

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

AGENDA

October 10, 2016

1:00 p.m.

433 Blatt Building

- I. Welcome and Introductions Mr. Robinson
- II. Approval of Minutes Mr. Robinson
- III. Assessment Information
Brandi Sabb, Director, K-12 State and District Partnerships
Asenith Dixon, Director, Government Relations – South
The College Board
- IV. Key Constituency
Accountability Working Group Progress Report
Superintendent's Division of SCASA

Discussion of Accountability
- V. Special Presentation
Rob Cardelli, Project Manager, Technology Readiness Studies
- VI. Subcommittee Reports
 - A. Academic Standards and Assessment Dr. Merck
Public Awareness Ms. Hairfield
Update: Merging of State and Federal Accountability
 - B. EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Dr. Couch
Information: K-12 Technology Initiative Report
Information: ECENC Report
- VII. Report on 2014-15 Community Block Grants for Education Pilot Dr. Rainey Knight

Adjournment

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Minutes
Summer Retreat
July 31, 2016 and August 1, 2016
Moore Farms Botanical Garden
Education Center
Lake City, South Carolina

Sunday, July 31, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.

Members Present: Neil Robinson, Chair; April Allen; Cynthia Bennett; Anne Bull; Bob Couch, Sen. Mike Fair; Rep. Raye Felder; Barbara Hairfield; Sen. Wes Hayes; Rep. Dwight Loftis; Sen. John Matthews; State Superintendent of Education Molly Spearman; John Stockwell; and Ellen Weaver.

Other Legislators Present: Sen. Greg Hembree

EOC Staff Present: Melanie Barton; Kevin Andrews; Rainey Knight; Bunnie Ward; and Dana Yow.

Mr. Robinson welcomed the members and guests to Lake City. He recognized the two newest members of the EOC in attendance. Governor Haley recently appointed Cynthia Bennett, the Associate Vice President of Education/Business Relations for the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce, as her business appointee to the EOC. Rep. Rita Allison, chairwoman of the House Education and Public Works Committee, has appointed to the EOC, Dr. John Stockwell, the Executive Director of the Spartanburg Academic Movement. Dr. Stockwell serves as a business appointee.

The minutes of the June 13, 2016 meeting were approved as distributed.

Mr. Robinson advised the members of the tentative meeting schedule of the EOC for fiscal year 2016-17. The full EOC will meet with the State Board of Education on September 14, 2016 in Columbia. Additional information will be mailed to members.

Mr. Robinson then called upon Mrs. Barton to present an overview of the existing data regarding South Carolina's progress toward every student graduating from public high schools with the knowledge, skills and characteristics of the *Profile of the South Carolina Graduate*. First, Mrs. Barton handed out information documenting the implementation of STEM Premier in 100 high schools and 10 career centers this fall. These schools and centers will receive dashboards that allow the schools to gather data that provides useful information about their students and programs being offered. Other high schools can still participate in the SC Future Makers initiative and encourage their students to create profiles on STEM premier at no cost.

Mrs. Barton then presented a PowerPoint presentation starting with an overview of the 2020 Vision that the EOC adopted in 2009 and the metrics that have been used over time to monitor student achievement. In 2015 40 percent of working-age adults in South Carolina had a postsecondary degree or industry credential, a national ranking of 42nd. Of concern is the fact that neighboring states, Georgia, Florida and North Carolina all had greater than 45 percent of the working-age

adults with a postsecondary degree or industry credential. The trend is also concerning since states in the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) region have not seen any real change since 2008 in this percentage of adults with a postsecondary degree. While South Carolina and other SREB states have made progress in improving the high school on-time graduation rate, the gap between the on-time graduation rate and college readiness, as measured by ACT scores, is significant. A 2016 report by Education Trust found that almost half of high school graduates did not complete a college or career-ready course of study. The presentation concluded with information regarding NAEP scores on reading and mathematics, highlighting the achievement gaps between white students and black and Hispanic students.

State Superintendent Molly Spearman commented that reading achievement must improve in the state. She noted the work the Department of Education is doing in Florence 4 where a lack of leadership capacity at the district and school levels had impacted teaching and learning. Underperforming schools and districts had been given money without the tools and capacity to implement effective intervention plans. Rep. Felder concurred that leadership is a critical component to achievement. Ms. Hairfield also noted that sustained intervention is important. Because education is one of the loneliest professions in the world, novice teachers need mentors, a technique that has improved teaching and learning at Meeting Street Academy. She concluded by reiterating the importance of skills and characteristics, students need to know how to learn. Dr. Couch noted that with his experience in the Allendale School District that the culture also needs to change so that expectations for learning are raised.

Mr. Robinson then recognized Darla Moore. In addition to her successful career in business, Ms. Moore has focused her attention recently on revitalizing her home town of Lake City. The EOC asked Ms. Moore to provide her insight into how to improve education in rural South Carolina. Ms. Moore explained that improving rural South Carolina requires a three-pronged approach. First, there needs to be a functioning government to make rapid change. Second, education must be improved. She noted that her involvement in local school board elections and in finding district leaders. She noted that her staff was able to find effective, research-based programs to implement in the schools with support from her foundation. For example, she assisted Florence 3 in finding Teach For America corps members, in implementing Reading Partners, and in establishing a New Tech High School at Lake City High School. She is now looking at the expansion of summer programs to increase the amount of time on task students in poverty have an opportunity to receive. And, third, a community must reinvent its economy. Ms. Moore has focused on downtown Lake City, building a hotel and attracting several businesses and restaurants. The next step involves a partnership with Florence-Darlington Technical College to establish a middle college environment focused on hospitality and tourism and mechanical, electrical and design careers. Ms. Moore noted that K-12 education is the “black hole” in philanthropy. Many non-profits are electing not to invest in K-12 education. For many, it is a concern that initiatives are not scalable. Ms. Moore concluded with two issues that impede progress. First, poverty prevents students from having access to opportunities. And, second, higher education is not adequately preparing our teachers and leaders to work with students in poverty.

Rep. Loftis asked Ms. Moore to comment about the use of technology in education. Ms. Moore stated that we have not touched the technology that is available and we need to work harder in that arena because technology can be used to scale initiatives. Rep. Felder concurred with Ms. Moore that our teachers are not taught how to effectively teach children of poverty and therefore, we have to change our teacher preparation programs. Ms. Moore noted that pre-service teachers need to be in the classrooms sooner, especially in our most challenging schools.

Mr. Robinson thanked Ms. Moore for having the EOC retreat in Lake City and invited her to the dinner to follow at 6:00 p.m.

The only action item on the EOC agenda is the approval of criteria to identify underperforming schools and districts based on student assessment and graduation results from the 2015-16 school year. Mr. Robinson explained the recommendations of the Academic Standards and Assessment Subcommittee. With passage of the federal legislation, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the new federal accountability system will not be operational until school year 2017-18. However, in the meantime, the state will release to the public in the fall of 2016 and 2017 transitional report cards that must identify “potentially underperforming schools and districts” to ensure that technical assistance support and interventions are provided. The criteria for identifying elementary and middle schools will be assessment results in English language arts and mathematics on the SC Ready assessment. The criteria for high schools will include graduation rates, ACT college benchmarks results, and WorkKeys results. For districts, the criteria include graduation rates and student assessment results from SC Ready, ACT and WorkKeys. After members asked clarifying questions, the subcommittee report was unanimously approved.

The EOC adjourned at 6:00 p.m. to have dinner at the facility.

Monday, August 1, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.

Members Present: Neil Robinson, Chair; April Allen; Cynthia Bennett; Anne Bull; Bob Couch, Rep. Raye Felder; Barbara Hairfield; Sen. Wes Hayes; Rep. Dwight Loftis; Sen. John Matthews; Rep. Joe Neal; State Superintendent of Education Molly Spearman; John Stockwell; and Ellen Weaver.

Staff Present: Melanie Barton; Kevin Andrews; Rainey Knight; Lisa Nichols; Bunnie Ward; and Dana Yow.

Other Legislators Present: Sen. Greg Hembree

Mr. Robinson opened the meeting by introducing Graceanne Cole, Vice President of Research for MarketSearch Corporation to provide the results of a statewide survey on accountability and expectations. The statewide survey was given during April and May 2016. The focus groups for the survey were general population, educators, businesspeople, and parents of school-aged children. Each survey looked at perceptions of education and how groups viewed the school and district report cards. In general, the public tends to see the report cards as effective tools to improve education. Educators, however, were somewhat more likely to view them as labels that are divisive. Priorities for the report cards vary somewhat by audience, but all want to see evidence of achievement and performing at grade level (especially on reading). Regarding the format for grading schools (by descriptors or letter grades), the study found mixed reactions from various audiences. Educators and parents identified a general preference for descriptors (Excellent, Average, At Risk, etc.) while the General Population audience and business leaders preferred giving schools letter grades (A-F).

When it comes to goals and expectations of students and schools, the study findings indicated that, for many, expectations tended to be higher than actual performance, but that the goals under consideration seem unrealistic or unattainable. Educators were somewhat more positive about current school performance but significantly more skeptical regarding attainment of projected goals.

Overall, the survey findings identified reasonable levels of engagement among all audience; support for measurement and reporting of performance, and support for setting reasonable goals that may ultimately enhance SC's public education system and the quality of education within the state.

Sen. Matthews asked if citizens from underperforming schools and districts were represented in the sample. Mrs. Cole explained that while the sample size for parents and educators was not controlled, a diverse area of the state was represented in each surveyed group. Larger school districts tended to have higher presentation, however. Rep. Neal asked questions about what could explain the differences in expectations between the groups. Mrs. Cole said that while educators had a higher familiarity with issues like personalized learning and the achievement gap, their perceptions about the report card and expectations may present the personal familiarity educators have with the subject matter being surveyed.

Then, Mr. Robinson introduced Dr. Lee D'Andrea, former superintendent of Anderson 4 and Pickens County and chair of the EOC's High School Task Force, to lead the EOC members into a discussion of the accountability system. Dr. D'Andrea used a "system approach" to evaluate the current and future needs of our state's accountability system. Working in groups the EOC members focused on: (1) ensuring that students entering the public schools be closely monitored to ensure that they are reading proficiently by the third grade; (2) new quality data collections that provide meaningful information to teachers, students and parents on the student's pathway for college and career readiness, as measured by knowledge, skills and characteristics; and (3) communicating to educators, parents, and the public on measures of college and career readiness. Specifically, EOC members discussed:

1. South Carolina must have a baseline assessment of the whole child (literacy, numeracy and some family background information) when students enter the system in full-day 4K or five-year-old kindergarten. This requires a new database system to collect the data.
2. South Carolina should assess students at the conclusion of each grade through 2nd grade for literacy and numeracy. This documentation of growth (formative) is powerful information for parents and can be used to demonstrate school success or accountability in moving students toward the Read to Succeed goal. This also requires a new database system to collect the data
3. South Carolina should assess students in grades 3-8 in the four core subject areas of English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. However, the assessments should not be merely multiple choice assessments of content. For example, the social studies assessment should contain a strand on citizenship, work ethics, service to country, etc., which is consistent with the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate. Again, a new database system to collect the data. It also requires an intensive communication plan.
4. South Carolina, working with institutions of higher education, must establish scores on the ACT, SAT, or ACCUPLACER to determine college readiness. Regarding career readiness, South Carolina must establish a WorkKeys National Certification level as well as an ASVAB and/or Career Completer Sequence and industry certification to be deemed "career-ready." Again, a new database system is needed to collect the data. It also requires an intensive communication plan.

Superintendent Spearman noted that additional assessments will not be readily embraced by the public. Rep. Neal noted that students in poverty are in need of opportunities through the K-12 public education system that students of higher socioeconomic status already have. Dr. Stockwell noted that a critical metric is the number of remedial courses our high school graduates have to take in two-year colleges before earning college credit.

Mr. Robinson concluded by thanking the members for their participation in the retreat. In September the Academic Standards and Assessment Subcommittee will begin working on recommendations to the General Assembly regarding the key components of the accountability system.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at noon.

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Subcommittee: EIA and Improvement Mechanisms

Date: October 10, 2016

ACTION:
K-12 Technology Initiative Report

PURPOSE/AUTHORITY

Proviso 3.6 of the 2015-16 General Appropriation Act requires the EOC to create a form that documents the amounts and expenditure of funds for this initiative.

CRITICAL FACTS

This report summarizes Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16 expenditures for the initiative as self-reported by the districts on the 2016 District Technology Survey. In addition answers from schools on the 2016 School Technology Survey provides information on the internal connections and one-to-one computing capacities of schools.

TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS

The surveys were administered between March 30 and June 30, 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)

K-12 TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE REPORT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff expresses its appreciation to the following individuals who provided data and support for this report:

Don Cantrell, Valarie Byrd, and Claudette Flynn of the South Carolina Department of Education

Keith Osman and Adam Epting of the South Carolina Department of Administration

BACKGROUND

Governor Nikki R. Haley's K-12 Education Reform Initiative of 2014 recommended state investment in educational technology and connectivity. "Modernizing technology in our schools and improving bandwidth will give students greater access to educational content and also critical computer skills their future employers will demand."¹ The Governor specifically recommended \$29.3 million for "improving bandwidth to school facilities, bolstering wireless connectivity within school walls, and launching or enhancing 1-to-1 technology initiatives."²

In Fiscal Year 2014-15 the General Assembly funded with lottery fund revenues the K-12 Technology Initiative. The Initiative has three objectives: to improve external connections to schools; to improve internal connections within schools; and to develop or expand one-to-one computing. The following table documents the annual appropriations to the K-12 Technology Initiative since its inception.

Table 1
K-12 Technology Initiative

Fiscal Year	Total Appropriation
2014-15	\$29,288,976
2015-16	\$29,288,976
2016-17	\$29,288,976
TOTAL:	\$87,866,928

Provisos in the annual general appropriations act established the funding formula and reporting requirements for the K-12 Technology Initiative. The portion of Proviso 3.6 of the 2015-16 General Appropriation Act that addressed the K-12 Technology Initiative is below.

Funds appropriated to the Department of Education for the K-12 Technology Initiative shall be distributed to the public school districts of the state, the special schools of the state and the South Carolina Public Charter School District, per pupil, based on the previous year's one hundred thirty-five day average daily membership, according to the below calculations: (1) For a school district with a poverty index of less than 75: \$35 per ADM; (2) For a school district with a poverty index of at least 75 but no more than 85: \$50 per ADM; or (3) For a school district with a poverty index of greater than 85 or a special school with no defined poverty index: \$70 per ADM.

The Department of Education may adjust the per-ADM rates for each of the three classes defined above in order to conform to actual levels of student attendance and available appropriations, provided that the per-ADM rate for each class is adjusted by the same percentage.

¹ Governor Nikki R. Haley, "K-12 Education Reform Initiative." 2014.
<<http://governor.sc.gov/News/Documents/Gov.%20Nikki%20Haley%20-%20K-12%20Education%20Reform%20Initiative%202014.pdf>>.

² Ibid.

Funds distributed to a school district through the K-12 Technology Initiative may only be used for the following purposes: (1) To improve external connections to schools, with a goal of reaching at least 100 kilobits per second, per student in each school by 2017; (2) To improve internal connections within schools, with a goal of reaching at least 1 megabit per second, per student in each school by 2017; or (3) To develop or expand one-to-one computing initiatives.

A school district that has achieved each of the above goals may submit a plan to the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee for permission to expend its allocation on other technology-related uses; such permission shall not be unreasonably withheld and the K-12 Technology Committee must permit districts to appeal any process should a district not receive approval and must provide technical assistance to districts in developing plans should the district request such.

Funds appropriated for the K-12 Technology Initiative may not be used to supplant existing school district expenditures on technology. By June 30, 2016, each school district that receives funding through the K-12 Technology Initiative during Fiscal Year 2015-16 must provide the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee with an itemized report on the amounts and uses of these funds, using a form developed by the Education Oversight Committee. In this report, a school district must provide information on its efforts to obtain reimbursements through the "E-Rate" Schools and Libraries Program administered by the Universal Service Administrative Company. Within its available resources, the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee shall support school districts' efforts to obtain these reimbursements.

Per Proviso 3.6. the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) was charged with developing a form by which districts would report to the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee on how many funds were expended and for what purposes. Working with the South Carolina Department of Education, the EOC provided questions that were included in the South Carolina Technology Counts Survey for the 2015-16 reporting period to address the following issues related to the K-12 Technology Initiative:

- How were K-12 Technology Initiative Funds expended in Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16?
- Are school districts and schools meeting the three objectives of the K-12 Technology Initiative: (1) to improve external connections to schools, with a goal of reaching at least 100 kilobits per second, per student in each school by 2017; (2) to improve internal connections within schools, with a goal of reaching at least 1 megabit per second, per student in each school by 2017; or (3) to develop or expand one-to-one computing initiatives?

Copies of the surveys, the District and School Technology Surveys, are in Appendix A.

The following is a summary of the school district and school responses to questions on the South Carolina Technology Counts Survey for the 2015-16 reporting period that pertain directly to the K-12 Technology Initiative.

DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY SURVEY RESPONSES

All 82 school districts, including the South Carolina Public Charter School District, responded to the survey. The following questions pertain to “bring your own devices” and online education opportunities in districts.

Question: Is your district moving toward student-owned learning devices as a replacement to district-owned devices?

Five school districts responded “yes” to this question. However, in reviewing the comments submitted, it was determined that the districts likely did not understand that the question pertained only to “bring your own devices” (BYOD) as opposed to district-assigned devices. There were three districts, however, who indicated that they had a BYOD policy or were considering the option in the future.

Question: Are courses offered in either a blended learning format (at least 50% of instruction online) or a completely online (100% of instruction online) format in your district? Do not include courses offered through VirtualSC.

No 51
Yes 31

The thirty-one districts that responded in the affirmative were:

Aiken	Horry
Allendale	Lancaster
Anderson 2	Laurens 55
Anderson 5	Laurens 56
Bamberg 1	Lexington 1
Berkeley	McCormick
Calhoun	Marlboro
Charleston	Oconee
Chester	Richland 2
Clarendon 1	Spartanburg 2
Darlington	Spartanburg 3
Dillon 4	Spartanburg 7
Edgefield	Sumter
Greenwood 51	Union
Greenwood 52	SC Public Charter School District
Hampton 2	

Finance Questions

The South Carolina Technology Counts Survey included questions related to the expenditure of K-12 Technology Initiative funds in Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16. The following responses are all self-reported by each district.

In Fiscal Year 2014-15, the traditional school districts and the SC Public Charter School District were allocated \$29,038,395 for the K-12 Technology Initiative as documented in Appendix B. However, school districts reported spending \$34.8 million and carrying forward another \$8.9 million into Fiscal Year 2015-16. The EOC staff presumes that districts reported all funds, including state or other local funds, that were expended for technology rather than reporting only the K-12 Technology Initiative funds.

Table 2 documents that districts reported spending 67 percent for the purchase or replacement of devices. Another 16 percent was expended for internal connections within schools. Districts reported spending less than 3 percent to improve security.

Table 2
Fiscal Year 2014-15 K-12 Technology Initiative Funds

Expended For:	\$	%
Expand Broadband	\$1,142,242	3.3%
Improve Internal Connections within Schools	\$5,487,276	15.8%
Replace Devices (Computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	\$2,741,237	7.9%
Purchase New Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students & teachers	\$20,570,317	59.2%
Improve Security	\$911,131	2.6%
Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	\$578,204	1.7%
Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	\$187,047	0.5%
Other	<u>\$3,144,033</u>	9.0%
TOTAL:	\$34,761,386	
Carried Forward to FY2015-16	\$8,924,293	

Question: For what purpose are the funds that were carried forward being expended in the current fiscal year, 2015-16?

Twenty-six (26) districts indicated that they used all or a portion of their carry forward funds to improve internal connections in schools. The fewest number of districts indicated that they would use a portion of their carry forward funds to improve security or expand broadband.

**Table 3
2014-15 K-12 Technology Funds Carried Forward to 2015-16 For:**

Purpose	# Districts
Expand Broadband	7
Improve Internal Connections within Schools	26
Replace Devices	19
Purchase or Lease New Devices	9
Improve Security	5
Professional Development for Classroom Teachers	7
Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	8
Other	0

Note: A district could have indicated that they would expend carry forward funds for multiple purposes and these were counted.

In Fiscal Year 2015-16, school districts were allocated \$28,904,424 for the K-12 Technology Initiative as documented in Appendix B. Districts self-reported carrying forward an additional \$8.9 million from 2014-15 into 2015-16 (See Table 2) which totals \$37.8 million. However, in responding to the survey, districts reported spending \$37.4 million in 2015-16 and carrying forward \$5.2 million into Fiscal Year 2016-17, which sums to a total of \$42.6 million (Table 4). The self-reported data again likely includes local or other funds that were also expended for technology.

Of the \$37.4 million in total expenditures, districts reported spending two-thirds (63 percent) for the purchase or replacement of devices, a decline from 68 percent in the prior school year. Districts reported spending 20 percent for internal connections within schools, which is almost a four percent increase over the prior year. District reported spending less than 2 percent of funds to improve security, a slight decline from the prior school year.

**Table 4
Fiscal Year 2015-16 K-12 Technology Initiative Funds**

Expended For:	\$	%
Expand Broadband	\$992,838	2.7%
Improve Internal Connections within Schools	\$7,305,817	19.5%
Replace Devices (Computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	\$3,674,583	9.8%
Purchase New Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students & teachers	\$19,777,432	52.8%
Improve Security	\$580,654	1.6%
Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	\$353,350	0.9%
Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	\$234,251	0.6%
Other	\$4,522,934	12.1%
TOTAL:	\$37,441,861	
Projected Funds Carried Forward to FY2015-16	\$5,198,138	

E-Rate Reimbursement

The EOC and the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee have been interested in knowing how many districts hire outside vendors or consultants to file E-Rate reimbursements and how much the districts pay for such service. The Educational Rate (E-Rate) Program was instituted under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to expand Internet and telecommunication connectivity for schools and libraries. Recent changes in the program have eliminated or reduced funding for services which have traditionally received full funding. Schools and libraries that are not monitoring this change will face significant funding loss and not be prepared. From district efficiency reviews conducted by Tidwell and Associates and released by the EOC in 2015, smaller districts struggle to keep up-to-date on technology.³

³ District Efficiency Reviews. <<http://www.eoc.sc.gov/reportsandpublications/Pages/SCDistrictEfficiencyReview.aspx>>.

Question: If your school district uses an outside vendor/consultant to assist in filing E-Rate reimbursements, identify the percentage of the total reimbursements that the vendor/consultant is paid to provide such services.

Thirty-seven (37) districts reported paying an outside vendor or consultant to file E-Rate reimbursements at a rate of 10 percent or less. If a district responded “not applicable,” it can be assumed that either district staff files for the E-Rate reimbursements or no E-Rate reimbursements were filed (Table 5).

**Table 5
Districts and E-Rate Reimbursements to Consultant Service Providers**

Percent of E-rate to Consultant	# Districts
0 to 5%	18
6 to 10%	19
11 to 15%	3
16 to 20%	3
21 to 25%	0
More than 25%	0
Not Applicable	37
Did Not Answer	2

SCHOOL TECHNOLOGY SURVEY RESPONSES

There were 1,248 schools in the 82 school districts that responded to the survey. The following questions highlight the technology capacity of individual schools, as reflected in the goals of the K-12 Technology Initiative.

Regarding internal connections, the answers to the following questions overwhelmingly show that schools have adequate internal connections per wireless or wired device at the school location.

Question: On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) wireless student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network?

Yes	1,072
No	138
Unknown	<u>38</u>
	1,248

Question: On averages, does each concurrent (actively in use) wired student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network?

Yes	1,127
No	97
Unknown	<u>24</u>
	1,248

However, in looking at *internal connections* at the student level, the responses show that internal access can be improved for at least 40 percent of schools, based on the following question and responses.

Question: On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth between the local area network and central location, such as district office or other sites which host common accessed resources for this location?

Yes	691
No	527
Unknown	28
No Answer	<u>2</u>
	1,248

Question: What percentage of classrooms in this school has access to your school’s wireless network? A classroom is defined as “a room with a certified teacher who provides direct instruction to students.”

Table 6 documents the extensive internal access of classrooms to wireless access networks. Over 95 percent of all schools reported that between 91 and 100 percent of classrooms in their school had internal access to wireless networks.

**Table 6
Classroom Access to Wireless Network**

Percent of Classrooms	Number of Schools
0%	19
1 to 10%	14
11 to 20%	4
21 to 30%	2
31 to 40%	0
41 to 50%	2
51 to 60%	0
61% to 70%	5
71% to 80%	5
81 to 90%	4

91 to 100%	1,193
No Response	1
TOTAL	1,248

Question: What percentages of students in your school are served by 1:1 learning? For reporting purposes, a student is considered to be served with 1:1 learning when they have access to a personal device throughout the school day, whether that device is provided by the school district or the student.

Table 7 documents the wide range of responses to the question of 1:1 learning. Approximately 27 percent of schools have no students with 1:1 learning while 28 percent of schools have over 91 percent of students with 1:1 learning.

**Table 7
Percentage of Students with 1:1 Learning**

Percentage of Students	Number of Schools	Percent of All Schools
0%	335	26.8%
1 to 10%	95	7.6%
11 to 20%	63	5.0%
21 to 30%	72	5.8%
31 to 40%	31	2.5%
41 to 50%	93	7.5%
51 to 60%	66	5.3%
61 to 70%	25	2.0%
71 to 80%	88	7.1%
81 to 90%	22	1.8%
91 to 100%	353	28.3%
No Answer	5	0.4%
	1,248	

Of the 335 schools that reported having zero percent of students with 1:1 computing, 60 percent were either elementary or primary schools. These 335 schools were located in forty-eight districts. Table 8 documents the responses to this question by school district and by type of school and identifies schools that have grade spans that extend from elementary to middle and middle to high.

Table 8
Number of Schools in Each District
Reporting No 1: 1 Computing Capability in the School

District	Elementary-Middle-High	Elementary	Elementary-Middle	Middle	Middle-High	High	Primary	Total
Abbeville	0	2	2	1	0	2	0	7
Aiken	0	9	1	3	0	0	1	14
Allendale	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Anderson 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Anderson 2	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	6
Anderson 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Bamberg 1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
Bamberg 2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Barnwell 19	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Barnwell 29	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Barnwell 45	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	4
Berkeley	0	8	0	2	1	6	4	21
Charleston	1	22	0	6	4	5	2	40
Chesterfield	0	7	0	3	1	3	2	16
Clarendon 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Clarendon 3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Colleton	0	5	0	1	0	0	2	8
Dillon 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Dillon 4	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
Florence 1	0	11	0	2	0	1	2	16
Florence 3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Florence 4	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Greenville	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	9
Greenwood 50	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Greenwood 52	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Hampton 1	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	7
Horry	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Jasper	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
Lancaster	0	8	0	2	0	3	0	13
Laurens 55	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	8
Laurens 56	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Lexington 1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lexington 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Lexington 5	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Marion	0	1	0	2	0	1	3	7
Marlboro	0	1	4	1	0	1	1	8
McCormick	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Newberry	0	7	0	2	1	2	1	13
Oconee	0	6	0	2	0	3	0	11
Orangeburg 3	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	6

Pickens	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	9
Spartanburg 1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Spartanburg 4	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Spartanburg 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Williamsburg	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
York 1	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	7
York 3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
York 4	0	7	0	4	0	2	0	13
Total	2	165	12	50	9	47	37	322

Note: 13 schools did not have a known school type.

Question: Has the district/school adopted a goal of implementing/expanding 1:1 computing?

Yes	840
No	404
No Answer	<u>4</u>
	1,248

Two-thirds of schools reported having adopted a goal of implementing or expanding 1:1 computing. Of those schools responding that they have a goal to implement or expand 1:1 computing, schools were asked several questions about the grade levels for which 1:1 computing is targeted or has been implemented. The results are reflected in Table 9.

**Table 9
Number of Schools Responding
1:1 Computing by Grade Level**

Grade Level	Targeted	Not Targeted	Implemented	No Response
K	98	429	90	223
1	94	428	103	215
2	109	408	106	217
3	247	191	215	187
4	266	148	235	191
5	227	128	284	201
6	120	198	246	276
7	117	194	247	282
8	117	193	241	289
9	82	208	243	307
10	115	197	205	323
11	116	202	207	315
12	120	212	202	306

The responses document that schools that have implemented 1:1 computing have focused on grades 3 through 12. Schools that are targeting implementation of 1:1 computing are focusing on grades 3 through 5.

INTERNET BANDWIDTH

The EOC contacted the Division of Technology Operations at the South Carolina Department of Administration to determine the Internet bandwidth speeds for each school district between June of 2013 and June of 2016. June was selected as a point in time that coincides with the end of the school and fiscal years. The data provided are summarized in Table 10.

In June of 2013, there were 67 districts that had 150 MBs or less of Internet bandwidth. Six districts had 1000 MBs of Internet bandwidth. In June of 2016, there were 14 districts with 150 MBs or less of Internet bandwidth, and all districts had at least 100 MBs of Internet bandwidth. There were 32 districts with 1000 MBs or more of Internet bandwidth. The K-12 Technology Initiative Committee will now begin comparing Internet bandwidth to utilization to determine where to target resources to expand Internet bandwidth.

Table 10
Internet Bandwidth by District, 2012-13 and 2015-16

	2012-13	2015-16
Internet Bandwidth (MBs)	# Districts	# Districts
0	1	0
10	4	0
30 to 90	3	0
100 to 150	59	14
200 to 250	0	6
300 to 350	2	9
400 to 450	0	4
500 to 550	4	11
600 to 900	1	4
1,000	6	13
1,500	0	2
2,000	0	7
2,500	0	1
3,000	0	4
4,000	0	3
5,000	0	2
	80	80

Not included are the SC Public Charter School District and the Oconee County School District. Oconee County School District does not participate in the State K-12 Schools and Libraries Network; instead, connectivity is provided by the county to the district through a federal grant.

Source: Data provided to EOC by Division of Technology Operations at the South Carolina Department of Administration

FINDINGS

The data as reported by school districts and schools on the South Carolina Technology Counts Survey for the 2015-16 reporting period document the following as related to the objectives of the K-12 Technology Initiative:

K-12 Technology Initiative Funds Expenditures – For both Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16, school districts reported spending more K-12 Technology Initiative Funds than were appropriated for the initiative. The staff assumes that districts also spent local and other funds on technology and reported the expenditures in totem.

School districts reported spending the following percentage of their K-12 Technology Initiative Funds in Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16 for the following purposes. The percentage of funds expended for the replacement or purchase of devices was 67.1% in 2014-15 and 62.6% in 2015-16. The percentage of funds expended to improve internal connections increased from 15.8% in 2014-15 to 19.5% in 2015-16.

% of Total Expenditures for:

	FY2014-15	FY2015-16
Expand Broadband	3.3%	2.7%
Improve Internal Connections within Schools	15.8%	19.5%
Replace Devices (Computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	7.9%	9.8%
Purchase New Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students & teachers	59.2%	52.8%
Improve Security	2.6%	1.6%
Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	1.7%	0.9%
Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	0.5%	0.6%
Other	9.0%	12.1%

Internal Connections – Approximately 90 percent of schools reported having, on average, at least 1Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network for every wired or wireless student device. However, within the school walls, approximately 55 percent of schools have at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth within the school.

One-to-One Computing – Approximately 28 percent of schools reported having one-to-one computing available for 91 percent or more of their students. On the other end, approximately 27 percent of schools reported having no students with 1:1 learning. Two-thirds of schools reported having adopted a goal of implementing or expanding 1:1 computing. Schools that have implemented 1:1 computing have focused on grades 3 through 12. Schools that are targeting implementation of 1:1 computing are focusing on grades 3 through 5.

Internet Bandwidth - In June of 2013, there were 67 school districts that had 150 MBs or less of Internet bandwidth. Six districts had 1000 MBs of Internet bandwidth. In June of 2016, there were 14 districts with 150 MBs or less of Internet bandwidth, and all districts had at least 100 MBs of Internet bandwidth. There were 32 districts with 1000 MBs or more of Internet bandwidth.

District Technology Survey

1:1 Learning Questions

1) Is your district moving toward student-owned learning devices as a replacement to district-owned devices?

Yes

No

2) Please provide any comments.

Online Learning Questions

3) Are courses offered in either a blended learning format (at least 50% of instruction online) or a completely online (100% of instruction online) format in your district? Do not include courses offered through VirtualSC.

Yes

No

4) If yes, who manages the delivery system?

Finance Questions

In Fiscal Year 2014-2015 the General Assembly appropriated over \$29 million to school districts for the K-12 Technology Initiative. The law requires that districts must provide an "itemized report on the amounts and uses of these funds." In collaboration with your district's finance/business officer, please provide an account of how the funds appropriated to your school district in Fiscal Year 2014-2015 were actually expended. (The TOTAL should equate to the amount allocated in Fiscal Year 2014-2015)

Category	Actual Expenditure
5) Expand Broadband	\$
6) Improve Internal Connections within Schools	\$
7) Replace Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	\$
8) Purchase New (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students and teachers	\$
9) Improve Security	\$
10) Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	\$
11) Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	\$
12) Other	\$

13) Funds Carried Forward \$
Total Expenditures: \$

14) Were any funds carried forward?

Yes

No

15) For what purpose are the funds that were carried forward being expended in the current fiscal year, 2015-2016?

Expand Broadband

Improve Internal
Connections within Schools

Purchase or Lease Devices (computers, laptops, iPad, etc.)

Improve Security

Professional Development for Classroom Teachers

Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff

Other

16) If other, please explain.

In Fiscal Year 2015-2016 the General Assembly appropriated over \$29 million to school districts for the K-12 Technology Initiative. The law requires that districts must provide an "itemized report on the amounts and uses of these funds." In collaboration with your district's finance/business officer, please provide an account of how the funds appropriated to your school district in Fiscal Year 2015-2016 were actually expended. (The TOTAL should equate to the amount allocated in Fiscal Year 2015-2016)

Category	Actual Expenditure
17) Expand Broadband	\$
18) Improve Internal Connections within Schools	\$
19) Replace Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	\$
20) Purchase New (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students and teachers	\$
21) Improve Security	\$
22) Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	\$
23) Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	\$
24) Other	\$
25) Projected Funds Carried Forward	\$
Total Expenditures:	\$

26) If your school district uses an outside vendor/consultant to assist in filing E-Rate reimbursements, identify the percentage of the total reimbursements that the vendor/consultant is paid to provide such services.

0 to 5%

6 to 10%

11 to 15%

16 to 20%

21 to 25%
More than 25%
Not Applicable

Infrastructure Questions

Network

- 27) What percentage of network equipment, in both schools and at the district level, is up-to-date with the latest firmware and security patches?
- 0 – 25% up to date
 - 26 – 50% up to date
 - 51 – 75% up to date
 - 76 – 100% up to date
- 28) Are you able to measure network uptime?
- Yes
 - No
- 29) Are staff personal/mobile devices allowed on wired networks?
- Yes
 - No
- 30) If yes, is access controlled/restricted?
- Yes
 - No
- 31) Are staff personal/mobile devices allowed on wireless networks?
- Yes
 - No
- 32) If yes, is access controlled/restricted?
- Yes
 - No
- 33) If mobile devices are supported, is mobile device management employed?
- Yes
 - No

Infrastructure

Please provide the number of devices used by administrative staff and other non-instructional staff.

- 34) Desktops (District provided)
- 35) Laptops (District provided)
- 36) Tablets (District provided)
- 37) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 38) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 39) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Computer Aging

Indicate the number of functional computing devices at the district level, by age (as of the end of the current school year). Do not include equipment retired and designated for salvage or stolen. Include all computers, at the district level and office sites. Computers include laptops, netbooks, tablets, and desktops. If refurbished equipment was purchased, select the original date of the equipment (i.e., the original date is 2006 and the refurbished date is 2010).

- 40) Total less than 1 year old?
- 41) Total between 2 and 3 years old?
- 42) Total between 4 and 5 years old?
- 43) Total 5 years and older?

Servers

44) What Operating Systems are in use at the district?

- Windows
- Linux
- Apple
- UNIX

45) How many servers or Virtual Machines (VM) are used for PowerSchool at the district and/or school levels?

46) What is the total number of servers in use?

PowerSchool

47) What version of PowerSchool is currently installed?

48) Have you set up the field level security in PowerSchool?

- Yes
- No

49) What operating system is running on the PowerSchool server?

50) What third-party vendors are connected to PowerSchool?

Indicate the number of functional server devices at the district and school level, by age (as of the end of the current school year). Do not include equipment retired and designated for salvage or stolen. If refurbished equipment was purchased, select the original date of the equipment (i.e., the original date is 2006 and the refurbished date is 2010).

- 51) Total number of servers less than 1 year old?
- 52) Total number of servers between 2 and 3 years old?
- 53) Total number of servers between 4 and 5 years old?
- 54) Total number of servers 5 years and older?

Security Questions

55) What information security training methods are available and in use by all staff?

- DVD
- Videos
- Virtual Class
- Traditional Classroom
- ETV
- Vendor purchased solution
- Libraries
- Web-based
- Other
- None

56) At what frequency are user passwords required to be changed on a regular basis?

- 0 - 30 days
- 31 - 60 days
- 61 - 90 days
- Greater than 90 days
- Never

57) At what frequency are screensaver timeouts enabled?

- 1 - 5 minutes
- 6 - 10 minutes
- 11 - 15 minutes
- 16 - greater minutes
- Never

Data

58) Is all confidential or personally identifiable information (PII) encrypted on servers?

- Yes
- No

59) Does your district require data encryption on all district/school portable devices?

60) Does your district allow sensitive data to be downloaded to portable devices?

- Yes
- No

61) Does your district allow the use of external storage devices (i.e. USB/thumb drives, portable hard drives, etc.)?

Yes

No

62) Have you installed a SSL Certificate for the PowerSchool Server?

Yes

No

Compliance: Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA)

63) Which of the following provides the internet filtering service?

District

ISP

64) Additionally, is filtering provided individually on each internet enabled district level computing device?

Yes

No

Internet Safety Policy

The district's Internet Safety Policy includes:

65) Online activities of minors while under school jurisdiction is monitored for appropriate use.

Yes

No

66) Safe and secure use by minors of direct electronic communications (email, chat rooms, etc.) while under school jurisdiction, is assured.

Yes

No

67) Unauthorized online access, including "hacking" and other unlawful activities, is prohibited and stated in policy. Yes

No

68) Unauthorized disclosure, use and dissemination of personal identification information regarding minors is prohibited and stated in policy.

69) Minors are educated about appropriate online behavior, including interacting with other individuals on social networking websites and in chat rooms and cyber-bullying awareness and response.

Yes

No

70) At least one public hearing or meeting occurred to address the proposed Internet Safety Policy.

Yes

No

Physical Security

71) Is access to servers' physical environment secured?

Yes

No

72) Are all portable computing devices physically secured both while in use and in storage?

Yes

No

Access Control

73) Does the district have a documented Access Control Policy?

Yes

No

74) Has the district documented access control procedures and associated access controls (e.g. new hire, transfer & terminated user process, obtaining privileged access, remote user access, password procedures, third-party access, etc.)?

Yes

No

75) Has the district developed procedures to administer privileged user access based on a Role Based Access Control (RBAC) model?

Yes

No

76) Does the district use Active Directory individual accounts?

Yes

No

77) Does the district use Active Directory group accounts?

Yes

No

78) Does the district use Active Directory system or application accounts?

Yes

No

79) Are access requests for information systems a documented procedure within the district?

Yes

No

80) Is the activity of the guest/anonymous or temporary accounts monitored?

Yes

No

Vulnerability

- 81) Does the district control, monitor and report privileged accounts periodically?
Yes
No
- 82) Has the district developed a Vulnerability Assessment Policy?
Yes
No
- 83) Does the district scan for vulnerabilities within information systems and hosted applications at least monthly?
Yes
No
- 84) Has the district determined a risk ranking strategy for identified vulnerabilities?
Yes
No
- 85) Does the district conduct penetration testing exercises on an annual basis (internal resources or third-party teams are acceptable)?
Yes
No
- 86) Has the district developed an information security incident response policy?
Yes
No
- 87) Does the district have an information security incident response team?
Yes
No
- 88) Does the district have a process in place for personnel to report information security incidents?
Yes
No
- 89) Has the district determined to whom the information security incidents will be shared and reported (e.g. incident response team and/or district management)?
Yes
No
- 90) Is the South Carolina Department of Education notified of information security incidents involving student level data?
Yes
No
- 91) Does the district monitor information systems to detect attacks or potential attacks?
Yes
No

Business Continuity Plan / Disaster Recovery

- 92) Does your district have documented plans for the continuity of business operations and the recovery of information technology systems in the event of a disaster or significant disruption?
Yes
No – Proceed to question 108
- 93) Does the documented organizational plan establish and list critical business functions with specified recovery priorities?
Yes
No
- 94) Does the Disaster Recovery Plan (DRP) specify the level of service (which the owner has agreed to be acceptable) to be provided while in recovery mode?
Fully Addressed
Partially Addressed
Not Addressed Yet
- 95) Does the district have a dedicated team of professionals focused on the continuity and recovery of service capabilities?
Yes
No
- 96) If not, does the district use an external service provider to plan for continuity and recovery needs?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 97) Does the district provide the schools with detailed contact information in the event of a disruption in service capabilities, outages, and/or emergencies?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 98) Does the district have an alternate site location for data center recovery purposes?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 99) If so, what is the approximate distance between the production or primary site and the alternate or secondary site for data center recovery purposes?
< 10 miles
11 - 25 miles
26 - 100 miles
100 miles Not Applicable

- 100) Is the processing capacity of the back-up facility equal to that of the primary facility?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 101) If not, what is the processing capacity of the back-up facility in proportion to the processing capacity of the primary facility?
< 25%
26 - 75%
75%
Not Applicable
- 102) Is it feasible to process/run normal business operations from the back-up facility for an extended period (i.e. at least 6 weeks)?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 103) Has the alternate location been tested?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 104) Does the district conduct exercise(s) of the DRP at least annually?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 105) When was the Business Continuity Plan (BCP) last tested?
Within the last 3 - 6 months
Within the last 7 - 12 months
Not within the last 12 months
Never been tested
Not Applicable
- 106) Does the district include IT personnel, operational personnel, or both in internal exercises?
IT Personnel
Operating Personnel
Both
Not Applicable
- 107) Do the auditors, internal or external, passively review and/or actively observe the exercises? Passively review only
Actively observe only Both
None
Not Applicable

Backups

108) Indicate how often data are backed up (i.e. files, databases, curriculum, etc.) at your district?

- Never
- By transaction
- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly

109) How often are backups stored offsite?

- Never
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- More than monthly

Professional Development

110) Does the technical support staff receive ongoing professional development in the technologies they support?

- Yes
- No

111) Does the district staff receive ongoing professional development in the technologies they use?

- Yes
- No

Technology Support

Please list the number of IT staff for the following:

- 112) Number of Staff (FTE) : IT supervisors / administrators
- 113) Number of Staff (FTE) : Help Desk/ Break-Fix Support technicians
- 114) Number of Staff (FTE) : Developers of administrative systems
- 115) Number of Staff (FTE) : Developers of instructional system
- 116) Number of Staff (FTE) : Information Technology security
- 117) Number of Staff (FTE) : Other staff in Information Technology not listed above, including web development, database administration, networking staff, infrastructure staff, technology trainers
- 118) Please provide additional comments if necessary.

Funding

E-rate

119) Does the district apply for E-rate discounts on its own and/or as part of a consortium application?

- Yes
- No

School Technology Survey

Technology Capacity Questions

If your network topology is such that multiple locations share a common wide area network link along the way, factor in the total number of concurrent users that share a link.

- 1) On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) wireless student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Unknown

- 2) If unknown, please explain.

- 3) On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) wired student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Unknown

- 4) If unknown, please explain.

- 5) On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth between the local area network and central location, such as district office or other sites which host commonly accessed resources for this location?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Unknown

- 6) If unknown, please explain.

- 7) What percentage of classrooms in this school have access to your school's wireless network? A classroom is defined as "a room with a certified teacher who provides direct instruction to students."
 - 0% 81-90%
 - 1-10%
 - 11-20%
 - 21-30%
 - 31-40%
 - 41-50%
 - 51-60%
 - 61-70%
 - 71-80%

1:1 Learning Questions

For reporting purposes, a student is considered to be served with 1:1 learning when they have access to a personal learning device throughout the school day, whether that device is provided by the school district or the student.

8) What percentages of students in your school are served by 1:1 learning?

- 0%
- 1-10%
- 11-20%
- 21-30%
- 31-40%
- 41-50%
- 51-60%
- 61-70%
- 71-80%
- 81-90%
- 91-100%

9) Has the district/school adopted a goal of implementing/expanding 1:1 computing?

- Yes
- No – Skip to question 36

10) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade K?

- Targeted
- Not Targeted
- Implemented

11) If grade K has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

12) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 1?

- Targeted
- Not Targeted
- Implemented

13) If grade 1 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

14) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 2?

- Targeted
- Not Targeted
- Implemented

15) If grade 2 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

16) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 3?

- Targeted
- Not Targeted

Implemented

17) If grade 3 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

18) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 4?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

19) If grade 4 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

20) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 5?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

21) If grade 5 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

22) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 6?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

23) If grade 6 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

24) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 7?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

25) If grade 7 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

26) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 8?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

27) If grade 8 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

28) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 9?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

29) If grade 9 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

30) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 10?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

31) If grade 10 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

- 32) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 11?
Targeted
Not Targeted
Implemented
- 33) If grade 11 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?
- 34) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 12?
Targeted
Not Targeted
Implemented
- 35) If grade 12 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

Online Learning Questions

- 36) What is the number of courses offered at this school where the primary mode of instruction is at least 50% online (blended learning)? Do not include courses offered by VirtualSC.
- 37) What is the number of courses offered at this school where 100% of instruction is provided online (online courses)? Do not include courses offered by VirtualSC.
- 38) If the number of online courses is 1 or more, what courses are offered?
- 39) How many students have completed 1 or more courses where at least 50% of instruction is provided online (blended learning) in the past year?
- 40) How many students have completed 1 or more courses where 100% of instruction is provided online (online courses)? Do not include courses completed through Virtual SC.

Infrastructure Questions

Infrastructure

Please provide the number of devices dedicated for student use.

- 41) Desktops (District provided)
42) Laptops (District provided)
43) Tablets (District provided)
44) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
45) Mobile Devices (District provided)
46) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Please provide the number of devices dedicated for teachers.

- 47) Desktops (District provided)
- 48) Laptops (District provided)
- 49) Tablets (District provided)
- 50) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 51) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 52) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Please provide the number of devices dedicated for instructional aides and other instructional employees.

- 53) Desktops (District provided)
- 54) Laptops (District provided)
- 55) Tablets (District provided)
- 56) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 57) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 58) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Please provide the number of devices used by administrative staff, counselors, and other non-instructional staff.

- 59) Desktops (District provided)
- 60) Laptops (District provided)
- 61) Tablets (District provided)
- 62) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 63) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 64) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Computer Aging

Indicate the number of functional computing devices in the school, by age (as of the end of the current school year). Do not include equipment retired and designated for salvage or stolen. Include all computers, including employee and student use; academic and non-academic; and in schools and office sites. Computers include laptops, netbooks, tablets, and desktops. If refurbished equipment was purchased, select the original date of the equipment (i.e., the original date is 2006 and the refurbished date is 2010).

- 65) Total less than 1 year old?
- 66) Total between 2 and 3 years old?
- 67) Total between 4 and 5 years old?
- 68) Total 5 years and older?

Classroom Technology

How many of the following does your school have available and in use?

- 69) Interactive White Boards (do not count devices used solely for administrative, non-classroom purposes).
- 70) Interactive Digital Monitors (do not count devices used solely for administrative, non-classroom purposes).
- 71) Projectors (do not count vintage, overhead projectors, or document camera projectors).

Appendix B
 Allocations of K-12 Technology Funds
 FY2014-15 and FY2015-16

District	ALLOCATION	ALLOCATION
	2014-15	2015-16
	(Revenue Code 3630)	(Revenue Code 3630)
	(Subfund 963)	(Subfund 963)
Abbeville	\$152,313.00	\$141,475.95
Aiken	\$832,418.00	\$789,167.80
Allendale	\$87,877.00	\$82,227.10
Anderson 1	\$318,531.00	\$308,010.28
Anderson 2	\$128,374.00	\$122,999.31
Anderson 3	\$125,438.00	\$118,929.20
Anderson 4	\$98,504.00	\$92,917.27
Anderson 5	\$428,364.00	\$408,150.46
Bamberg 1	\$68,366.00	\$62,429.54
Bamberg 2	\$53,708.00	\$44,766.35
Barnwell 19	\$53,899.00	\$45,673.27
Barnwell 29	\$63,913.00	\$59,474.80
Barnwell 45	\$117,788.00	\$107,165.36
Beaufort	\$687,288.00	\$676,595.43
Berkeley	\$1,047,430.00	\$1,038,614.54
Calhoun	\$113,011.00	\$112,031.64
Charleston	\$1,500,405.00	\$1,484,924.95
Cherokee	\$430,063.00	\$407,245.86
Chester	\$264,045.00	\$239,692.64
Chesterfield	\$362,788.00	\$335,507.60
Clarendon 1	\$53,823.00	\$50,429.45
Clarendon 2	\$204,548.00	\$186,993.48
Clarendon 3	\$41,391.00	\$39,694.96
Colleton	\$408,101.00	\$377,932.15
Darlington	\$511,182.00	\$475,330.75
Dillon 3	\$77,738.00	\$74,954.09
Dillon 4	\$286,411.00	\$273,532.90
Dorchester 2	\$811,081.00	\$811,342.98
Dorchester 4	\$147,438.00	\$139,759.74
Edgefield	\$117,184.00	\$156,559.57
Fairfield	\$193,020.00	\$174,954.18
Florence 1	\$540,203.00	\$519,949.58
Florence 2	\$58,881.00	\$55,112.87

	ALLOCATION	ALLOCATION
	2014-15	2015-16
	(Revenue Code 3630)	(Revenue Code 3630)
District	(Subfund 963)	(Subfund 963)
Florence 3	\$249,951.00	\$238,253.78
Florence 4	\$51,682.00	\$46,912.92
Florence 5	\$70,431.00	\$63,910.35
Georgetown	\$468,255.00	\$439,373.97
Greenville	\$2,512,393.00	\$2,432,442.33
Greenwood 50	\$302,330.00	\$412,301.61
Greenwood 51	\$47,686.00	\$43,349.99
Greenwood 52	\$57,352.00	\$54,050.83
Hampton 1	\$166,907.00	\$154,607.76
Hampton 2	\$63,531.00	\$52,626.29
Horry	\$1,347,574.00	\$1,925,767.31
Jasper	\$190,687.00	\$176,185.89
Kershaw	\$356,706.00	\$342,059.00
Lancaster	\$405,335.00	\$400,021.29
Laurens 55	\$277,718.00	\$273,402.68
Laurens 56	\$145,564.00	\$140,342.42
Lee	\$149,311.00	\$135,330.33
Lexington 1	\$802,740.00	\$792,228.61
Lexington 2	\$426,121.00	\$408,171.49
Lexington 3	\$93,984.00	\$89,937.07
Lexington 4	\$219,735.00	\$204,921.45
Lexington 5	\$568,313.00	\$544,450.22
McCormick	\$54,367.00	\$51,464.70
Marion	\$344,952.00	\$315,876.17
Marlboro	\$288,263.00	\$265,873.39
Newberry	\$285,859.00	\$278,211.31
Oconee	\$365,479.00	\$333,994.00
Orangeburg 3	\$198,705.00	\$184,964.66
Orangeburg 4	\$185,724.00	\$245,818.03
Orangeburg 5	\$448,930.00	\$428,325.88
Pickens	\$563,731.00	\$531,864.52
Richland 1	\$1,142,470.00	\$1,100,601.34
Richland 2	\$905,322.00	\$877,472.80
Saluda	\$105,492.00	\$100,046.21
Spartanburg 1	\$169,255.00	\$161,501.26
Spartanburg 2	\$340,558.00	\$322,316.54

	ALLOCATION	ALLOCATION
	2014-15	2015-16
	(Revenue Code 3630)	(Revenue Code 3630)
District	(Subfund 963)	(Subfund 963)
Spartanburg 3	\$98,852.00	\$134,231.58
Spartanburg 4	\$93,039.00	\$86,747.13
Spartanburg 5	\$263,818.00	\$258,644.18
Spartanburg 6	\$371,061.00	\$356,179.71
Spartanburg 7	\$341,090.00	\$320,389.97
Sumter	\$813,726.00	\$770,834.14
Union	\$206,475.00	\$188,613.02
Williamsburg	\$309,386.00	\$280,310.63
York 1	\$171,703.00	\$164,478.67
York 2	\$227,055.00	\$224,435.04
York 3	\$594,301.00	\$568,746.79
York 4	\$386,491.00	\$402,838.62
SC Public Charter	\$402,461.00	\$564,449.68
Subtotal:	\$29,038,395.00	\$28,904,423.61
Special School and Districts		
<u>District: 5204 - State Supported</u>	\$0	\$4,137.35
John de la Howe	\$1,750.00	\$3,770.55
Wil Lou Gray	\$28,070.00	\$22,623.30
Deaf & Blind	\$18,873.00	\$16,003.67
DJJ	\$46,803.00	\$47,428.89
Palmetto Unified	\$51,139.00	\$35,289.70
TOTAL:	\$29,185,030.00	\$29,033,677.07

Source: "Monthly Payments to Districts." Office of Finance. SC Department of Education. <http://ed.sc.gov/finance/financial-services/payment-information/monthly-payments-to-districts/>

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: October 10, 2016

ACTION:

Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Program, Fiscal Year 2016-17
Implementation Responsibilities of the EOC

PURPOSE/AUTHORITY

Proviso 109.15. of the 2016-17 General Appropriation Act requires the EOC to determine if an independent school meets the eligibility requirements for participation in the program.

CRITICAL FACTS

This report documents the approval process and the schools that are eligible to participate in the ECENC program this fiscal year.

TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS

Schools were notified on June 9, 2016 about the application process. As of September 19, 2016, 110 schools had been approved.

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)

Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) Program

School Approval Process for
FY 2016-17

Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Program: Education Oversight Committee's Responsibilities and Results Fiscal Year 2016-17

Statutory Authority

Proviso 109.15. of the 2016-17 General Appropriation, Act 284 of 2016, authorized the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) Program for Fiscal Year 2016-17. The ECENC Program was first established by proviso in the Fiscal Year 2013-14 General Appropriation Act.

For Fiscal year 2016-17, the General Assembly authorized a total of \$12 million in tax credits for this program. First, a total of \$10 million in contributions may be made to the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund. Another \$2 million was authorized for individuals making tuition payments on behalf of qualifying students.

The Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund is separate and distinct from the State general fund. The fund is organized by the Department of Revenue as a public charity. Monies contributed to the fund provide scholarships for exceptional needs children attending eligible schools. A board of five directors, appointed by the Governor and members of the General Assembly based upon the recommendations of the South Carolina Association of Christian Schools, the Diocese of Charleston, South Carolina Independent Schools Association and the Palmetto Association of Independent Schools, grant the scholarships. The directors of the fund also designate an executive director. The proviso expressly prohibits the appropriation of public funds to the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund. The public may access information and apply to the program at <https://exceptionalsc.org/>. In prior fiscal years, nonprofit scholarship funding organizations received refundable tax credits and made tuition grants.

In addition to the creation of the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund, there were two other significant changes in the program in 2016-17. First, the maximum amount of scholarship grants increased from \$10,000 to \$11,000 per eligible child. And, second, the definition of an eligible school was amended to require independent schools to provide "a specially designed program or learning resource center to provide needed accommodations based on the needs of exceptional needs students or provides onsite educational services or supports to meet the needs of exceptional needs students, or is a school specifically existing to meet the needs of only exceptional needs students with documented disabilities." Proviso 109.15 is documented in Appendix A.

Proviso 109.15. expressly charges the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) with determining if an independent school meets the eligibility requirements for which it may receive contributions from a nonprofit scholarship funding organization for which the tax credit allowed by this proviso is allowed. Specifically, for Fiscal Year 2016-17 the law requires:

1. Schools may apply to the EOC to participate in the program on or before August 1;
2. The EOC develop an application for schools that includes at a minimum:
 - o the number and total amount of grants received in the preceding fiscal year;
 - o student test scores, by category, on national achievement or state standardized tests, or both, for all grades tested and administered by the school receiving or entitled to receive scholarship grants pursuant to this chapter in the previous fiscal year;
 - o a copy of a compilation, review, or compliance audit of the organization's financial statements, conducted by a certified public accounting firm; and
 - o a certification by the independent school that it meets the definition of an eligible school as that term is defined in subsection (A)(1) and that the report is true, accurate, and complete under penalty of perjury in accordance with Section 16-9-10.
3. The EOC may extend the August 1 deadline upon a school demonstrating good cause;
4. The EOC must publish by September 1 on its website the list of independent schools meeting the eligibility requirements, the schools' contact information, test scores; and audit information.
5. The EOC must also work with the nine-member advisory committee to make recommendations on the program's implementation.

The following is a report that documents the steps taken and results of the EOC's administration of the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) Program for Fiscal Year 2016-17.

Application Process for Independent Schools

On June 9, 2016, the EOC staff communicated in writing and via email to all schools that had participated in the ECENC program in Fiscal Year 2015-16 the following information:

- A letter from the Executive Director of the EOC explaining the application process for Fiscal Year 2016-17;
- A copy of Proviso 109.15; Four documents to be completed as part of the application. Copies of the four documents are in Appendix B. These documents were also posted online; and
- Schools were asked to provide a statement of services provided to meet the needs of exceptional needs children to comply with changes in the law.

Date	Action
June 9, 2016	EOC staff notified independent schools of application process
July 13, 2016	EOC posts online list of 59 approved schools and thereafter posts weekly updates. Names and contact information of approved schools also forwarded directly to Department of Revenue.
September 1, 2016	109 schools approved for participation in ECENC program in 2016-17.
September 2, 2016	110 schools approved.
September 19, 2016	1 additional school approved.

To date, only one applicant has been denied participation. The applicant was not a member in good standing of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the South Carolina Association of Christian Schools, or the South Carolina Independent Schools Association.

As of September 1, two schools had begun but not completed the application process. One of the schools submitted its final documentation, a compliance review, on September 2 and was approved. On September 19, 2016 a school that had previously never participated in the program was approved, increasing the total number of approved schools to 111 (Appendix C). Table 1 documents the number of schools approved over time by the EOC.

Table 1
Schools Approved to Participate in ECENC Program

Fiscal Year	Number of Schools
2016-17	111
2015-16	117
2014-15	89
2013-14	73

Note: In 2015-16 101 schools were approved on September 1, 2015 and another 16 approved pursuant to Joint Resolution H.4633 (R.139) of 2016.

Of the 111 schools that have been approved in 2016-17, 95 reported receiving tuition grants from non-profit scholarship organizations in the prior fiscal year, and 16 reported not receiving any tuition grants. Table 2 summarizes the number of grants and total amount of grants awarded by non-profit scholarship funding organization as reported by schools applying for participation in the program in 2016-17. There were five schools that reported receiving grants from more than one non-profit scholarship funding organization. Approximately, 1,626 grants were received totaling just over \$10 million. Appendix D is a list of grants by independent school.

Table 2
Grants Received in FY2015-16
by Schools Applying for ECENC Program in FY2016-17

Non-Profit Scholarship Funding Organization	Number of Schools Receiving Grants	Total Amount of Grants	Total Number of Grants
Advance Carolina	9	\$152,425.00	52
Donors Enriching Students' Knowledge	6	\$174,629.20	21
Palmetto Kids FIRST	56	\$7,310,773.51	1,137
St. Thomas Aquinas	<u>29</u>	<u>2,369,672.00</u>	<u>416</u>
Total:	100	\$10,007,499.71	1,626

Source: Schools applying for ECENC Program in FY 2016-17, Form B.

As in the previous years, the EOC staff encountered problems with data security. Several schools submitted information that included individual student test data while others provided the names of individual students who received scholarship grants in the prior fiscal year. Upon receiving the personally identifiable information, the information was either shredded or the names redacted.

Appendix A
Proviso 109.15 of the 2016-17 General Appropriation Act
(Act 284 of 2016)

109.15. (DOR: Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children)

(A) As used in this proviso:

(1) "Eligible school" means an independent school including those religious in nature, other than a public school, at which the compulsory attendance requirements of Section 59-65-10 may be met, that:

(a) offers a general education to primary or secondary school students;

(b) does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin;

(c) is located in this State;

(d) has an educational curriculum that includes courses set forth in the state's diploma requirements, graduation certificate requirements (for special needs children), and where the students attending are administered national achievement or state standardized tests, or both, at progressive grade levels to determine student progress;

(e) has school facilities that are subject to applicable federal, state, and local laws;

(f) is a member in good standing of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the South Carolina Association of Christian Schools, or the South Carolina Independent Schools Association; and

(g) provides a specially designed program or learning resource center to provide needed accommodations based on the needs of exceptional needs students or provides onsite educational services or supports to meet the needs of exceptional needs students, or is a school specifically existing to meet the needs of only exceptional needs students with documented disabilities.

(2) "Exceptional needs child" means a child:

(a) who has been evaluated in accordance with this state's evaluation criteria, as set forth in S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-243.1, and determined eligible as a child with a disability who needs special education and related services, in accordance with the requirements of Section 300.8 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; or

(b) who has been diagnosed within the last three years by a licensed speech-language pathologist, psychiatrist, or medical, mental health, psychoeducational, or other comparable licensed health care provider as having a neurodevelopmental disorder, a substantial sensory or physical impairment such as deaf, blind, or orthopedic disability, or some other disability or acute or chronic condition that significantly impedes the student's ability to learn and succeed in school without specialized instructional and associated supports and services tailored to the child's unique needs.

(4) 'Independent school' means a school, other than a public school, at which the compulsory attendance requirements of Section 59-65-10 may be met and that does not discriminate based on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(5) 'Parent' means the natural or adoptive parent or legal guardian of a child.

(6) 'Qualifying student' means a student who is an exceptional needs child, a South Carolina resident, and who is eligible to be enrolled in a South Carolina secondary or elementary public school at the kindergarten or later year level for the applicable school year.

(7) 'Resident public school district' means the public school district in which a student resides.

(8) 'Transportation' means transportation to and from school only.

(9) 'Tuition' means the total amount of money charged for the cost of a qualifying student to attend an independent school including, but not limited to, fees for attending the school, textbook fees, and school-related transportation.

(10) 'Department' means the Department of Revenue.

(B) (1) There is created the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund that is separate and distinct from the State general fund. The fund shall be organized by the department as a public charity as defined by the Internal Revenue Code under sections 509(a)(1) through 509(a)(4) and consist solely of contributions made to the fund. The fund may not receive an appropriation of public funds. The fund shall receive and hold all contributions intended for it as well as all earnings until disbursed as provided in this chapter. Monies received in the fund shall be used to provide scholarships to exceptional needs children attending eligible schools.

(2) The amounts on deposit in the fund do not constitute public funds nor are the deposits property of the State. Amounts on deposit in the fund must not be commingled with public funds and the State shall have no claim to or interest in the amounts on deposit. Agreements or contracts entered into by or on behalf of the fund do not constitute a debt or obligation of the State.

(3) The fund shall be governed by five directors, two appointed by the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, one of which is based upon the recommendation of the South Carolina Association of Christian Schools and one which is based upon the recommendation of the Diocese of Charleston, two appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee based upon the recommendations of the South Carolina Independent Schools Association and one appointed by the Governor based upon the recommendation of the Palmetto Association of Independent Schools. The directors of the fund, along with the Director of the Department of Revenue, shall designate an executive director of the fund.

(4) In concert with the fund directors, the Department of Revenue shall administer the fund, including, but not limited to, the keeping of records, the management of accounts, and disbursement of the grants awarded pursuant to this proviso. The department may expend up to two percent of the fund for administration and related costs. The department may not expend public funds to administer the program.

(5) By June thirtieth of the current fiscal year, the Department of Revenue must report to the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Governor:

- (a) the number and total amount of grants issued to eligible schools in the fiscal year; (b) for each grant issued to an eligible school in the fiscal year, the identity of the school and the amount of the grant;
- (c) an itemization and detailed explanation of any fees or other revenues obtained from or on behalf of any eligible schools;
- (d) a copy of a compilation, review, or audit of the fund's financial statements, conducted by a certified public accounting firm and;
- (e) the criteria and eligibility requirements for scholarship awards.

(C) (1) Grants may be awarded in an amount not exceeding eleven thousand dollars or the total annual cost of tuition, whichever is less, to a qualifying student at an eligible school.

(2) Before awarding any grant, the fund must receive written documentation from the qualifying student's parent or guardian documenting that the qualifying student is an exceptional needs child. Upon approving the application, the fund must issue a check to the eligible school in the name of the qualifying student within either thirty days upon approval of the application or thirty days of the start of the school's semester.

(3) In the event that the qualifying student leaves or withdraws from the school for any reason before the end of the semester or school year and does not reenroll within thirty days, then the eligible school must return a prorated amount of the grant to the fund based on the number of

days the qualifying student was enrolled in the school during the semester or school year within sixty days of the qualifying student's departure.

(4) The department may not award grants solely for the benefit of one school.

(5) The department may not release any personally identifiable information pertaining to students or donors or use information collected about donors, students, or schools for financial gain.

(6) The department shall develop a process to prioritize the awarding of grants to eligible incumbent grant recipients at eligible schools.

(D) (1) (a) Tax credits authorized by subsection (H)(1) and subsection (I) of this proviso annually may not exceed cumulatively a total of ten million dollars for contributions to the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund.

(b) Tax credits authorized pursuant to subsection (H)(2) of this proviso annually may not exceed cumulatively a total of two million dollars for tuition payments made on behalf of qualifying students.

(c) If the department determines that the total of the credits claimed by all taxpayers exceeds either limit amount as contained in items (a) or (b), it shall allow credits only up to those amounts on a first come, first served basis.

(2) (a) The department shall establish an application process to determine the amount of credit available to be claimed. The receipt of the application by the department shall determine priority for the credit. Subject to the provisions of subitem (e), contributions must be made annually on or before June thirtieth, in order to claim the credit. The credit must be claimed on the return for the tax year that the contribution is made.

(b) A taxpayer may not claim more than sixty percent of his total tax liability for the year in contribution toward the tax credit authorized by subsection (H)(1) or subsection (I). This credit is not refundable.

(c) If a taxpayer deducts the amount of the contribution on his federal return and claims the credit allowed by subsection (H)(1) or subsection (I), then he must add back the amount of the deduction for purposes of South Carolina income taxes.

(d) The department shall prescribe the form and manner of proof required to obtain the credit authorized by subsection (H)(1) or subsection (I). The department shall also develop a method of informing taxpayers if the credit limit is met at any time during the fiscal year.

(e) A taxpayer only may claim a credit pursuant to subsection (H)(1) and subsection (I) for contributions made during the fiscal year. (3) A corporation or entity entitled to a credit under subsection (H)(1) and subsection (I) may not convey, assign, or transfer the credit authorized by this proviso to another entity unless all of the assets of the entity are conveyed, assigned, or transferred in the same transaction.

(E) (1) On or before August 1, 2016 independent schools may apply to the Education Oversight Committee to be certified as an eligible institution. The Education Oversight Committee shall develop an application to be completed by the independent schools which must contain at least:

(a) the number and total amount of grants received in the preceding fiscal year;

(b) student test scores, by category, on national achievement or state standardized tests, or both, for all grades tested and administered by the school receiving or entitled to receive scholarship grants pursuant to this chapter in the previous fiscal year;

(c) a copy of a compilation, review, or compliance audit of the organization's financial statements, conducted by a certified public accounting firm; and

(d) a certification by the independent school that it meets the definition of an eligible school as that term is defined in subsection (A)(1) and that the report is true, accurate, and complete under penalty of perjury in accordance with Section 16-9-10.

(2)(a) The Education Oversight Committee may waive the August first deadline contained in subsection (E) upon good cause shown by an independent school.

(b) The Education Oversight Committee may waive some or all of the curriculum requirements contained in subsection (A)(1)(d) following consultation with the advisory committee.

(3)(a) By September 1, 2016 the Education Oversight Committee shall publish on its website a comprehensive list of independent schools certified as eligible institutions. The list shall include for each eligible institution: (i) the institution's name, addresses, telephone numbers, and, if available, website addresses; and (ii) the score reports and audits received by the committee pursuant to subsection (E)(1)(b) and (c).

(b) The Education Oversight Committee shall summarize or redact the score reports identified in item (3)(a)(ii) if necessary to prevent the disclosure of personally identifiable information.

(4) An independent school that does not apply for certification pursuant to this subsection must not be included on the list of eligible schools and contributions to that school shall not be allowed for purposes of the tax credits permitted by this proviso.

(5) An independent school that is denied certification pursuant to this section may seek review by filing a request for a contested case hearing with the Administrative Law Court in accordance with the court's rules of procedure.

(F) (1) The Education Oversight Committee shall establish an advisory committee made up of not more than nine members, including parents, and representatives of independent schools and independent school associations.

(2) The advisory committee shall:

(a) consult with the Education Oversight Committee concerning requests for exemptions from curriculum requirements; and

(b) provide recommendations on other matters requested by the Education Oversight Committee.

(G) Except as otherwise provided, the Department of Education, the Education Oversight Committee, and the Department of Revenue, nor any other state agency may regulate the educational program of an independent school that accepts students receiving scholarship grants pursuant to this chapter."

(H) (1) A taxpayer is entitled to a tax credit against income taxes imposed pursuant to Chapter 6, Title 12 for the amount of cash and the monetary value of any publicly traded securities the taxpayer contributes to the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund up to the limits contained in subsection (D)(1)(a) of this proviso if:

(a) the contribution is used to provide grants for tuition to exceptional needs children enrolled in eligible schools who qualify for these grants under the provisions of this proviso; and

(b) the taxpayer does not designate a specific child or school as the beneficiary of the contribution.

(2) (a) A taxpayer is entitled to a refundable tax credit against income taxes imposed pursuant to Chapter 6, Title 12 for the amount of cash and the monetary value of any publicly traded securities, not exceeding eleven thousand dollars per child, for tuition payments to an eligible school for an exceptional needs child within his custody or care who would be eligible for a grant pursuant to this proviso up to the limits contained in subsection (D)(1)(b) of this proviso.

(b) If a child within the care and custody of taxpayer claiming a tax credit pursuant to this item also receives a grant from the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund, then the taxpayer may only claim a credit equal to the difference of eleven thousand dollars or the cost of tuition, whichever is lower, and the amount of the grant.

(I) A taxpayer is entitled to a tax credit against income taxes imposed pursuant to Chapter 11, Title 12 for the amount of cash and the monetary value of any publicly traded securities the taxpayer contributes to the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund up to the limits contained in subsection (D)(1)(a) of this proviso if: (1) the contribution is used to provide grants for tuition to exceptional needs children enrolled in eligible schools who qualify for these grants under the provisions of this proviso; and (2) the taxpayer does not designate a specific child or school as the beneficiary of the contribution.

(J) On or before August 1, 2016, each scholarship funding organization organized and operating pursuant to SECTION 9 of H. 4230, R. 130, Act 92 of 2015 shall deposit with the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund all remaining funds on hand as of July 1, 2016. Scholarship funding organizations organized and operating pursuant to SECTION 9 shall remain in existence after the effective date of this act solely for the purpose of winding down operations and depositing remaining funds with the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Fund pursuant to this provision. On August 1, 2016 all scholarship funding organizations organized pursuant to SECTION 9 shall cease to exist.

Appendix B
Application Documents, 2016-17

South Carolina Education Oversight Committee
Annual Standards Assurance Form
S.C. Budget Proviso 109.15
2016-2017
Document A

Please complete the information requested below concerning your independent school. This information will be listed on the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee's website, www.eoc.sc.gov.

Independent School Name:	
Independent School Contact Person:	
Independent School Address:	
City, State, Zip Code:	
Independent School Telephone Number:	() -
Independent School Fax Number:	() -
Independent School E-mail Address:	
Independent School Website Address:	

Please review the standards below based on the 2016-17 General Appropriation Act. An "Eligible school" is defined in the Proviso as "an independent school including those religious in nature, other than a public school, at which the compulsory attendance requirement of Section 59-65-10 may be met and that does not discriminate based on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin." Please indicate whether your school has met each standard to ensure the following academic requirements are being met. The S.C. Education Oversight Committee reserves the right to **request additional documentation** to show the school is in compliance with the 2016-17 General Appropriation Act.

STANDARDS	YES	NO
1. Offers a general education to primary or secondary school students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion or national origin.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Is located in this state.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Has an educational curriculum that includes courses set forth in the state's diploma requirements, graduation certificate requirements (for special needs children), and where the students attending are administered national achievement or state standardized tests, or both, at progressive grade levels to determine student progress.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Has school facilities that are subject to applicable federal, state, and local laws.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is a member in good standing of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the South Carolina Association of Christian Schools or the South Carolina Independent Schools Association.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Provides a specially designed program or learning resource center to provide needed accommodations based on the needs of exceptional needs students or provides onsite educational services or supports to meet the needs of exceptional needs students, or is a school specifically existing to meet the needs of only exceptional needs students with documented disabilities. Provide evidence of services or supports.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Did this school receive any grants last fiscal year (July 1, 2015 until June 30, 2016) from any nonprofit scholarship funding organization under the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Program? If Yes, then Complete Document B.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Will your school provide student test data from school year 2015-16? If Yes, then Complete Document C.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Will your school provide a compilation, review, or compliance audit of the organization's financial statements, conducted by a certified public accounting firm? Yes, then Complete Document D.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I assure that all documents submitted to the SC Education Oversight Committee for the purpose of applying as an eligible school, as defined by the Proviso, is true, accurate, and complete under penalty of perjury in accordance with Section 16-9-10.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Print Name of Signature Above: _____

Title: _____

Email: _____

Return this form to Melanie Barton

- Phone: 803.734.6148
- E-mail: mbarton@eoc.sc.gov
- Mail: (P.O. Box 11867)
502 Brown Building
Columbia, S.C. 29211 (29201)

Document B Grants Received

Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) Application 2016-2017

Independent School Name: _____

An independent school applying for or continuing to participate in the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Program for Fiscal Year 2016-17 is required to submit the following information:

Number and total amount of grants received from each nonprofit scholarship funding organization from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

Please complete the following chart. If no grants were received from a nonprofit scholarship funding organization indicate with "0" and "\$0."

Nonprofit Scholarship Funding Organizations	Total Number of Grants Received	Total Amount of Grants Received
Advanced Carolina SFO		\$
Donors Enriching Students' Knowledge (DESK)		\$
Palmetto Kids FIRST Scholarship Program, Inc.		\$
St. Thomas Aquinas Scholarship Funding Organization		\$

Total number of grants is the number of individual children/students who received a grant even if the school received more than one grant for a specific child/student. The total amount of grants per child/student should not have exceeded \$10,000.

Return this form & report to EOC:

Fax: 803.734.6167
Phone: 803.734.6148
Mail: P.O. Box 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

Document C

Student Assessment Data

Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) Application 2016-2017

Independent School Name: _____

An independent school applying for or continuing to participate in the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Program for Fiscal Year 2016-17 is required to submit the following information:

Student test scores, by category, on national achievement or state standardized tests, or both, for all grades tested and administered by the school.

In working with its nine-member advisory committee, the EOC has determined that, to maintain student privacy and to recognize the educational needs of students, each school must submit the following:

- Summative assessment data from the 2015-16 school year that documents for *each grade tested* and for *each grade with at least 10 students in the grade*, the English language arts (reading) and mathematics achievement of students in the grade. Examples include: *TerraNova, Stanford 10, Iowa Test of Basic Skills, etc.*
- For grades 9-12, the school may provide average PSAT, SAT, ACT, or other scores as appropriate.
- For Support Level III schools, those schools that specifically exist to meet the need of only exceptional needs students with documented disabilities, the EOC will work with the Support Level III schools to provide information (including formative assessments, portfolios, etc.) that document the students' academic and social development
- Please DO NOT provide personally identifiable student information.

The following is a **template** that you may use for reporting purposes. For questions, contact the EOC.

2015-16 School Year Results for _____ Assessment
National Percentiles Mean Scale Scores, Average Scores, Grade Equivalents, etc.

Grade	English language arts (Reading)	Mathematics
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7 etc.		

Return this form and assessment data to EOC:

Fax: 803.734.6167
 Phone: 803.734.6148
 Mail: P.O. Box 11867
 Columbia, SC 29211

Document D

Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) Application 2016-2017

Independent School Name: _____

An independent school applying for or continuing to participate in the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Program for Fiscal Year 2016-17 is required to submit the following information:

A copy of a compilation, review, or compliance audit of the organization's financial statements, conducted by a certified public accounting firm. By law, the compilation, review or compliance audit will be posted online at www.eoc.sc.gov.

Please answer the following questions:

	YES	NO
Did your school receive any grants last fiscal year, between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016, under the ECENC program?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If Yes, are you attaching a compilation, review or compliance audit conducted by a certified public accounting firm to this Document and submitting it to the EOC by December 30, 2016.</p> <p>Does the audit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document and verify that all grants received under the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children Program in 2015-16 were for eligible children enrolled in the school? • Document the total amount of each grant per child from every scholarship funding organization (SFO)? • Document that no grant exceeded \$10,000 during school year 2015-16? • Document that the independent school returned a prorated amount of the grant to the SFO if any student withdrew during the school year? <p>Also, document that the total amount of each grant was used for tuition which is defined as "the total amount of money charged for the cost of a qualifying student to attend an independent school including, but not limited to, fees for attending the school and school-related transportation."</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If No , will your school submit a compilation, review or compliance audit conducted by a certified public accounting firm by June 30, 2017 to the EOC if you receive tuition grants this fiscal year, between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Return this form & report to EOC:

Fax: 803.734.6167
 Phone: 803.734.6148
 Mail: P.O. Box 11867
 Columbia, SC 29211

Appendix C
Schools Approved for 2016-17

SCHOOL	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	WEBSITE ADDRESS
Addlestone Hebrew Academy	1639 Wallenberg Boulevard Charleston, SC 29407	843.571.1105	http://addlestone.org/
Anderson Christian School	3902 Liberty Highway Anderson, SC 29621	864.224.7309	http://www.andersonchristian.com/
Ashley Hall	172 Rutledge Avenue Charleston, SC 29403	843.722.4088	http://www.ashleyhall.org/
Beaufort Academy	240 Sams Point Road Beaufort, SC 29907	843.524-3393	http://www.beaufortacademy.org/
Beaufort Christian School	378 Parris Island Gateway Beaufort, SC 29906	843.525.0635	http://www.beaufortchristianschool.org/
Ben Lippen School	7401 Monticello Road Columbia, SC 29203	803.786.7200	http://www.benlippen.com/
Bishop England High School	363 Seven Farms Drive Charleston, SC 29492	843.849.9599	http://www.behs.com/
Blessed Hope Christian Academy	410 Blessed Hope Road PO Box 609 York, SC 29745-0297	803.684.9819	www.bhcayork.com/
Blessed Sacrament School	7 Saint Teresa Drive Charleston, SC 29407-7243	843.766.2128	http://www.scbss.org/home
Bob Jones Academy	1700 Wade Hampton Boulevard Greenville, SC 29614	864.770.1395	www.bobjonesacademy.net
Calvary Christian School	101 Calvary Street Greer, SC 29650	864.877.5555	http://www.calvarychristiangreer.org/
Camden Military Academy	520 Highway 1 North Camden, SC 29020	800.948.6291	https://camdenmilitary.com/
Camperdown Academy	501 Howell Road Greenville, SC 29615	864.244.8899	http://camperdown.org
Capers Preparatory Christian Academy	1945 Bees Ferry Road Charleston, SC 29414	843.225.2892	http://www.caperspreparatorychristianacademy.com/
Cardinal Newman School	2945 Alpine Road Columbia SC 29223	803.782.2814	www.cnhs.org
Carolina Christian Academy	1850 Kershaw Camden Highway Lancaster, SC 29720	803.285.5565	http://carolinachristian.org/

SCHOOL	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	WEBSITE ADDRESS
Cathedral Academy	3790 Ashley Phosphate Road Charleston, SC 29423	843-760-1192	www.cathedralacademy.com
Chabad Jewish Academy	2803 North Oak Street Myrtle Beach, SC 29577	843.448.0035	http://www.chabadjewishacademy.org/
Charleston Collegiate School	2024 Academy Drive John's Island, SC 29455	843.559.5506	http://www.charlestoncollegiate.org/page/Home
Charleston Day School	15 Archdale Street Charleston, SC 29401	843.377.0315	http://www.charlestondayschool.org/
Cherokee Creek Boys School, Inc.	198 Cooper Road Westminster, SC 29693	864.647.1885	http://cherokeecreek.net/
Christ Church Episcopal School	245 Cavalier Drive Greenville, SC 29607	864.331.4225	https://www.cces.org/
Christ Our King-Stella Maris Catholic School	1183 Russell Drive Mount Pleasant, SC 29464-4057	843.884.4721	http://www.coksm.org/
Clarendon Hall School	P.O. Box 609 1140 South Duke Street Summerton, SC 29148	803.485.3550	http://clarendonhall.net/
Colleton Preparatory Academy	P.O. Box 1426 (165 Academy Road) Walterboro, SC 29488	843.538.8989	http://www.colletonprep.org/index.html
Covenant Classical Christian School	3120 Covenant Road Columbia, SC 29204	803.787.0225	https://covenantcs.org/
Cross Schools	495 Buckwalter Parkway Bluffton, SC 29910	843.706.2000	https://www.crossschools.org/
Crown Leadership Academy	1455 Wakendaw Road Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464	843-425-2414	www.crownleadershipacademy.org
Cutler Jewish Day School	5827 A North Trenholm Road Columbia, SC 29206	803.782.1831	http://www.cjdssc.com/
Divine Redeemer Catholic School	1104 Fort Drive Hanahan, SC 29406	843 553 1521	www.divineredeemerschool.com
Einstein Academy	847 Cleveland Street Greenville, SC 29601	864.269.8999	http://www.einsteinacademysc.org/
First Baptist School of Charleston	48 Meeting Street Charleston, SC 29401	843.722.6646	http://www.fbschool.org/
Five Oaks Academy	1101 Jonesville Road Simpsonville, SC 29681	864-228-1881	http://www.fiveoaksacademy.com/

SCHOOL	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	WEBSITE ADDRESS
Glenforest School	1041 Harbor Drive West Columbia, SC 29169	803.796.7622	www.Glenforest.org
Grace Christian School	416 Denham Ave. West Columbia, SC 29169	803-794-8996	http://www.gracelions.com/d/
Greenwood Christian School	2026 Woodlawn Road Greenwood, SC 29649	864.229.2427	http://www.greenwoodchristianschool.org/
Hammond School	854 Galway Lane Columbia, SC 29209	803.776.0295	http://www.hammondschool.org/Home
Hampton Park Christian School	875 State Park Road Greenville, SC 29609	864.233.0556	http://hpcsonline.org/
Harvest Community School	PO Box 21 (10 South Dukes Street) Summerton, SC 29148	803.574.1004	http://www.harvestcommunityschool.org/
Heathwood Hall Episcopal School	3000 South Beltline Blvd Columbia, SC 29201	803-765-2309	www.heathwood.org
Heritage Academy	11 New Orleans Road Hilton Head, SC 29928	866.925.5528	http://www.heritagehhi.com/
Hidden Treasure Christian School	500 West Lee Road Taylors, SC 29687	864.235.6848	www.hiddentreasure.org
Hilton Head Christian Academy	55 Gardner Drive Hilton Head Island, SC 29926	843.681.2878	http://www.hhca.org/index.php
Hilton Head Preparatory School	8 Fox Grape Road Hilton Head Island, SC 29928	843.671.2286	http://www.hhprep.org/page.cfm?p=1
Holy Trinity Catholic School	1760 Living Stones Lane Longs, SC 29568-7486	843.390.4108	http://www.htcatholicschoolmyrtlebeach.com/
HOPE Academy	2131 Woodruff Road Greenville, SC 29607	864.676.0028	http://www.projecthopesc.org/
Hope Christian Academy	545 Alexander Circle Columbia, SC 29206	803.790.4028	http://hcatoday.com/
James Island Christian School	15 Crosscreek Drive Charleston, SC 29412	843.795.1762	http://www.jics.org/home
John Paul II Catholic School	4211 N. Okatie Highway Ridgeland, SC 29936	843.645.3838	www.johnpaul2school.org
Laurence Manning Academy	1154 Academy Drive P.O. Box 278 Manning, SC 29102	803.435.2114	http://www.laurencemanning.com/

SCHOOL	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	WEBSITE ADDRESS
Mason Preparatory School	56 Halsey Boulevard Charleston, SC 29401	843.723.0664	http://www.masonprep.org/page.aspx?pid=278
Mead Hall Episcopal School	129 Pendleton Street Aiken, SC 29801	803. 644.1122	http://www.meadhallschool.org/
Miracle Academy Preparatory School	1019 Bethel Road Russellville, SC 29476	843.567.4644	http://miracleacademy.org/Home_Page.html
Mitchell Road Christian Academy	207 Mitchell Road Greenville, SC 29615	864.268.2210	http://www.mitchellroadchristian.org/
Montessori Academy of Spartanburg	384 South Spring Street Spartanburg, SC 29306	864-585-3046	http://www.montessorispartanburg.com/
Montessori School of Anderson	280 Sam McGee Road Anderson, SC 29621	864.226.5344	http://msasc.org/
Montessori School of Florence	510 W. Palmetto Street Florence, SC 29501	843.629.2920	www.FlorenceMontessori.com
Montessori School of Mauldin	205b East Butler Rd Mauldin, S.C. 29662	864-288-8613	http://www.mauldinmontessori.com/Welcome.html
Nativity Catholic School	1125 Pittsford Circle Charleston, SC 29412	843.795.3975	http://www.nativity-school.com/
New Covenant School	303 Simpson Road Anderson, SC 29621	864.224.5675	https://newcovschool.net/
Newberry Academy	2055 Smith Road Newberry, SC 29108	803.276.2760	http://newberryacademy.com/~naeagles/
North Walterboro Christian Academy	2177 North Jefferies Highway Walterboro, SC 29488	843.539.1618	http://www.northwalterborobc.org/our-school
Northside Christian Academy	4347 Sunset Boulevard Lexington, SC 29072	803.520.5656	http://www.northsidechristianacademy.org/
Oconee Christian Academy	150 His Way Circle Seneca, SC 29672	864-882-6925	http://www.oconeechristian.org/
Orangeburg Preparatory Schools, Inc.	2651 North Road, NW Orangeburg, SC 29118	803.534.7970	http://www.orangeburgprep.com/index.html
Our Lady of Peace Catholic School	856 Old Edgefield Road N Augusta, SC 29841	803.279.8396	http://www.olpschool.us/
Our Lady of the Rosary Catholic School	2 James Drive Greenville, SC 29605-2209	864.277.5350	www.olrschool.net
Palmetto Christian Academy	361 Egypt Road Mt. Pleasant, S.C. 29464	843-881-9967	www.palmettochristianacademy.org

SCHOOL	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	WEBSITE ADDRESS
Pee Dee Academy	2903 E. Highway 76 E P.O. Box 449 Mullins, SC 29574	843.423.1771	http://www.peedeeacademy.org/
Porter-Gaud School	300 Albemarle Road Charleston, SC 29407	843.556.3620	https://www.portergaud.edu/
Prince of Peace Catholic School	1209 Brushy Creek Road Taylors, SC 29687	864.331.2145	www.popcatholicsschool.org
Ridge Christian Academy	2168 Ridge Church Road Summerville, SC 29483	843.873.9856	http://ridgechristian.info/
Sandhills School	1500 Hallbrook Drive Columbia, SC 29209	803.695.1400	http://www.sandhillsschool.org
Shannon Forest Christian School	829 Garlington Road Greenville, SC 29615	864.678.5107	https://www.shannonforest.com/
Southside Christian School	2211 Woodruff Road Simpsonville, SC 29681	864.234.7575	http://www.southsidechristian.org
Spartanburg Day School	1701 Skylyn Drive Spartanburg, SC 29307	864.582.7539	http://www.spartanburgdayschool.org/
St. Andrew Catholic School	3601 N Kings Highway Myrtle Beach, SC 29577-2933	843.448.6062	www.standrewschoolmb.com
St. Anne Catholic School-Rock Hill	1698 Bird Street Rock Hill, SC 29730-3800	803.324.4814	http://www.stanneschool.com/wp/
St. Anne Catholic School-Sumter	11 South Magnolia Street Sumter, SC 29150	803.775.3632	www.stannesumter.com
St. Anthony Catholic School-Florence	2536 W. Hoffmeyer Road Florence, SC 29501	843.662.1910	www.saintanthonycatholic.com
St. Anthony of Padua Catholic School	311 Gower Street Greenville, SC 29611	864.271.0167	www.stanthonygreenvillesc.org
*St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Catholic School	3501 North Kings Highway Suite 102 Myrtle Beach, SC 29577	843.839.2245	www.setonhighschoolsc.org
St. Francis by the Sea Catholic School	45 Beach City Road Hilton Head Island, SC 29926	843.681.6501	www.sfcshhi.com
St. Gregory the Great Catholic School	323 Fording Island Road Bluffton, SC 29909-6134	843.815.9988	www.sgg.cc

SCHOOL	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	WEBSITE ADDRESS
St. John Catholic School-Charleston	3921 St. John Ave N. Charleston, SC 29405	843.744.3901	http://saintjohncatholicsc.org/schoolsite/index.php
St. John Neumann Catholic School	721 Polo Road Columbia, SC 29223	803.788.1367	http://www.sjncatholic.com
St. John's Christian Academy	204 W. Main Street Moncks Corner, SC 29461	843.761.8539	http://www.sjacavaliers.com/
St. Joseph Catholic School-Anderson	1200 Cornelia Road Anderson, SC 29621-3349	864.760.1619	http://www.stjosephofanderson.com/
St. Joseph Catholic School-Columbia	3700 Devine Street Columbia, SC 29205-1908	803.254.6736	http://www.stjosdevine.com/
St. Joseph's Catholic School-Greenville	100 St Joseph's Drive Greenville, SC 29607	864.234.9009	www.sj catholic school.org
St. Mary Help of Christians Catholic School	118 York Street, SE Aiken, SC 29801	803.649.2071	www.stmaryschoolaiiken.com
St. Michael Catholic School	542 Cypress Avenue Murrells Inlet, SC 29576-8739	843.651.6795	http://www.saintmichaelsc.com
St. Peter's Catholic School-Beaufort	70 Lady's Island Drive Beaufort, SC 29907	843.522.2163	http://school.stpeters-church.org/
St. Peter's Catholic School-Columbia	1035 Hampton Street Columbia, SC 29201	803.252.8285	http://stpeterscatholicsschool.org/
Step of Faith Christian Academy	9009 Tarboro Rd. Ridgeland, SC 29936	843-726-6100	http://www.sfcaweb.org/
Summerville Catholic School	226 Black Oak Blvd Summerville, SC 29485-5800	843.873.9310	www.summervillecatholic.org
Sumter Christian School	420 S. Pike West Sumter, SC 29150	803.773.1902	http://www.sumterchristian.org/
Tabernacle Christian School	3931 White Horse Road Greenville, SC 29611	864.269.2760	http://tbc.sc/school/
The Barclay School	631 Longtown Road Ridgeway, SC 29130	803.337.0124	http://www.thebarclayschool.org/
The Chandler School	2900 Augusta Street Greenville, SC 29605	864.991.8443	https://thehandlerschool.org/
The Charleston Catholic School	888-A King St Charleston, SC 29403-4181	843.577.4495	www.charlestoncatholic.com

SCHOOL	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	WEBSITE ADDRESS
The King's Academy	1015 S Ebenezer Road Florence, SC 29501	843.661.7464	http://www.tkaflorence.com/
The Oaks Christian School	505 Gahagan Road Summerville, SC 29485	843.875.7667	http://www.oakschristianschool.org/
Thomas Hart Academy	852 Flinns Road Hartsville, SC 29550	843.332.4991	https://thomashart.org/
Thomas Heyward Academy	1727 Malphrus Road Ridgeland, SC 29936	843.726.3673	http://www.thomasheyward.org/
Thomas Sumter Academy	5625 Camden Highway Rembert, SC 29128	803.499.3378	http://www.thomassumteracademy.org/
Timmerman School	2219 Atascadero Drive Columbia, SC 29206	803.782.2748	https://www.timmermanschool.org/
Trident Academy	1455 Wakendaw Road Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464	843.884.7046	http://www.tridentacademy.com/
Walnut Grove Christian School	1036 Maxwell Mill Road Fort Mill, SC 29708	803.835.2000	http://www.walnutgrovechristianschool.com/
Westminster Catawba Christian School	2650 India Hook Road Rock Hill, SC 29732	803.366.4119	http://www.wccs.org/
Westside Christian Academy	554 Pinewood Road Sumter, SC 29154	803-775-4406	http://www.wcasumter.org/

*Pending Opening of School this Fall

Appendix D

2015-16 Grants Received by Schools

As Reported by Schools Applying for Program Participation in 2016-17, Document B

	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16		
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST
Addlestone Hebrew Academy	0	0	8	0	8	\$0	\$0	\$0
Anderson Christian School	0	0	48	0	48	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$56,080.00
Ashley Hall	0	0	3	0	3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Beaufort Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Beaufort Christian School	1	0	0	0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Blessed Hope Christian Academy	1	0	0	0	1	\$1,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ben Lippen	0	0	23	0	23	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
Bishop England High School	0	0	0	22	22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$107,104.00
Blessed Sacrament Catholic School, Charleston	0	0	0	8	8	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Bob Jones Academy	13	0	0	0	13	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Calvary Christian School	5	0	0	0	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00
Camden Military Academy	0	0	18	0	18	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$115,000.00
Camperdown Academy	0	0	130	0	130	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,000.00
Capers Preparatory Christian Academy	0	0	14	0	14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
Cardinal Newman School	0	0	0	38	38	\$19,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Carolina Christian Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$168,894.60
Cathedral Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$168,894.60
Chabad Jewish Academy	0	0	6	0	6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Charleston Collegiate School	0	0	4	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$184,548.00
Charleston Day School	0	0	5	0	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cherokee Creek Boys School	0	0	1	0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Christ Church Episcopal School	0	0	47	0	47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Christ Our King-Stella Maris Catholic School	0	0	0	21	21	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$46,000.00
Clarendon Hall	0	0	2	0	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Colleton Preparatory Academy	0	0	17	0	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$367,050.00
Covenant Classical Christian School	0	0	4	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cross Schools	0	0	14	0	14	\$85,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Crown Leadership Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$362,912.00
Cutler Jewish Day School	0	0	12	0	12	\$17,500.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00
Divine Redeemer Catholic School	0	0	0	7	7	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Einstein Academy	0	0	49	0	49	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
First Baptist School of Charleston	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in		
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST
Five Oaks Academy	0	0	7	0	7	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$31,332.00
Glenforest School	0	13	0	0	13	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$600,000.00
Grace Christian School	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$294,872.80
Greenwood Christian School	0	0	9	0	9	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$475,000.00
Hammond School	0	0	2	0	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$32,481.50
Hampton Park Christian	0	0	1	0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Harvest Community School	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$34,075.00
Heathwood Hall Episcopal School	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$26,832.00
Heritage Academy	0	0	1	0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hidden Treasure Christian School	17	0	0	0	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,912.50
Hilton Head Christian Academy	0	0	28	0	28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hilton Head Preparatory School	0	0	14	0	14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$241,347.50
Holy Trinity Catholic School, Longs	0	0	0	4	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HOPE Academy	0	0	60	0	60	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hope Christian Academy	4	1	0	0	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$177,500.00
James Island Christian	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,175.00
John Paul II Catholic School, Ridgeland	0	0	0	22	22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Laurence Manning Academy	0	0	8	0	8	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$24,574.00
Mason Preparatory School	0	1	13	0	14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$70,000.00
Mead Hall Episcopal School	0	3	0	0	3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Miracle Academy Preparatory School	0	0	87	0	87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$204,000.00
Mitchell Road Christian Academy	0	0	9	0	9	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,855.50
Montessori Academy of Spartanburg	0	0	6	0	6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,000.00
Montessori School of Anderson	0	0	12	0	12	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Montessori School of Florence	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$18,844.00
Montessori School of Mauldin	0	0	2	0	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Nativity Catholic School	0	0	0	2	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
New Covenant School	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Newberry Academy	0	0	9	0	9	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,000.00
North Walterboro Christian Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Northside Christian Academy	0	0	2	0	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Oconee Christian Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$329,430.00
Orangeburg Preparatory Schools, Inc.	0	0	11	0	11	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in		
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST
Our Lady of Peace Catholic School	0	0	0	16	16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,930.00
Our Lady of the Rosary Catholic School, Greenville	0	0	0	28	28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$60,000.00
Palmetto Christian Academy	0	0	4	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Pee Dee Academy	0	0	11	0	11	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,550.00
Porter-Gaud School	0	0	3	0	3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Prince of Peace Catholic School	0	0	0	18	18	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ridge Christian Academy	0	0	31	0	31	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Sandhills School	0	0	82	0	82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
Shannon Forest	0	0	31	0	31	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Southside Christian School	0	2	42	0	44	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Spartanburg Day School	0	0	20	0	20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,225.00
St. Andrew Catholic School	0	0	0	5	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$820,000.00
St. Anne Catholic School, Rock Hill	0	0	0	28	28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,500.00
St. Anne Catholic, Sumter	0	0	0	5	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$92,500.00
St. Anthony Catholic School, Florence	0	0	0	1	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. Anthony of Padua Catholic School	0	0	0	10	10	\$0.00	\$7,500.00	\$51,199.50
St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Catholic School **	0	0	0	0	0	\$8,500.00	\$0.00	\$14,300.00
St. Francis By the Sea Catholic School	0	0	0	9	9	\$0	\$0	\$49,460.00
St. Gregory the Great Catholic School	0	0	0	1	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. John Catholic School, North Charleston	0	0	0	26	26	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,000.00
St. John Neumann Catholic School	0	0	0	34	34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,300,000.00
St. John's Christian Academy	0	0	20	0	20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,212.50
St. Joseph Catholic School, Anderson	0	0	0	4	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. Joseph Catholic School, Columbia	0	0	0	20	20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. Joseph Catholic School, Greenville	0	0	0	16	16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. Mary Help of Christians Catholic School, Aiken	0	0	0	7	7	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. Michael Catholic School	0	0	0	17	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. Peter Catholic School, Beaufort	0	0	0	6	6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,840.00
St. Peter Catholic School, Columbia	0	0	0	15	15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Step of Faith Christian Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$97,845.00

	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in		
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST
Summerville Catholic School	0	0	0	9	9	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sumter Christian School	4	0	0	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Tabernacle Christian School	0	0	17	0	17	\$0.00	\$130,000.00	\$0.00
The Barclay School *	0	0	17	0	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
The Chandler School	0	0	37	0	37	\$5,425.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
The Charleston Catholic School	0	0	0	17	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,565.00
The King's Academy *	0	0	34	0	34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$113,986.30
The Oaks Christian School	0	0	17	0	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
Thomas Hart Academy	0	0	5	0	5	\$0.00	\$16,813.00	\$140,161.00
Thomas Heyward Academy	0	0	10	0	10	\$0.00	\$10,316.20	\$0.00
Thomas Sumter Academy	0	0	8	0	8	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,794.00
Timmerman School	0	0	0	0	0	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Trident Academy	0	1	34	0	35	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,000.00
Walnut Grove Christian School	3	0	6	0	9	\$0	\$0	\$7,000.00
Westminster Catawba Christian	0	0	22	0	22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,990.00
Westside Christian Academy	4	0	0	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL:	52	21	1,137	416	1,626	\$150,925.00	\$174,629.20	\$7,310,773.50

* Expressly represents net amount of tuitions after refunds to SFOs for students who withdrew during the 2015-16 year.

** Pending the opening of the school this fall.

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.

Full Report will be passed out at the EOC Meeting, October 10, 2016.



South Carolina Community Block Grants for Education Pilot Programs: Year 1 Report *Executive Summary*

The South Carolina General Assembly created the South Carolina Community Block Grant for Education Pilot Program by Proviso 1.94 in the 2014-15 General Appropriation Act. The purpose of the proviso was to encourage and sustain partnerships between a community and its public school district for the implementation of innovative, state-of-the-art education initiatives and models to improve learning. Any public school, including a charter school, was eligible to submit a grant application. The proviso asserts that the success of the grant program is best served when there is vigorous community support, which is integral to the development and implementation on innovative initiatives for young people. Through this proviso, one million dollars was allocated for the block grants with direct allocations to school districts. Grants awarded were to be implemented for a period of one year beginning July 1, 2015 until June 30, 2016.

Per the proviso, the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) was charged with reviewing the grant reports submitted upon completion of the grant period and examining of the implementation initiatives/models. The EOC is also responsible for highlighting the accomplishments and identifying common challenges of the initiatives in order to share the lessons learned with the state’s public education community.

2015-16 Community Block Grants Recipients

District	Beaufort	Charleston	Clarendon 1	Colleton	Jasper
Project Topic	Beaufort Community Learning Program- Extended learning day	Charleston Promise Neighborhood Learning Community – Extended learning day through STEAM	STEM, Project-based Learning and AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination)	Robotics with First Lego League	STEM 5E Model
School(s) Poverty Rating	82.5%	99.5%	98.2%	89.3%	87.9%
Number of Schools involved in the Project	(1) Beaufort Elementary	(2) Chicora Elementary (Partial magnet in communications); Sanders Clyde Elementary	(1) Scotts Branch Middle and St Paul Elementary	(5) All elementary schools in district: Bells, Cottageville Forest Hills, Henderson, Northside	(1) Hardeeville-Ridgeland Middle

Full Report will be passed out at the EOC Meeting, October 10, 2016.

		(Arts magnet)			
Grade Level	K-5	CD-5	6, 7, 8	4, 5	6, 7, 8
# Expected Students	100	1060	193	150	150
# Actual Students	52	264	187	93	94
% Actual vs. Expected Students Served	52%	25%	97%	62%	63%
Grant Amount Awarded	\$163,500	\$249,595	\$242,237	\$144,668	\$200,000
Matching Funds as self-reported	\$67,400	\$370,559	\$37,000	\$77,000	\$61,000

Highlights of 2015-16 Community Block Grants

District	Highlights
Beaufort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Students in the program showed gains in math and reading and greater gains than students not in the program. ➤ The relationship and communication among the families/students in the housing apartment community, the NOC and the school has greatly increased. ➤ The NOC has broadened its influence in the community and continues to make strides with the lowest performing students in the high poverty area in the city of Beaufort.
Clarendon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The partnerships created in the district were numerous and should be sustained for future work in the district. ➤ Sixth and seventh grade science scores show the most promise for student achievement and interest ➤ Based on the Gallup Poll Student Survey, Clarendon 1 students show slightly more positive perceptions on engagement, hope, entrepreneurial aspiration and career/financial literacy.
Colleton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The First League Lego (FLL) robotics curriculum was implemented with fidelity. ➤ Student scores in math as measured by MAP showed 93% of students saw gains. ➤ In its first year of operation, the district was able to host a regional FLL event and three teams progressed to the state finals.
Charleston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A quality assessment program was implemented to assist the partners in implementing a high quality program for after school programs and will be used in future grant implementations. ➤ The partnership initiated in Charleston has created a greater awareness of the need and increased the communication among partners for extended learning programs. ➤ Academic results were mixed however increased focus on alignment between in-school and extended learning should show more promising results.

Full Report will be passed out at the EOC Meeting, October 10, 2016.

Jasper	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ The instructional model and curriculum used in the project were of high quality and research based.➤ Mixed results were shown on the student however over 90 percent indicated they would recommend the program.➤ Academic results were mixed but scores in 6th and 8th grade math showed a potential for student growth in math.
---------------	---

Conclusions/Recommendations

Overall, the recommendations for future community block grant initiatives are summarized below.

1. School districts served as the fiscal agents for the grant funds allocated from the Education Oversight Committee for the purpose of implementing the grants as described in the grant proposal. School district superintendents and financial officers signed an Assurance of Award form to comply with state financial regulations. One hundred percent of the funds were dispersed to districts at the beginning of the grant period. In order to ensure data requested of districts is complete and submitted on a timely basis, future grant opportunities should require school districts to submit final expenditure requests at the conclusion of the grant period for some portion of the remaining funds or allocate funds to districts on an incremental basis throughout the grant period.
2. A recommendation for further discussion is to consider a 2 to 3 year grant program to ensure that school districts/community partnerships have built a strong foundation to sustain the grant program. In addition, data from a single year most likely will not provide the long-term gains regarding goals outlined in the grant. However, with multi-year implementation of the programs described for this grant, broader implications with greater defined results could be obtained.
3. In future grant opportunities, the evaluation component of the grant should be reviewed and appropriate changes be made by the district as to the measurable goals and corresponding data needed to measure the goals before a grant is awarded.
4. The proviso in place that initiated this grant opportunity for schools and community partners had as its primary purpose to encourage and sustain partnerships between a community and its local public school district or school for the implementation of innovative, state-of-the-art education initiatives and models to improve student learning. While the goal is laudable, it may be too broad and general to provide specific recommendations and conclusions for a set of grants. Considerations for future grant opportunities to promote innovativeness and community partnerships may need to take a more focused approach offering districts flexibility but with specific, strategic and targeted initiative.
5. A pattern seen in the five projects was a need for a closer alignment of the content/skills in the extended learning school to the in-school lessons. The content and skills outlined in the academic standards for a grade level could be better articulated in the extended learning programs. This would provide opportunities for greater practice and/or remediation in a specific skill for a content area as well as a practical application of the skill/content.