7
3. My child's teachers care about my child as an individual.	84.6	83.8	83.7	84.1	81.1
4. Students at my child's school are well behaved.	64.9	64.8	64.0	63.7	61.2
5. I am satisfied with the social and physical environment at my child's school	85.3	84.4	84.3	84.1	82.4

Data presented in Table 14 demonstrate that the differences in parental satisfaction in the social and physical environment of their child's school by school type are consistent with results for both the learning environment and home and school relations. The percentage of parents of elementary school students express more satisfaction (89.2 percent) than either the parents of middle school students (81.7 percent) or high school students (80.4 percent). The difference between the percentages for parents of middle school and high school parents are not large enough to infer that these parents view the school differently.

Table 14
I am Satisfied with the Social and Physical Environment at My Child’s School.
(Percentage of Parents by School Type: Elementary, Middle or High School)

Type	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
Elementary	89.2	8.0
Middle	81.7	13.9
High	80.4	13.9

D. Parental Involvement

According to the National Network of Partnership Schools, founded and directed by Dr. Joyce Epstein at Johns Hopkins University, there are six types of successful partnerships between the school, family and community:⁶

- Type 1. Parenting – Assist families with parenting skills and setting home conditions to support children as students. Also, assist schools to better understand families.
- Type 2. Communicating – Conduct effective communications from school-to-home and home-to-school about school programs and student progress.
- Type 3. Volunteering – Organize volunteers and audiences to support the school and students. Provide volunteer opportunities in various locations and at various times.
- Type 4. Learning at Home – Involve families with their children on homework and other curriculum-related activities and decisions.
- Type 5. Decision Making – Include families as participants in school decisions, and develop parent leaders and representatives.
- Type 6. Collaborating with the family – Coordinate resources and services from the community for families, students, and the school, and provide services to the community.

In addition to determining parent satisfaction with their child’s school, the annual survey of parents in South Carolina includes questions designed to elicit information on the level of parental involvement in schools. The questions focus on the first five types of parental involvement. It should be reiterated that parents self-report their involvement.

First, parents were asked to specifically respond to eight questions relating to their involvement in their child’s school. These questions focus on the following types of parental involvement: parenting, volunteering and decision making. Parents were asked specifically to respond to these eight questions in one of four ways:

- I do this.
- I don’t do this but would like to.
- I don’t do this and I don’t care to.
- The school does not offer this activity/event.

The responses are reflected in Table 15 with the middle column highlighting the percentage of parents who expressed an interest in becoming involved in these school activities. These parents want to be

⁶ Epstein, et. al. 2002. *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action, Second Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/P2000/nnps_model/school/sixtypes.htm>.

involved but either have personal barriers preventing their involvement or face obstacles at the school level. At the school level, parents responding “I don’t do this but would like to” are the parents for whom school initiatives to improve parental involvement should be focused.

Table 15
Percent of Parents Providing Each Response to
Parental Involvement Questions Regarding Activities at the School

<u>Parental Involvement Question</u>	I do this	I don’t but would like to	I don’t and don’t care to	Activity/event not offered
Attend Open Houses or parent-teacher conferences	79.9	15.0	4.3	0.9
Attend student programs or performances	80.4	14.7	3.7	1.2
Volunteer for the school	34.1	38.0	24.7	3.2
Go on trip with my child’s school	35.3	42.3	17.0	5.4
Participate in School Improvement Council Meetings	12.3	43.3	39.0	5.4
Participate in Parent-teacher Student Organizations	29.2	35.1	32.7	2.9
Participate in school committees	15.3	37.8	40.0	6.9
Attend parent workshops	24.5	38.5	22.5	14.6

Based on the responses in Table 15 and the six types of involvement, there are significant opportunities for improving parental involvement in South Carolina’s public schools.

- Decision-Making – Substantially fewer parents report being involved in the School Improvement Council and school committees than in any other activity. Slightly less than one-third of parents report participating in Parent-Teacher-Student Organizations. Decision making, including parents and families in school decisions, and developing parent leaders and representatives are areas for growth where parents want to be involved in these decision-making organizations.
- Volunteering – Approximately 34 percent of the parents responded that they volunteered while 38 percent wanted to volunteer.
- Parenting - Over three-fourths of the parents attended open houses, parent-teacher conferences or student programs, all activities that support their children. Approximately one-fourth reported attending parent workshops while approximately 15 percent contend that such workshops were not provided at their child’s school.

Parents were asked five questions about their involvement with their child’s learning, both at the school site and at home. Parents could respond in one of three ways:

- I do this
- I don’t do this but would like to
- I don’t do this and I don’t care to

Table 16 summarizes parental responses to these five questions.

Table 16
Percent of Parents Providing Each Response to
Parental Involvement Questions Regarding Their Child’s Learning

	I do this	I don’t but would like to	I don’t and don’t care to
Visit my child’s classroom during the school day	28.1	51.7	20.2
Contact my child’s teachers about my child’s school work.	75.3	18.7	6.0
Limit the amount of time my child watches TV, plays video games, surfs the Internet	83.0	9.3	7.7
Make sure my child does his/her homework	94.7	3.5	1.8
Help my child with homework when he/she needs it.	93.2	5.2	1.6

Clearly, parents overwhelmingly report being involved in activities and decisions to support their child’s learning. Over 93 percent of parents reported helping their child with his or her homework while 83.0 percent report limiting television and other distractions at home. Over one-fourth of parents responded that they visited their child’s classroom during the day while a majority wanted to become involved in this way. These responses are similar to parent responses in prior years.

There are obstacles that impede parental involvement in schools. These obstacles may include lack of transportation, family responsibilities, and work schedules. Schools may not encourage or facilitate parental involvement at the school level. The annual parent survey asks parents to respond “true” or “false” to seven questions on factors that impact their involvement. The results from 2011 through 2015 are included in Table 17. Consistently across years, work schedule is the most common obstacle to parent involvement. At the individual school, the responses to these questions may assist principals and teachers in scheduling parental involvement activities or even parent-teacher conferences at times and places convenient for both parents and teachers.

Table 17
Percentage of Parents Experiencing Each Impediment to Involvement in Schools

	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
Lack of transportation reduces my involvement	10.8	12.2	11.6	11.6	11.5
Family health problems reduce my involvement.	14.9	15.5	14.6	14.4	14.3
Lack of available care for my children or other family members reduces my involvement.	14.5	14.8	14.1	14.7	14.5
My work schedule makes it hard for me to be involved.	56.2	57.1	54.6	53.8	54.4
The school does not encourage my involvement.	16.2	17.5	16.1	15.7	16.2
Information about how to be involved either comes too late or not at all.	24.3	25.5	23.7	23.5	24.6
I don't feel like it is appreciated when I try to be involved.	10.8	11.9	11.3	10.6	11.4

Finally, parents were also asked several questions about their child's school and its efforts at increasing parental involvement. Across these questions and across time, two-thirds or more of parents consistently rated the efforts of their child's school at parental involvement efforts as good or very good (Table 18). Fewer than 10 percent of parents have provided unfavorable responses regarding their child's school for any of these questions over the past three years.

Table 18
Percent of Parents Providing Each Response to Parental Involvement Questions Regarding School Effort: 2013-2015

Question:	Very Good or Good			Bad or Very Bad			Okay		
	2015	2014	2013	2015	2014	2013	2015	2014	2013
School's overall friendliness.	80.9	80.6	79.3	2.2	1.6	2.2	16.9	16.9	18.4
School's interest in parents' ideas and opinions.	62.6	62.5	63.4	7.4	8.1	7.6	30.0	29.4	30.1
School's effort to get important information from parents.	70.8	68.6	67.4	6.3	7.5	7.6	22.9	24.0	25.1
The school's efforts to give important information to parents.	75.5	73.9	73.1	5.3	6.3	6.1	19.3	19.8	20.8
How the school is doing overall.	*	76.9	75.8	*	3.6	3.2	*	19.5	21.0

* Not included in 2015 survey.

E. Bullying

Three new questions on the parent survey for 2015 addressed the topic of bullying. The first asked the parent if their child had been bullied at school. If a parent responded yes to the first question, they were asked to respond to two additional questions. The second question asked parents where their child was bullied, with the following options provided:

- In classroom
- Other location at school
- At sporting events
- On-line/texting during school
- On the bus
- After school

The final question asked whether their child was bullied physically, verbally, or both.

A total of 43,455 (72.1 percent) of parents indicated that their child was not bullied at school, while 11,583 (19.1 percent) parents indicated that their child was bullied at school, and 5,273 (8.7 percent) parents were not sure whether their child was bullied at school. Table 19 presents a summary of the locations in which children were bullied, ordered by frequency of occurrence. Classrooms were the location parents reported their child was bullied in most frequently (11.9 percent), followed by some other location at school (9.4 percent). Although only 5.1 percent of parents indicated that their child was bullied on the bus, this should not be interpreted as the percentage of bus riding children who were bullied, because we do not know whether all children of responding parents rode the bus. The percentage of parents who reported their child was bullied at sporting events was the smallest (0.8 percent), and the percentage of parents who reported their child was bullied online was only 1.8 percent.

Table 19
Percent of Parents Indicating Their Child was Bullied by Location

<u>Location of Bullying</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
In classroom	7,413	11.9
Other location at school	5,869	9.4
On the bus	3,149	5.1
After school	1,750	2.8
On-line/texting during school	1,129	1.8
At sporting events	469	0.8

Individual students may have been bullied in more than one of these locations. Table 20 presents a summary of the number of different locations where parents reported that their child had been bullied. Most parents who indicated their child was bullied also indicated that bullying occurred in only one location.

Table 20
Number of Locations in Which Parents Reported Their Child Being Bullied

<u>Number of Locations</u>	Number of Parents	Percentage of Percent
0	49,842	80.1
1	7,302	11.7
2	3,301	5.3
3	1,279	2.1
4	345	0.6
5	86	0.1
6	38	0.1

Conclusions

- In 2015 parental satisfaction in all areas assessed by the survey: Learning Environment (87.6 percent), Home and School Relations (73.1 percent), and the Social and Physical Environment (85.3 percent) is similar to the levels reported in 2014.
- Parental satisfaction with the Home and School Relations for their child's school in 2015 (73.1 percent) increased only slightly from 2014 (71.7). The decrease from the 2013 level of satisfaction (83.3 percent) was not recovered. The percentage of parents who did not indicate a level of satisfaction with home and school relations in 2015 (12.5 percent) did not differ markedly from 2014 (13.7 percent), both of which are dramatic increases from 2013 (3.4 percent).
- Parents of elementary school students are more satisfied than parents of either middle or high school students, which do not differ from one another in their levels of satisfaction.
- Parental work schedule continues to be the largest impediment to parental involvement in school activities.
- The percentage of parents who reported that their child was bullied at school was 19.1, with the most frequent location of the bullying being in the classroom.

PART FOUR

Results of the 2015 Teacher Survey

Teacher Survey Methodology

The teacher surveys were administered online to all teachers in all grade levels. A link to the survey was available on the front page of the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) web-site. The teacher survey was available during the same period of time that the parent survey was available, from March 4, 2015 to April 3, 2015.

The 2015 teacher survey contained a total of 81 questions. Items included in the teacher survey are included in Appendix B. Seventy-two questions were designed to elicit information on teacher perceptions with respect to four aspects of their school. Three of these were in common with the parent survey, though the content of specific items differed from the parent survey: learning environment, home and school relations, and the physical and social environment of their school. The last aspect of the school assessed on the teacher survey was the professional working environment of the school. For each of these areas, teachers were asked to respond to individual statements using one of the following responses: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree, or Don't Know.

Additional questions obtained the race, gender, teacher preparation, the highest degree obtained, whether the teacher was national board certified, the total number of years of experience, and the number of years spent at the current school. Teachers were also asked to identify their current school.

Responses to the parent survey were returned to their child's school and from the school were returned to the scoring contractor. In this process, school identification was also made for the parent surveys. Summary results of the parent survey for each school could then be associated with either the individual results of each teacher from the same school or summary results of teachers for the same school.

Method of Analysis

In previous years, the results of the parent survey were compared to the absolute ratings of the school. Since there were no absolute ratings in 2015, this was not possible. Instead, this analysis used the parent survey item that addressed the overall learning environment of the school to create five groups (quintiles) of schools based on parent perceptions of the learning environment in the school.

To accomplish this, the mean score for the overall learning environment of the school were computed, then schools were ordered from high to low based on this mean. These mean scores were categorized into quintiles. Quintiles divide a set of ordered scores into five groups, with each group containing as near to 20 percent of the scores as possible. The lowest 20 percent of school learning environment scores are in the 1st quintile, and represent the schools with the lowest level of parent satisfaction with the school learning environment. The next 20 percent are in the 2nd quintile, etc. The highest 20 percent of learning environment scores are in the 5th quintile, and represent the schools with the highest level of parent satisfaction with the school learning environment.

Teacher Perceptions of Their School

Responses to the items that describe the teacher respondents are presented in Table 21. The overwhelming majority of teachers responding in 2015 were female (82.8 percent), white (81.0 percent), and have a Master's degree (62.6 percent). Approximately 14.3 percent of responding teachers are national board certified. The largest percentage of responding teachers had between 7 and 15 years of experience as a teacher. With respect to the number of years teachers had spent at their current school,

teachers most frequently reported being at their school from 1 to 3 years, followed by 7 to 15 years. Teachers at a school from 1 to 3 years would include newly hired teachers as well as more experienced teachers who chose to change schools for some reason.

Table 21
Respondents to the 2015 Teacher Survey
(n=45,177)

Gender:	
Male	17.1%
Female	82.8%
Race:	
African-American	13.2%
Caucasian/White	81.0%
Hispanic	1.0%
All Other	4.8%
National Board Certified:	
Yes	14.3%
No	85.7%
Years of Experience as a Teacher:	
1-3 years	14.0%
4-6 years	10.9%
7-15 years	33.9%
15-25 years	25.6%
26 or more years	15.6%
Years Teaching at Current School:	
1-3 years	35.0%
4-6 years	16.5%
7-15 years	32.6%
15-25 years	11.4%
26 or more years	4.5%
Teacher Preparation:	
Bachelor's degree program	30.6%
5 th year program	57.0%
Master's degree program	6.6%
Alternative Certification	5.8%
Highest Degree:	
Bachelor's	31.3%
Master's	62.6%
Doctorate	1.6%
Other	4.6%

A. Learning Environment

The responses of teachers to selected questions regarding the learning environment of their school are presented in Table 22. Overall, 89.3 percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the learning environment of their school. Teachers responded most favorably to the first nine items of the survey, which primarily assess whether they feel the instruction provided students at their school is effective. Two additional items that had high percentages of teachers that agreed or strongly agreed were that their school has high expectations of teachers (94.6 percent), and that teachers respect one another (93.2 percent). The item that the lowest percentage of teachers agreed or strongly agreed with was item 10, that the level of staff and teacher morale is high (78.2 percent).

Table 22
Percent of Teachers with each Response to Learning Environment Questions

Social and Physical Environment Questions	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. My school provides challenging instructional programs for students.	96.9	2.6	0.2
2. Teachers at my school effectively implement the state curriculum standards.	97.9	1.1	0.7
3. Teachers at my school focus instruction on understanding, not just memorizing facts.	96.7	2.2	0.5
4. Teachers at my school have high expectations for students' learning.	96.5	2.5	0.6
5. There is a sufficient amount of classroom time allocated to instruction in essential skills.	92.6	6.2	0.5
6. Student assessment information is effectively used by teachers to plan instruction.	95.4	3.5	0.6
7. Effective instructional strategies are used to meet the needs of low achieving students.	93.6	5.1	0.5
8. My school offers effective programs for students with disabilities.	92.7	5.5	1.2
9. Instructional strategies are used to meet the needs of academically gifted students.	93.4	5.0	1.3
10. The level of teacher and staff morale is high at my school.	78.2	21.2	0.1
11. Teachers respect each other at my school.	93.2	5.9	0.2
12. Teachers at my school are recognized and appreciated for good work.	84.6	13.9	0.2
13. Students at my school are motivated and interested in learning.	84.8	14.3	0.1
14. There are sufficient materials and supplies available for classroom and instructional use.	87.8	11.1	0.3
15. Our school has a good selection of library and media material.	90.8	6.7	1.7
16. Our school has sufficient computers for instructional use.	78.6	19.9	0.5

17. Computers are used effectively for instruction at my school.	88.0	10.5	0.5
18. There are relevant professional development opportunities offered to teachers at my school.	89.0	10.0	0.4
19. The school administration communicates clear instructional goals for the school.	91.1	8.1	0.2
20. The school administration sets high standards for students.	91.9	7.1	0.2
21. The school administration has high expectations for teacher performance.	94.6	3.5	0.3
22. The school administration provides effective instructional leadership.	87.3	11.3	0.2
23. Student assessment information is used to set goals and plan programs for my school.	93.8	4.7	0.5
24. Teacher evaluation at my school focuses on instructional improvement.	91.1	7.2	0.8
25. School administrators visit classrooms to observe instruction.	91.1	7.2	0.5
26. The school administration arranges for collaborative planning and decision making.	89.1	9.5	0.4
27. I am satisfied with the learning environment in my school.	89.3	9.8	0.2

B. Home and School Relations

Table 23 presents the results of questions of the teacher survey that address home and school relations. Overall, 81.9 percent of teachers are satisfied with home and school relations. The items with the largest percentage of teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing were the first two items, which indicate that parents are aware of school policies and school activities. Two additional items with large percentage of teachers that agree or strongly agree are that parents support instructional decisions regarding their children (88.3 percent) and understand the school's instructional programs (88.2 percent). The item with the smallest percentage of teachers that agree or strongly agree is that parents participate as volunteers in the classroom (64.5 percent). As previously reported, 34.1 percent of parents indicated that they volunteered at school (Table 15), while 51.7 percent of parents indicated that they would like to visit their child's classroom during the school day (Table 16).

Table 23
Percent of Teachers with each Response to Home and School Relations Questions

Home and School Relations Questions	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. Parents at my school are aware of school policies.	93.9	5.5	0.4
2. Parents at my school know about school activities.	95.3	4.0	0.4
3. Parents at my school understand the school's instructional programs.	88.2	10.5	0.6
4. Parents at my school are interested in their children's schoolwork.	82.2	17.1	0.4
5. Parents at my school support instructional decisions regarding their children.	88.3	10.6	0.6
6. Parents attend conferences requested by teachers at my school.	84.7	14.0	1.0
7. Parents at my school cooperate regarding discipline problems.	86.6	12.1	0.8
8. Parents attend school meetings and other school events.	78.3	20.7	0.6
9. Parents participate as volunteer helpers in the school or classroom.	64.5	31.7	3.5
10. Parents are involved in school decisions through advisory committees.	73.9	13.4	2.8
11. I am satisfied with home and school relations.	81.9	17.2	0.4

C. Social and Physical Environment

Table 24 presents the results of questions of the teacher survey that address the social and physical environment of the school, including three items on bullying. Overall, 91.0 percent of teachers were satisfied with the social and physical environment of their school. The three items with the largest percentage of teachers that agree or strongly agree are items that indicated the teachers' level of safety at the school. Eighty-seven (87.0) percent of teachers, however, indicated that they have been bullied by a student at their school. Thirteen (13) percent of teachers indicate that they have been bullied by another adult at their school. Eighty-four (84) percent of teachers indicated that they have been provided professional guidance on how to assist in preventing and/or dealing with bullying.

Table 24
Percent of Teachers with each Response to Social and Physical Environment Questions

Social and Physical Environment Questions	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. The grounds around my school are kept clean.	94.8	4.5	0.5
2. The hallways at my school are kept clean.	95.2	3.9	0.6
3. The bathrooms at my school are kept clean.	88.9	9.7	0.6
4. The school building is maintained well and repaired when needed.	90.8	8.1	0.5
5. There is sufficient space for instructional programs at my school.	86.9	11.8	0.5
6. Students at my school behave well in class.	85.8	13.6	0.2
7. Students at my school behave well in the hallways, in the lunchroom, and on school grounds.	82.5	16.6	0.6
8. Rules and consequences for behavior are clear to students.	86.8	12.7	0.2
9. The rules for behavior are enforced at my school.	93.7	5.6	0.3
10. The rules about how students should behave in my school are fair.	15.7	78.2	4.6
11. I have been bullied by an adult at this school.	13.1	80.2	5.8
12. I have been bullied by a student at this school.	87.0	10.8	0.6
13. My school or district provides me with training to assist in preventing and/or dealing with bullying	84.0	14.8	0.2
14. I feel safe at my school before and after school hours.	95.3	3.2	0.6
15. I feel safe at my school during the school day.	96.3	2.3	0.5
16. I feel safe going to or coming from my school.	96.6	1.6	0.6
17. Students from different backgrounds get along well at my school.	93.5	5.2	0.4
18. Teachers and students get along well with each other at my school.	95.5	3.5	0.2
19. Teachers at my school collaborate for instructional planning.	79.8	6.7	0.4
20. I am satisfied with the social and physical environment at my school.	91.0	8.3	0.1

D. Teacher Working Conditions

Overall, 89.4 percent of teachers were satisfied with the working conditions at their school. Teachers were most satisfied with their familiarity with local, state, and national policies that affect teaching and learning (item 6), and with communication technology (item 3). Also noteworthy is that 91.9 percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that their decisions regarding instruction and student progress were supported, and that 91.7 percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that teachers at their school were encouraged to develop innovative solutions to problems. The items with the lowest percentages of teachers who agreed or strongly agreed dealt with class size and non-instructional duties that interfered with teaching.

Table 25
Percent of Teachers with each Response to Working Conditions Questions

Working Conditions Questions	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. I have sufficient space in my classroom to meet the educational needs of my students.	87.0	10.9	1.9
2. My non-instructional duties do not interfere with my essential role of educating students.	82.2	16.5	1.0
3. I have access to reliable communication technology, including phone, fax, and e-mail.	96.4	3.0	0.2
4. I feel supported by administrators at my school.	88.6	10.9	0.2
5. The faculty and staff at my school have a shared vision.	90.8	8.3	0.2
6. I am familiar with local, state, and national policies and how they affect teaching and learning.	97.1	2.1	0.3
7. Local, state, or national policies assist me in meeting the educational needs of my students.	88.0	10.6	0.8
8. The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns.	86.3	13.0	0.3
9. My decisions in areas such as instruction and student progress are supported.	91.9	7.1	0.6
10. Teachers at my school are encouraged to develop innovative solutions to problems.	91.7	7.6	0.3
11. I feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to me.	82.8	16.7	0.2
12. Sufficient resources are available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development activities.	88.8	10.0	0.4
13. My class sizes allow me to meet the educational needs of my students.	79.9	17.5	2.2
14. I am satisfied with my current working conditions.	89.4	10.0	0.2

E. Results of the Teacher Survey Related to Parent Perceptions of the School Learning Environment

The relationship between teacher perceptions of the overall learning environment of the school and parent perceptions of the overall learning environment of the school is presented in Table 26. The numbers in parentheses in the table are the percentages of teachers within each column of the table. Each column represents a different group of schools based on the parent perceptions of the learning environment in the school.

Consider the pattern of the percentages of teachers responding that they strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the overall learning environment of the school as the parent rating increased from lowest to highest. The percentage of parents who strongly agreed increased with each increase in the parental perception of the school. Now considering all other rows in the table, within each row, the percentage of teachers decreases as the parental perception of the school becomes more favorable. From this perspective, the one row that defines the pattern of teacher perception of the school learning environment in relation to parental perception of the school learning environment is the row of the table associated with teachers who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the learning environment. This one row includes 62 percent of teacher responses, so it represents the opinions of the majority of teachers. The simple summary of this relationship is that as parents perceive the school more favorably, so do teachers.

**Table 26
Teacher Perceptions of School Learning Environment by
Parental Perception of the School Learning Environment**

Teacher Rating of the Learning Environment	Parent Rating of the School Learning Environment					All Teacher Responses
	1 st Fifth (Lowest)	2 nd Fifth	3 rd Fifth	4 th Fifth	5 th Fifth (Highest)	
Strongly Disagree	608* (7**)	336 (4)	245 (3)	166 (2)	74 (1)	1429 (3)
Disagree	918 (11)	665 (8)	505 (6)	307 (4)	170 (2)	2565 (6)
Agree	2993 (37)	2801 (32)	2394 (28)	2160 (25)	1408 (19)	11756 (28)
Strongly Agree	3656 (45)	4961 (56)	5502 (64)	5891 (69)	5619 (77)	25629 (62)

* Number of Teacher Responses

** Percent of Responses within each column (may not add to 100 due to rounding).

A similar relationship exists between teacher perceptions of home and school relations of the school with parental perceptions of the school learning environment (Table 27). The percentage of teachers who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the home and school relations at their school increased as the parental perceptions of the learning environment of the school became more favorable. The pattern of percentages of teachers within any other row of the table consistently decreases as the parental perception the school learning environment becomes more favorable. The row of the table with the largest percentage of teacher responses (strongly agree), most clearly defines the relationship between

teacher perceptions of home and school relations and parental perceptions of the school learning environment; as parents view the learning environment of the school more favorably, teachers view the home and school relations for their school more favorably.

Table 27
Teacher Perceptions of Home and School Relations by
Parental Perception of the School Learning Environment

Teacher Rating of Home and School Relations	Parent Rating of the School Learning Environment					All Teacher Responses
	Lowest Quintile	2 nd Quintile	3 rd Quintile	4 th Quintile	Highest Quintile	
Strongly Disagree	902* (11**)	455 (5)	303 (3)	195 (2)	91 (1)	1946 (5)
Disagree	1875 (23)	1368 (16)	954 (11)	644 (8)	316 (4)	5157 (12)
Agree	3395 (42)	3930 (45)	3631 (42)	3251 (38)	2114 (29)	16321 (39)
Strongly Agree	2002 (24)	3019 (34)	3789 (44)	4435 (52)	4756 (65)	18001 (43)

* Number of Teacher Responses

** Percent of Responses within each column (may not add to 100 due to rounding).

The same relationship occurs between teacher perceptions of the social and physical environment of the school with parental perceptions of the school learning environment (Table 28). The percentage of teachers who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the social and physical environment of their school increased as the parental perceptions of the learning environment of the school became more favorable. The pattern of percentages of teachers within any other row of the table consistently decreases as the parental perception the school learning environment becomes more favorable. The row of the table with the largest percentage of teacher responses (strongly agree), most clearly defines the relationship between teacher perceptions of the social and physical environment of their school and parental perceptions of the school learning environment; as parents view the learning environment of the school more favorably, teachers view the social and physical environment of their school more favorably.

Table 28
Teacher Perceptions of the Social and Physical Environment of Their School
by Parental Perception of School Learning Environment

Teacher Rating of the Social and Physical Environment	Parent Rating of the School Learning Environment					All Teacher Responses
	Lowest Quintile	2 nd Quintile	3 rd Quintile	4 th Quintile	Highest Quintile	
Strongly Disagree	457* (6**)	262 (3)	187 (2)	121 (1)	78 (1)	1105 (3)
Disagree	862 (11)	576 (7)	446 (5)	275 (3)	154 (2)	2313 (6)
Agree	3254 (40)	2907 (33)	2582 (30)	2240 (26)	1482 (20)	12465 (30)
Strongly Agree	3640 (44)	5054 (57)	5472 (63)	5589 (69)	5577 (76)	24702 (60)

* Number of Teacher Responses

** Percent of Responses within each column (may not add to 100 due to rounding).

The relationship between teacher perceptions of the working conditions in their school and parental perceptions of the school learning environment is parallel to three previous results: as parent perception of the school learning environment increases, teacher perceptions of their working conditions increase (Table 29).

Table 29
Teacher Perceptions of their Working Conditions
by Parental Perception of School Learning Environment

Teacher Rating of their Working Conditions	Parent Rating of the School Learning Environment					All Teacher Responses
	Lowest Quintile	2 nd Quintile	3 rd Quintile	4 th Quintile	Highest Quintile	
Strongly Disagree	571* (7**)	359 (4)	295 (3)	198 (2)	125 (2)	1548 (4)
Disagree	776 (9)	636 (7)	559 (6)	420 (5)	203 (3)	2594 (6)
Agree	3038 (37)	2930 (33)	2652 (30)	2414 (28)	1698 (23)	12732 (31)
Strongly Agree	3836 (47)	4883 (55)	5192 (60)	5514 (65)	5277 (72)	24702 (59)

* Number of Teacher Responses

** Percent of Responses within each column (may not add to 100 due to rounding).

This same pattern exists between most of the items of the parent survey and parental perceptions of the school learning environment.

F. Results of Teacher Survey Questions on Bullying

The teacher survey asked teachers if they had been bullied by a student or by an adult. Table 30 presents a summary of the responses to these questions. Thirteen (13) percent of teachers agreed that they were bullied by another adult at their school, while 89 percent of teachers indicated that they were bullied by a student at their school. Although not presented here, these results are consistent for teachers in elementary, middle, and high school.

**Table 30
Teacher Perceptions of Being Bullied**

Teacher Response	Bullied by Another Adult at School (%)	Bullied by a Student at School (%)
Strongly Disagree	28394 (74)	1293 (3)
Disagree	2885 (7)	2788 (7)
Agree	1372 (4)	8691 (23)
Strongly Agree	3643 (9)	25263 (66)
Don't Know	2221 (6)	222 (1)

* Number of Teacher Responses

** Percent of Responses within each column (may not add to 100 due to rounding).

Conclusions

- Overall, 89.3 percent of teachers were satisfied with the learning environment of their school, as compared to 87.6 percent of parents.
- Overall, 81.9 percent of teachers were satisfied with home and school relations, as compared to 73.1 percent of parents.
- Overall, 91.0 percent of teachers were satisfied with the social and physical environment of their school, as compared to 85.3 percent of parents.
- For nearly all items, as parent satisfaction with the learning environment of their child's school increased, teacher satisfaction with the learning environment, home and school relations, and the social and physical environment of their school increased.
- The percentage of teachers who reported that they were bullied by a student at their school was approximately 89 percent.
- The percentage of teachers who reported that they were bullied by another adult at their school is approximately 13 percent.

APPENDIX A

The 2015 Parent Survey

4803026903

South Carolina
Parent Survey

DIRECTIONS

- Correct Mark: ○ ● ○ ○ ○
- Incorrect Mark: ● ○ ○ ○ ○
- Erase completely to change.
- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Fill in bubble completely.
- Do not fold or staple.

Parents in South Carolina who have children in selected grades are being asked to complete this survey. This survey asks you how you feel about your child's school. Since this survey will be used to help make your child's school a better place, it is very important to tell us exactly what you think. Your answers will be kept private. The school will get a summary of the survey results.

Directions: Read each statement. Decide if you agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or disagree with the statement. Then darken the bubble beside each statement. Do not write your name or address on this survey.

Learning Environment

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1. My child's teachers give homework that helps my child learn.	<input type="radio"/>				
2. My child's school has high expectations for student learning.	<input type="radio"/>				
3. My child's teachers encourage my child to learn.	<input type="radio"/>				
4. My child's teachers provide extra help when my child needs it.	<input type="radio"/>				
5. I am satisfied with the learning environment at my child's school.	<input type="radio"/>				

Home-School Relations

1. My child's teachers contact me to say good things about my child.	<input type="radio"/>				
2. My child's teachers tell me how I can help my child learn.	<input type="radio"/>				
3. My child's teachers invite me to visit my child's classrooms during the school day.	<input type="radio"/>				
4. My child's school returns my phone calls or e-mails promptly.	<input type="radio"/>				
5. My child's school includes me in decision-making.	<input type="radio"/>				
6. My child's school gives me information about what my child should be learning in school.	<input type="radio"/>				
7. My child's school considers changes based on what parents say.	<input type="radio"/>				
8. My child's school schedules activities at times that I can attend.	<input type="radio"/>				
9. My child's school treats all students fairly.	<input type="radio"/>				
10. The principal at my child's school is available and welcoming.	<input type="radio"/>				
11. I am satisfied with home-school relations at my child's school.	<input type="radio"/>				

Social and Physical Environment

1. My child's school is kept neat and clean.	<input type="radio"/>				
2. My child's teachers care about my child as an individual.	<input type="radio"/>				
3. Students at my child's school are well-behaved.	<input type="radio"/>				
4. My child feels safe at school.	<input type="radio"/>				
5. My child's teachers and school staff prevent or stop bullying at school.	<input type="radio"/>				
6. My child's school has an anti-bullying program to prevent or deal with bullying.	<input type="radio"/>				
7. I am satisfied with the social and physical environment at my child's school.	<input type="radio"/>				

Please tell us if you do the following:

	I do this	I don't do this, but I would like to	I don't do this, and I don't care to	The school does not offer this activity/event
1. Attend Open Houses or parent-teacher conferences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Attend student programs or performances.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Volunteer for the school (bake cookies, help in office, help with school fundraising, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Go on trips with my child's school (out-of-town band contest, field trip to the museum, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Participate in School Improvement Council meetings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Participate in Parent-Teacher-Student Organizations (PTA, PTO, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Participate in school committees (textbook committee, spring carnival committee, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Attend parent workshops (how to help my child with school work, how to talk to my child about drugs, effective discipline, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Go on to next page.

The 2015 Parent Survey

4860026906

Please tell us if you do the following:

- | | I do this | I don't do this, but I would like to | I don't do this, and I don't care to |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Visit my child's classrooms during the school day. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Contact my child's teachers about my child's school work. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Limit the amount of time my child watches TV, plays video games, surfs the Internet, etc. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Make sure my child does his/her homework. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. Help my child with homework when he/she needs it. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please mark if each of the following are True or False:

- | | True | False |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Lack of transportation reduces my involvement. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Family health problems reduce my involvement. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Lack of available care for my children or other family members reduces my involvement. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. My work schedule makes it hard for me to be involved. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. The school does not encourage my involvement. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. Information about how to be involved either comes too late or not at all. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. I don't feel like it is appreciated when I try to be involved. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please rate your school on:

- | | Very Good | Good | Okay | Bad | Very Bad |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The school's overall friendliness. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. The school's interest in parents' ideas and opinions. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. The school's efforts to get important information from parents. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. The school's efforts to give important information to parents. | <input type="radio"/> |

Please answer the following questions about your child:

- What grade is your child in? 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th 9th 10th 11th
- What is your child's gender? Male Female
- What is your child's race/ethnicity? African American/Black Hispanic Asian American/ Pacific Islander
 Caucasian/White Native American Other
- What grades did your child receive on his/her last report card? All or mostly A's and B's All or mostly C's and D's
 All or mostly B's and C's All or mostly D's and F's
- Has your child been bullied at school this year? Yes No Don't know
- If yes, was your child bullied: (Check all that apply) In classroom Other location at school At sporting events
 On-line/texting during school On the bus After school
- If yes, was your child bullied: (Check all that apply) Physically Verbally Both

Bullying is when 1 or more students tease, threaten, spread rumors about, hit, shove, or hurt another student over and over again physically. It is not bullying when 2 students of about the same strength or power argue or fight or tease each other in a friendly way.

Please answer the following questions about yourself. We are asking these questions because we want to be sure that schools are including all parents. For each question, mark only one answer. Your answers will be kept private.

- What is your gender? Male Female
- What is your race/ethnicity? African American/Black Hispanic Asian American/ Pacific Islander
 Caucasian/White Native American Other
- What is the highest level of education you have completed?

<input type="radio"/> Attended elementary/high school	<input type="radio"/> Earned Associate Degree	<input type="radio"/> Earned college degree
<input type="radio"/> Completed high school/GED	<input type="radio"/> Attended college/training program	<input type="radio"/> Postgraduate study and/or degree
- What is your family's total yearly household income?

<input type="radio"/> Less than \$15,000	<input type="radio"/> \$25,000 - \$34,999	<input type="radio"/> \$55,000 - \$75,000
<input type="radio"/> \$15,000 - \$24,999	<input type="radio"/> \$35,000 - \$54,999	<input type="radio"/> More than \$75,000

Thank you very much for completing this survey!

DO NOT MARK IN THIS AREA

APPENDIX B

The 2015 Teacher Survey

Response options provided were:

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

Don't Know

Learning Environment

1. My school provides challenging instructional programs for students.
2. Teachers at my school effectively implement the State Curriculum Standards.
3. Teachers at my school focus instruction on understanding, not just memorizing facts.
4. Teachers at my school have high expectations for students' learning.
5. There is a sufficient amount of classroom time allocated to instruction in essential skills.
6. Student assessment information is effectively used by teachers to plan instruction.
7. Effective instructional strategies are used to meet the needs of low achieving students.
8. My school offers effective programs for students with disabilities.
9. Instructional strategies are used to meet the needs of academically gifted students.
10. The level of teacher and staff morale is high at my school.
11. Teachers respect each other at my school.
12. Teachers at my school are recognized and appreciated for good work.
13. Students at my school are motivated and interested in learning.
14. There are sufficient materials and supplies available for classroom and instructional use.
15. Our school has a good selection of library and media material.
16. Our school has sufficient computers for instructional use.
17. Computers are used effectively for instruction at my school.
18. There are relevant professional development opportunities offered to teachers at my school.
19. The school administration communicates clear instructional goals for the school.
20. The school administration sets high standards for students.
21. The school administration has high expectations for teacher performance.
22. The school administration provides effective instructional leadership.
23. Student assessment information is used to set goals and plan programs for my school.
24. Teacher evaluation at my school focuses on instructional improvement.
25. School administrators visit classrooms to observe instruction.
26. The school administration arranges for collaborative planning and decision making.
27. I AM SATISFIED WITH THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IN MY SCHOOL.

APPENDIX B

The 2015 Teacher Survey

Social and Physical Environment of the School

1. The grounds around my school are kept clean.
2. The hallways at my school are kept clean.
3. The bathrooms at my school are kept clean.
4. The school building is maintained well and repaired when needed.
5. There is sufficient space for instructional programs at my school.
6. Students at my school behave well in class.
7. Students at my school behave well in the hallways, in the lunchroom, and on school grounds.
8. Rules and consequences for behavior are clear to students.
9. The rules for behavior are enforced at my school.
10. The rules about how students should behave in my school are fair.
11. I have been bullied by an adult at this school.
12. I have been bullied by a student at this school.
13. My school or district provides me with training to assist in preventing and/or dealing with bullying.
14. I feel safe at my school before and after school hours.
15. I feel safe at my school during the school day.
16. I feel safe going to or coming from my school.
17. Students from different backgrounds get along well at my school.
18. Teachers and students get along well with each other at my school.
19. Teachers at my school collaborate for instructional planning.
20. I AM SATISFIED WITH THE SOCIAL AND PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AT MY SCHOOL.

Home and School Relations

1. Parents at my school are aware of school policies.
2. Parents at my school know about school activities.
3. Parents at my school understand the school's instructional programs.
4. Parents at my school are interested in their children's schoolwork.
5. Parents at my school support instructional decisions regarding their children.
6. Parents attend conferences requested by teachers at my school.
7. Parents at my school cooperate regarding discipline problems.
8. Parents attend school meetings and other school events.
9. Parents participate as volunteer helpers in the school or classroom.
10. Parents are involved in school decisions through advisory committees.
11. I AM SATISFIED WITH HOME AND SCHOOL RELATIONS.

APPENDIX B

The 2015 Teacher Survey

Teacher Working Conditions

1. I have sufficient space in my classroom to meet the educational needs of my students.
2. My non-instructional duties do not interfere with my essential role of educating students.
3. I have access to reliable communication technology, including phone, fax, and e-mail.
4. I feel supported by administrators at my school.
5. The faculty and staff at my school have a shared vision.
6. I am familiar with local, state, and national policies and how they affect teaching and learning.
7. Local, state, or national policies assist me in meeting the educational needs of my students.
8. The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns.
9. My decisions in areas such as instruction and student progress are supported.
10. Teachers at my school are encouraged to develop innovative solutions to problems.
11. I feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to me.
Sufficient resources are available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development
12. activities.
13. My class sizes allow me to meet the educational needs of my students.
14. I AM SATISFIED WITH MY CURRENT WORKING CONDITIONS.

Additional Questions:

1. Gender
2. Race
3. National Board Certification
4. Years of Experience as a Teacher
5. Years Teaching at Current School
6. Teacher Preparation
7. Highest Degree Obtained.

The Education Oversight Committee does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or handicap in its practices relating to employment or establishment and administration of its programs and initiatives. Inquiries regarding employment, programs and initiatives of the Committee should be directed to the Executive Director 803.734.6148.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee

FROM: Melanie Barton
Bunnie Ward

DATE: March 7, 2016

IN RE: Fiscal Year 2016-17 Budget Update

On February 25, 2016 the House Ways and Means Committee completed its deliberations on the 2016-17 state budget. As of the writing of this summary, the actual general appropriation bill has not yet been introduced in the House. Therefore, the information provided below on funding and provisos represents information obtained from handouts and spreadsheets provided to the public.

The following is a summary of the Ways and Means budget and proviso recommendations for Fiscal Year 2016-17 that related directly to public education.

**Ways and Means Recommended Increases/Decreases for FY2016-17
General Fund, Lottery, Non-Recurring and EIA Revenues**

Recurring General Funds

Education Finance Act – Increased base student cost from \$2,220 to \$2,350 and added a weight for dual enrollment of 0.2. The EFA appropriation was increased by \$217.6 million.

Virtual SC – Increase of \$1.2 million for 18 additional teachers for online courses.

Operations at South Carolina Department of Education – Increase of \$2.8 million for IT, technology infrastructure, staff, educator certification, alternative certification, etc.

EEDA - \$10.0 million increase for guidance counselors, etc.

Transportation

Bus Driver Salary \$19.2 million

Hazardous Transportation \$3.5 million

Other

Education Outreach/State Museum (SCDE) \$275,000

Coding Curriculum (SCDE) - \$300,000

Non-Recurring General Funds:

Allocations Targeted to Abbeville Equity Lawsuit:

Technology Technical Assistance (SCDE) \$16.8 million - Funds are to increase the capacity of districts who are or were the original trial and plaintiff school districts in the Abbeville law suit. Funds shall be used by the department to assist school districts in procuring appropriate technology to include devices and infrastructure in accordance with the recommendations made by the technology review team to begin to build capacity to offer online testing and increased access.

Statewide Facilities Assessment (SCDE) \$1.5 million

Lottery Revenues - Allocated through SCDE

K-12 Technology Initiative - \$29.3 million. This is the same level of funding as in the prior two fiscal years. The allocation formula has not changed as well.

School Bus Lease/Purchase - \$10.0 million for purchase or lease of new buses

Allocations Targeted to Abbeville Equity Lawsuit:

College & Career Readiness of \$3.0 million – “Funds are to be used first to increase the capacity of districts that are or were the original trial and plaintiff school districts in the Abbeville law suit. Funds shall be used by the department to provide assistance to districts using appropriately experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness in instructional leadership. Support shall include professional development, standards and learning support, instructional support, data analysis and leadership development resources to ensure that educators are equipped with the tools to provide students with high quality, personalized learning that supports the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate.”

Efficiency Studies - \$3.1 million

Dynamic Report Card System (EAA) - \$1,695,000 (Plus an additional \$1,952,000 in non-recurring EIA revenues for PowerSchool)

Reading Partners \$400,000

Mobile Device Access & Management \$3.0 million– Funds will be used to procure high-speed mobile internet service for students that do not have such internet service at home and are participating in a course of study that requires such access.

EIA – Increase of \$54.1 million in recurring and \$12.1 million in non-recurring EIA revenues allocated to:

- Teacher Pay - \$23.2 million for 2% teacher salary increase and for increasing the statewide minimum teacher salary schedule from 22 to 23 years.
- SC Public Charter School District \$12.1 million
- Rural Teacher Initiative \$8.2 million (Governor’s Initiative)
- AdvancedEd \$2,501,301
- Teacher Supply \$750,000
- Read to Succeed Office (SCDE) \$257,400
- Early Childhood (SCDE) \$343,200
- Office of First Steps:
 - BabyNet - \$4.9 million
 - Family Connection - \$300,000
 - Local Partnerships (4.0 FTEs) \$398,504
 - First Steps County Partnerships \$1.7 million

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
1.3	Base Student Cost	AMENDED - To Increase base student cost from \$2,220 to \$2,370 and add .15 pupil weighting for dual credit enrollment. Direct students in poverty be identified using USDA community eligibility criteria and include students eligible for Medicaid, children classified as transient and/or homeless. (Increase in EFA of \$217.6 million)	Adopt.
1.39	Instructional Materials Fees	AMENDED - To replace word "textbook" with "instructional materials."	Adopt.
1.42	Residential Treatment Facilities	AMENDED - To require students placed in licensed residential treatment facilities that are identified on the State Qualified Providers list and meet requirements of state law.	Adopt.
1.50	Student Health and Fitness	AMENDED - To allow funds for school nurses to be distributed to school districts directly rather than through a grant process.	Adopt.
1.53 and 1.83	Health Education	AMENDED - To require each district to publish on its website the title and publisher of all health ed materials it used in the classroom. Deletes the requirement that a district's base student cost be reduced by 1% if a complaint is determined to be founded and corrective action is not taken and instead establish a 30 day process for corrective action to be taken. If SCDE determines corrective action not taken 1% of districts SHFA funds shall be withheld until district is in compliance. (Proviso 1.83 DELETED and merged with 1.53)	Adopt.
1.62 and 1A.30	Full Day 4K	AMENDED - To Increase per student reimbursement from \$4,218 to \$4,323, to increase transportation reimbursement for private providers from \$550 to \$562.	Adopt.
1.63	Summer Reading Camps	AMENDED - To designate \$700,000 to SC Afterschool Alliance. Requires SLED background check for all volunteers, mentors, tutors. No more than 10% may be retained by Alliance for administration and planning document must be submitted to SCDE by September 15.	Adopt.
1.66 and 1A.66 in EIA	Literacy Coaches	AMENDED - To change "reading coaches" to "literacy coaches" and "not met" to "below proficient." Clarify the duties associated with literacy coaches. Direct that unspent or unallocated literacy coach funds be used to fund summer reading camps and require SCDE report the amount of funds used for this purpose.	Adopt.
1.73	Transition Funds to Districts	DELETED - Proviso had allocated funds to districts that were negatively impacted by changes in EFA weightings in prior years and in realignment of EIA and lottery appropriations.	Adopt.

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
1.74	First Steps 4K Technology	AMENDED - To delete reference to "early literacy and language development" and instead reference "required school readiness" assessments. Broadens the definition of assessment to consistent with upcoming planned changes. Still provides \$75,000 in 4K carry forward to fund electronic devices.	Adopt.
1.75	Teacher Salary Schedule Study	AMENDED - To direct SCDE to include salary needs information from Abbeville districts. Allows work to continue by deleting the deadline for submission of recommendations.	Adopt.
1.78	Transition Funds to Districts	DELETED - Proviso had allocated funds to districts that were negatively impacted by changes in EFA weightings in prior years and in realignment of EIA and lottery appropriations.	Adopt.
1.86	Educational Credits Exceptional Needs Children	AMENDED - To require eligible schools to have graduation certificate requirements for special needs children and offer a specially designed program or learning resource center to provide needed accommodations based on the needs of exceptional needs students or is a school specifically existing to meet the needs of only exceptional needs students with documented disabilities. Allows participating schools to notify EOC of continuing participation by December 30. Any school that did not participate in the program in the prior fiscal year may apply for participation in the program at any time in the fiscal year. EOC must publish the approved list on its website by September 1 and shall update the list upon approval of additional eligible schools.	Adopt.
1.79 and 1A.71	CDEPP Unexpended Funds	AMENDED - To permit First Steps to retain the first \$2 million in unexpended prior year CDEP funds. If by August 15, school districts eligible to participate in full-day 4K opt not to participate, SCDE may utilize available funds to increase participation on a per pupil basis for districts eligible to participate and who have a documented weighting list. Delete requirements that First Steps allocated \$4.25 million for CDEP to SCDE and \$2 million for Community Block Grants to EOC.	Adopt.
1.82	Literacy Initiatives	DELETED - Proviso had required SCDE to evaluate and coordinate available literacy initiatives.	

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
1.86	Educational Credits Exceptional Needs Children	AMENDED - To require eligible schools to have graduation certificate requirements for special needs children and "offer a specially designed program or learning resource center to provide needed accommodations based on the needs of exceptional needs students or is a school specifically existing to meet the needs of only exceptional needs students with documented disabilities." Allows participating schools to notify EOC of continuing participation by December 30. Any school that did not participate in the program in the prior fiscal year may apply for participation in the program at any time in the fiscal year. EOC must publish the approved list on its website by September 1 and shall update the list upon approval of additional eligible schools.	Adopt.
NEW:			
1.ita	SC IT Academy	ADDED - To direct SCDE to procure an IT Academy for public schools statewide and direct the academy offer certification opportunities for educators to receive Teacher Certification Exams and for middle school students to receive certification in an office suite of products and for high school students to receive programming credentials.	Adopt.
1.mov	Moving Cost Study	ADDED - To direct SCDE to submit a report on the costs associated with moving SCDE from Rutledge Building to legislature by September 1, 2016.	Adopt.
1.TTA	Technology Technical Assistance	ADDED - To direct funds appropriated by SCDE for technology technical assistance to be used to increase capacity of Abbeville districts. SCDE shall use funds to assist districts in procuring appropriate technology to include devices and infrastructure.	Adopt.
EIA:			
1A.2	African-American History	AMENDED - To direct that funds currently a salary line item be reallocated for development of instructional materials and programs and implementation of professional learning opportunities that promote African American history and culture. Amend the direct that SCDE expend 70% through a competitive bids process and that they be expended through a competitive grants process.	Adopt.

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
1A.4	Teacher Salaries/State Agencies	AMENDED - To direct that affected agencies receive increases for teacher salaries as recommended by the EOC rather than an allocation from the specific line item. Deletes the requirement that the Executive Budget Office distribute the line item funds and instead direct that teacher salary increases recommend by the EOC and funding in this act be incorporated into each agencies EIA appropriations.	Adopt.
1A.9	Teacher Supplies	AMENDED - To add on certified public school teachers and career specialist to those individuals eligible to receive the reimbursement and to also allow those eligible individuals employed by a publically funded full day 4K classroom.	Adopt.

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
1A.12	Technical Assistance (EIA)	AMENDED - To provide intensive support to schools and districts with the lowest percentages of students meeting state standards on state assessments on the most recent state assessments or with the lowest high school graduation rates or with an absolute rating of below average or at risk on school report card. SCDE will create a system of tiers on TA and low performing schools and districts shall be placed within the tiered framework no later than December 15. Low performing schools shall receive a diagnostic review through SCDE and new identified schools and districts must be reviewed by an External Review Team in the year of designation and every third year after. Schools and districts shall submit an updated school renewal or district strategic plan; plans shall address specific strategies designed to increase student achievements and must include measures to evaluation success. TA experts shall assist schools and districts in designing and implementing the strategies and measurements identified. SCDE must monitor plan progress on implementation and report findings to local legislative delegation and Governor. SCDE Superintendent may declare a state or emergency in a school if the accreditation status is probation or denied or if the school fails to show improvement on the state accountability system. SCDE Superintendent may take over management of the school district.	Adopt.
1A.20	Certified Staff Technology Proficiency	Amend proviso to delete preferred method for demonstrating technology proficiency and instead direct that district adopted technology proficiency standards and plan should be at a minimum aligned to ISTE teacher standards.	Adopt.
1A.24.	Students at Risk of School Failure	AMENDED - To change definition of poverty index to "students identified using USDA Community Eligibility guidelines and students in Medicaid, students identified as Migrant and students identified as homeless."	Adopt.
1A.25	Professional Development	25% of funds must target Abbeville districts. SCDE authorized to carry forward and expend any funds for the same purpose.	
1A.26	Assessments G&T, AP, IB	AMENDED - To increase from \$46.5 million to \$5.4 million allocation of funds for AP and IB testing due to increased participation.	
1A.27	Adult Education	AMENDED - To allow up to \$300,000 to be used to establish an initiative for qualifying adult ed students to qualify for a free high school equivalency test and direct SCDE to establish guidelines for this initiative.	Adopt.

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
1A.28	Clemson Agriculture Education Teachers	AMENDED - To authorize funds to be used for a Regional Coordinator if there are sufficient funds. (An additional \$100,000 allocated to Clemson PSA for this initiative)	Adopt.
1A.38	Teacher Salaries/ Southeast Average	AMENDED - To update projections for Southeastern average teacher salary from \$49,975 to \$51,495.	Adopt.
1A.41.	Assessments Projection	DELETED - To require SCDE to institute a plan for reviewing SAT, ACT, WorkKeys and other high school exams to determine student strengths and weaknesses and to provide guidance to school districts	Adopt.
1A.52	Surplus (EIA)	AMENDED - To require EIA surplus funds from prior fiscal year be allocated accordingly: \$2.8 million to EOC for Partnerships for Innovation; Allendale District \$150,000; Vocational Equipment Modernization \$1,501,307; Industry Certification \$3 million; Adult Ed \$1.5 million; Power School/Data Collection \$1.952 million; IT Academy \$750,000, Instructional Development and Digital Content Curation \$493,443	Adopt.
1A.54	SC Public Charter School District Funding	AMENDED - To extend the timelines for ruling on charter school application FY 2016-17 by 60 days if the Public Charter School district determines an applicant should be allowed to amend its application to meet the requirements based on their proposal to address an existing achievement gap in an underserved area of the state including, but not limited to, Abbeville districts. Direct the EOC to report at the end of the application cycle on the outcome of extending the hearing time.	Adopt.
1A.60	BabyNet Autism Therapy	AMENDED - To increase increasing BabyNet provider rate to \$13.58/hour or current Medicaid rate, whichever is higher.	Adopt.
1A.63.	Technology and Device Pilot Project	DELETED - SCDE to use surplus funds to pilot devices or digital content in up to six school districts	

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
1A.64	Rural Teacher Recruiting Initiative	AMENDED - To direct CERRA to "publish" rather than "develop" eligibility requirements. Direct CERRA to include incentives for subsidized tuition and instructional materials; for enhanced student loan forgiveness or repayment; for establishment and maintenance of a teaching mentorship program and for technical support and recruiting incentives. Direct CERRA to also develop a process for recovering an amount equal to the incentive given to a participant who does not meet the obligations associated with the incentive.	Adopt.
1A.68	4K Early Literacy Competencies Assessments	AMENDED - To delete the directive that SCDE select up to three formative assessments and instead directs SCDE to manage the administration of the assessments as done in the prior fiscal year. Directs that accommodation that do not invalidate assessment results must be provided in the manner set for by the student's IEP or 504. Deletes the requirement that districts and private providers be allocated \$15 per child to cover the cost of the assessment and for them to report electronically to SCDE the results of each individual assessment. SCDE was to sue the same assessments until the KEA work on numeracy in NC is completed.	Adopt.
1A.70.	Statewide Assessment Procurement	DELETED - Proviso required SCDE to procure 11th grade college readiness assessment and grades 3-8 ELA and math assessment	
NEW:			
1A.CCR	College and Career Readiness	ADDED - Funds appropriated to SCDE for college and career readiness assistance (\$must first be used to improve educational outcomes of students residing in Abbeville districts. SCDE shall use funds to provide districts assistance with using educators with effectiveness in instructional leadership. Equip educators with tools to provide students with high quality, personalized learning that supports Profile of SC Graduate.	Adopt.

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
1A.CETF	CATE Equipment	ADDED - Funds shall be distributed to districts and career centers based on prior year actual student enrollment in CATE courses with no district or center receiving less than \$50,000. Funds may be expended to purchase equipment, to up fit facilities and to purchase consumables. District must include info on current CATE equipment, alignment of equipment to job needs in District plan. Plans must include charter schools in district offering at least one CATE completer program. Districts and centers may carry forward funds to be used for same intended purposes.	Adopt.
1A.dl	Digital Learning	ADDED - \$1.9 million of surplus EIA funds allocated to EOC for Partnerships for Innovation will be utilized for one-year agreements with public and private entities to pilot computer science initiatives in schools. Initiatives must focus on improving the digital literacy skills of students and teachers, expanding opportunities for students to learn coding, or providing computer science curriculum. \$1.5 million must be authorized for schools or districts with 80% or greater poverty indices or are an Abbeville district. The EOC will pilot the program.	Adopt.
1A.FC	Family Connection (EIA)	ADDED - Funds appropriated (\$300,000) to be transferred in quarterly installments from SCDE to Family Connection. Funds shall be used to provide support to families of children with disabilities and shall include home visits, transition assistance, education assistance, parent support and parent training. Family Connection to provide planning documents to SCDE no later than July 15 and quarterly reporting thereafter.	Adopt.
1A.las	Low Achieving Schools (EIA)	ADDED - Of the funds allocated to EOC for Partnerships for Innovation, \$500,000 to be allocated to parent support initiatives and afterschool programs in historically underachieving communities.	Adopt.

FY2016-17 Education Proviso Summary

Proviso	Title	Description	House Ways and Means
XI.C.2	Teacher Salaries (EIA)	ADDED - SCDE directed to increase the statewide salary schedule by 2% . Local districts must provide all certified paid teachers increase. If districts already pay above the statewide salary schedule, districts shall use the additional funds made available from Teacher Salary Supplement appropriation to fund a 1% increase. District must increase salary compensation for all eligible certified teachers by an amount equal to a step on the salary schedule for any teacher entering the 23rd year if district's salary schedule does not go beyond 22 years. District may apply to SCDE for a waiver if it believes it will be unable to provide the additional step without incurring a deficit. Teachers are defined by SCDE Professional Certified Staff System. (An additional \$23.2 million plus carry forward funds of \$10.0 million used to pay for the increase, along with increase in EFA)	Adopt.
1A.1CC	Industry Certifications/ Credentials	ADDED - Funds appropriated (\$3.0 million) for national industry exams to be allocated to districts based on number of national industry exams administered in prior school year. SCDE to work with other agencies to ensure students are award of industry required credentials for current job availability.	Adopt

NOTE: Excluded from the list above are any proviso changes that update fiscal year or date references.

SOURCE: House Ways and Means Committee, Committee Postings and Reports, through February 25, 2016.

\