



**SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

Reporting facts. Measuring change. Promoting progress.

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

AGENDA

EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee

Monday, September 19, 2016
1:00 p.m.
Room 433, Blatt Building

- I. Welcome and Introductions Dr. Bob Couch
- II. Approval of Minutes of May 16, 2016 Dr. Bob Couch
- III. Information: Report on Educational Credits forMelanie Barton
Exceptional Needs Children
- IV. Information: Report on K-12 TechnologyMelanie Barton
- V. Update: 4K Community Block Grant Bunnie Ward
- VI. Information: Discussion of 2016-17 Budget
 - Presentation: Greenwood Genetic Center..... Dr. Leta Tribble
Director of Education
 - Analysis: Revenue and Fiscal Affairs for EFA Melanie Barton &
Bunnie Ward
 - Report: High School Task ForceMelanie Barton
- V. Adjournment

- Neil C. Robinson, Jr.
CHAIR
- Daniel B. Merok
VICE CHAIR
- April Allen
- Cynthia M. Bennett
- Anne H. Bull
- Bob Couch
- Mike Fair
- Raye Felder
- Barbara B. Hairfield
- Nikki Haley
- R. Wesley Hayes, Jr.
- Dwight A. Loftis
- John W. Matthews, Jr.
- Joseph H. Neal
- Molly Spearman
- John C. Stockwell
- Patti J. Tate
- Ellen Weaver

Subcommittee Members:

Dr. Bob Couch, Chair
April Allen
Cynthia Bennett
Rep. Dwight Loftis
Rep. Joseph Neal
Ellen Weaver

Melanie D. Barton
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee
May 16, 2016
Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance: Dr. Bob Couch, Rep. Dwight Loftis, Rep. Joe Neal

EOC Staff in Attendance: Dr. Kevin Andrews, Melanie Barton, Hope Johnson-Jones, Dr. Rainey Knight, Bunnie Ward

Dr. Couch called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. and welcomed Ms. April Allen, a newly-appointed member to the Education Oversight Committee. Minutes from the March 21, 2016 meeting were approved as submitted.

Ms. Bunnie Ward provided a summary to Teacher Loan Fund for the 2014-15 school year. Ms. Ward also highlighted other states' approaches to addressing teacher retention and advancement. Aiken County School District was also highlighted. Melanie Barton noted \$16.5 million remains in the Revolving Loan Fund. Further analysis should be conducted to most effectively and efficiently use these funds to support teacher recruitment. The report was approved as submitted and forwarded to the full EOC Committee for approval.

Ms. Jane Turner, Executive Director of the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention and Advancement (CERRA), provided a report on the status of teacher recruitment and retention in the state. Ms. Turner noted that in 2015-16 school year, there were only 1,954 teacher graduates in SC education programs and 4,074 teachers who did not return to their teaching positions. About 35% of teachers left within their first five years of teaching, with 15% of teachers leaving after their first year.

CERRA is working to improve marketing and outreach about the Teacher Loan Fund Program. One issue is that students do not realize they are eligible for the teacher loan fund program after their freshman year. The program also needs to be marketed to older college students since they may also be eligible. CERRA has met with historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) to ensure they have accurate information and are supported in marketing the program to students.

Ms. Turner supported the idea of expanding the Teacher Loan Fund Program with a tiered forgiveness approach so any teacher could get the loan forgiven but it would take some teachers longer to get the loan forgiven if they weren't teaching in a critical need or geographic area.

Teaching Fellows Program is rigorous with high admission standards and a demanding program curriculum. It is designed to recruit the best and the brightest students into the Fellows Program. CERRA recommends increasing the size of the award beyond the \$6,000 per year that is currently awarded to \$7,000 - \$7,500. For 16 years, the amount has not been increased.

Ms. Turner recommended strengthening the induction and mentoring program. Mentoring is a portion of the overall induction process for teachers. CERRA has revamped their mentoring program training. Mentors and mentees need time to process and consider their roles. Mentors should be utilized beyond the first year and into the second and third years of new teachers' careers. Districts need to commit staff at the district level to support induction process and also ensure there is effective training for other district staff that interact with and support new teachers.

Rep. Neal asked about the number of minority teachers in the South Carolina teacher workforce. Ms. Ward responded that in 2014-15, approximately 12 percent of all teachers in South Carolina are African-American males and 97 percent are female. Rep. Neal requested additional efforts and outreach be implemented to inform minority students of teacher opportunities and financial support. Dr. Couch noted the teacher educator pathway did not receive appropriate attention during the creation of the EEDA pathway system.

The Teacher Supply Study Report noted there will be continuing shortages in multiple areas, including STEM-related subjects, languages, special education, art, social studies and business/marketing/computer technology.

Ms. Turner also discussed Proviso 1A.73, which primarily focuses on addressing districts with high teacher turnover rates. A high turnover rate is defined as exceeding 11 percent annually. CERRA recommends teachers in high critical subject areas be paid a \$1,500 teacher salary supplement which teachers could receive multiple years – it is both a recruitment and retention tool. Approximate salary supplement cost is \$450,000. CERRA recommends limited it to math, science, special education for the first year. CERRA also recommends paying a supplement for teacher mentors and to provide additional training time for up to two years for new teachers. CERRA is also looking to ensure Teacher Cadet programs are in each district that experiences high teacher turnover.

Ms. Melanie Barton provided an overview of current education budget deliberations. Rep. Neal requested additional information and detail about programmatic and financial investments in Abbeville districts. Dr. Couch noted there are different pockets of funding for Abbeville districts but there is also a need for additional technical assistance and support for the most effective implementation of allocated funds. Rep. Loftis also noted there is a critical need for strong leadership. Dr. Couch suggested a mentoring district approach should be considered for professional development among districts.

Ms. Ward briefly updated the subcommittee on the 4K quality grants; there will be a grant orientation meeting September 8. Ms. Ward also noted there will be an interim report on the language and literacy assessment results at the beginning of the 2015-16 school year for 4K and 5K students.

There being no further business, the subcommittee adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Subcommittee: EIA and Improvement Mechanisms

Date: September 19, 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 as of September 1, 2016.

TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS

Schools were notified on June 9, 2016 about the application process. By September 1, 2016, 109 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)

2015–2016

Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) Program

School Approval Process and Results

Draft



SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

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

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 for participation in ECENC program in 2016-17.

Only one application was denied because the applicant was a program and not a school. 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, increasing the total number of approved schools to 110 (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	110
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 110 schools that were approved in 2016-17, 95 reported receiving tuition grants from non-profit scholarship organizations and 15 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

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/
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
Pee Dee Academy	2903 E. Highway 76 E P.O. Box 449 Mullins, SC 29574	843.423.1771	http://www.peedeeacademy.org/

SCHOOL	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	WEBSITE ADDRESS
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

Schools Approved for ECENC Program in 2016-17	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in FY 2015-16				TOTAL
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	
Addlestone Hebrew Academy	0	0	8	0	8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,100.00	\$8,100.00
Anderson Christian School	0	0	48	0	48	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$56,080.00	\$0.00	\$56,080.00
Ashley Hall	0	0	3	0	3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$24,875.00	\$24,875.00
Beaufort Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00
Beaufort Christian School	1	0	0	0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$47,026.00	\$47,026.00
Blessed Hope Christian Academy	1	0	0	0	1	\$1,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,500.00
Ben Lippen	0	0	23	0	23	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
Bishop England High School	0	0	0	22	22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$107,104.00	\$0.00	\$107,104.00
Blessed Sacrament Catholic School, Charleston	0	0	0	8	8	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Bob Jones Academy	13	0	0	0	13	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,035.00	\$14,035.00
Calvary Christian School	5	0	0	0	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00
Camden Military Academy	0	0	18	0	18	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$115,000.00	\$0.00	\$115,000.00
Camperdown Academy	0	0	130	0	130	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,000.00	\$0.00	\$36,000.00
Capers Preparatory Christian Academy	0	0	14	0	14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
Cardinal Newman School	0	0	0	38	38	\$19,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,500.00
Carolina Christian Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$168,894.64	\$0.00	\$168,894.64
Cathedral Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$168,894.64	\$0.00	\$168,894.64
Chabad Jewish Academy	0	0	6	0	6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$177,871.00	\$177,871.00
Charleston Collegiate School	0	0	4	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$184,548.00	\$0.00	\$184,548.00
Charleston Day School	0	0	5	0	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$60,500.00	\$60,500.00
Cherokee Creek Boys School	0	0	1	0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$101,936.00	\$101,936.00
Christ Church Episcopal School	0	0	47	0	47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$181,150.00	\$181,150.00

Schools Approved for ECENC Program in 2016-17	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in FY 2015-16				
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL
Christ Our King-Stella Maris Catholic School	0	0	0	21	21	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$46,000.00	\$0.00	\$46,000.00
Clarendon Hall	0	0	2	0	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$166,339.00	\$166,339.00
Colleton Preparatory Academy	0	0	17	0	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$367,050.00	\$0.00	\$367,050.00
Covenant Classical Christian School	0	0	4	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,900.00	\$22,900.00
Cross Schools	0	0	14	0	14	\$85,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$85,000.00
Crown Leadership Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$362,912.00	\$0.00	\$362,912.00
Cutler Jewish Day School	0	0	12	0	12	\$17,500.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,500.00
Divine Redeemer Catholic School	0	0	0	7	7	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Einstein Academy	0	0	49	0	49	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00
First Baptist School of Charleston	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$74,790.00	\$74,790.00
Five Oaks Academy	0	0	7	0	7	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$31,332.00	\$0.00	\$31,332.00
Glenforest School	0	13	0	0	13	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$600,000.00	\$0.00	\$600,000.00
Grace Christian School	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$294,872.83	\$0.00	\$294,872.83
Greenwood Christian School	0	0	9	0	9	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$475,000.00	\$0.00	\$475,000.00
Hammond School	0	0	2	0	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$32,481.50	\$0.00	\$32,481.50
Hampton Park Christian	0	0	1	0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$27,600.00	\$27,600.00
Harvest Community School	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$34,075.00	\$0.00	\$34,075.00
Heathwood Hall Episcopal School	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$26,832.00	\$0.00	\$26,832.00
Heritage Academy	0	0	1	0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$70,650.00	\$70,650.00
Hidden Treasure Christian School	17	0	0	0	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,912.50	\$0.00	\$7,912.50
Hilton Head Christian Academy	0	0	28	0	28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hilton Head Preparatory School	0	0	14	0	14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$241,347.50	\$0.00	\$241,347.50
Holy Trinity Catholic School, Longs	0	0	0	4	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$257,496.00	\$257,496.00

Schools Approved for ECENC Program in 2016-17	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in FY 2015-16				
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL
HOPE Academy	0	0	60	0	60	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hope Christian Academy	4	1	0	0	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$177,500.00	\$0.00	\$177,500.00
James Island Christian	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,175.00	\$0.00	\$23,175.00
John Paul II Catholic School, Ridgeland	0	0	0	22	22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$74,950.00	\$74,950.00
Laurence Manning Academy	0	0	8	0	8	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$24,574.00	\$0.00	\$24,574.00
Mason Preparatory School	0	1	13	0	14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$70,000.00	\$0.00	\$70,000.00
Mead Hall Episcopal School	0	3	0	0	3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,150.00	\$3,150.00
Miracle Academy Preparatory School	0	0	87	0	87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$204,000.00	\$0.00	\$204,000.00
Mitchell Road Christian Academy	0	0	9	0	9	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,855.50	\$0.00	\$30,855.50
Montessori Academy of Spartanburg	0	0	6	0	6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	\$20,000.00
Montessori School of Anderson	0	0	12	0	12	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Montessori School of Florence	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$18,844.00	\$0.00	\$18,844.00
Montessori School of Mauldin	0	0	2	0	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$24,078.00	\$24,078.00
Nativity Catholic School	0	0	0	2	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$92,484.00	\$92,484.00
New Covenant School	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Newberry Academy	0	0	9	0	9	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,000.00	\$0.00	\$12,000.00
Northside Christian Academy	0	0	2	0	2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$92,400.00	\$92,400.00
Oconee Christian Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$329,430.00	\$0.00	\$334,430.00
Orangeburg Preparatory Schools, Inc.	0	0	11	0	11	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$132,070.00	\$132,070.00
Our Lady of Peace Catholic School	0	0	0	16	16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,930.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$60,000.00
Palmetto Christian Academy	0	0	4	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,300.00	\$16,300.00
Pee Dee Academy	0	0	11	0	11	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,550.00	\$0.00	\$20,550.00

Schools Approved for ECENC Program in 2016-17	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in FY 2015-16				
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL
Porter-Gaud School	0	0	3	0	3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$215,232.00	\$215,232.00
Prince of Peace Catholic School	0	0	0	18	18	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$27,773.00	\$27,773.00
Ridge Christian Academy	0	0	31	0	31	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$254,652.00	\$254,652.00
Sandhills School	0	0	82	0	82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
Shannon Forest	0	0	31	0	31	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Southside Christian School	0	2	42	0	44	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$27,909.00	\$27,909.00
Spartanburg Day School	0	0	20	0	20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,225.00	\$0.00	\$9,225.00
St. Andrew Catholic School	0	0	0	5	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$820,000.00	\$0.00	\$820,000.00
St. Anne Catholic School, Rock Hill	0	0	0	28	28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,500.00	\$0.00	\$15,500.00
St. Anne Catholic, Sumter	0	0	0	5	5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$92,500.00	\$0.00	\$92,500.00
St. Anthony Catholic School, Florence	0	0	0	1	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$58,699.50
St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Catholic School **	0	0	0	0	0	\$8,500.00	\$0.00	\$14,300.00	\$0.00	\$22,800.00
St. Francis By the Sea Catholic School	0	0	0	9	9	\$0	\$0	\$49,460	\$0.00	\$49,460.00
St. Gregory the Great Catholic School	0	0	0	1	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,406.00	\$45,406.00
St. John Catholic School, North Charleston	0	0	0	26	26	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,000.00	\$0.00	\$13,000.00
St. John Neumann Catholic School	0	0	0	34	34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,300,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,300,000.00
St. John's Christian Academy	0	0	20	0	20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,212.50	\$0.00	\$36,212.50
St. Joseph Catholic School, Anderson	0	0	0	4	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,600.00	\$3,600.00
St. Joseph Catholic School, Columbia	0	0	0	20	20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. Joseph Catholic School, Greenville	0	0	0	16	16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Schools Approved for ECENC Program in 2016-17	Number of Grants Received from SFO in FY2015-16					Amount of Grants Received from SFO in FY 2015-16				
	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL	Advance Carolina	DESK	Palmetto Kids FIRST	St. Thomas Aquinas	TOTAL
St. Mary Help of Christians Catholic School, Aiken	0	0	0	7	7	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$65,600.00	\$65,600.00
St. Michael Catholic School	0	0	0	17	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
St. Peter Catholic School, Beaufort	0	0	0	6	6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,840.00	\$0.00	\$22,840.00
St. Peter Catholic School, Columbia	0	0	0	15	15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Step of Faith Christian Academy	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$97,845.00	\$0.00	\$97,845.00
Summerville Catholic School	0	0	0	9	9	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Sumter Christian School	4	0	0	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$58,800.00	\$58,800.00
Tabernacle Christian School	0	0	17	0	17	\$0.00	\$130,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$130,000.00
The Barclay School *	0	0	17	0	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
The Chandler School	0	0	37	0	37	\$5,425.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,425.00
The Charleston Catholic School	0	0	0	17	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,565.00	\$0.00	\$30,565.00
The King's Academy *	0	0	34	0	34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$113,986.34	\$0.00	\$113,986.34
The Oaks Christian School	0	0	17	0	17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
Thomas Hart Academy	0	0	5	0	5	\$0.00	\$16,813.00	\$140,161.06	\$0.00	\$156,974.06
Thomas Heyward Academy	0	0	10	0	10	\$0.00	\$10,316.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,316.20
Thomas Sumter Academy	0	0	8	0	8	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,794.00	\$0.00	\$16,794.00
Timmerman School	0	0	0	0	0	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00
Trident Academy	0	1	34	0	35	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,000.00	\$0.00	\$45,000.00
Walnut Grove Christian School	3	0	6	0	9	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	\$0.00	\$7,000.00
Westminster Catawba Christian	0	0	22	0	22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,990.00	\$0.00	\$7,990.00
Westside Christian Academy	4	0	0	0	4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL:	52	21	1,137	416	1,626	\$150,925.00	\$174,629.20	\$7,310,773.51	\$2,369,672.00	\$10,007,499.71

* 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 at 803.734.6148.

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Subcommittee: EIA and Improvement Mechanisms

Date: September 19, 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)

2016

K-12 TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE REPORT

Draft



**SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**



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

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 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 highlighting 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. (See 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. (Table 4) 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 from 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.

Forty-four (44) 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 device.

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 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	

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 8.

**Table 8
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 receive 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 9.

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.

Table 9
Internet Bandwidth by District, 2012-13 and 2015-16

Internet Bandwidth (MBs)	2012-13	2015-16
	# 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 tottem.

School districts reported expending 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%

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.

Internal Connections – Approximately 55 percent of schools have at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth within the school. Over 95 percent of all schools reported that between 91 and 100 percent of classrooms in their school had internal access to wireless networks.

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 report 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.

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	\$

Last Updated September 6, 2016

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

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 at 803.734.6148.

Request for EIA Program for Fiscal Year 2017-18

The attached application should be completed for programs that request Education Improvement Act (EIA) funding for the first time during Fiscal Year 2017-18.

The completed document should not exceed ten (10) pages, with 12-point font and 1 inch margins.

The completed application packet should contain fifteen (15), three-hole-punched single sided copies and one electronic file by 12:00 p.m. September 30, 2016.

Hard copies may be mailed to: Education Oversight Committee, Post Office Box 11867, Columbia, SC 29211. Hard copies may also be dropped off at the Education Oversight Office, located in Room 502 of the Brown Building on Statehouse grounds. The Brown Building is located on the corner of Pendleton and Sumter streets.

Any questions and electronic copies should be sent to Bunnie Lempeis Ward at bward@eoc.sc.gov.

Request for EIA Program for Fiscal Year 2017-18

Program Summary			
Program Name	Science Education Outside the Classroom	Requested Amount	\$750,000.

Program Contact Name	Leta M. Tribble, PhD	Organization	Greenwood Genetic Center
Program Contact Title	Director, Division of Education	Address	101 Gregor Mendel Circle Greenwood, SC 29646
Program Contact Phone	864-943-4170	Program Contact E-Mail	LMT@ggc.org

Fiscal Officer Contact Name	Bonnie M. Ramage	Organization	Greenwood Genetic Center
Fiscal Officer Contact Title	Administrator	Address	101 Gregor Mendel Circle Greenwood, Sc 29646
Fiscal Officer Contact Phone	864-941-8163	Fiscal Officer Contact E-Mail	Boo@ggc.org

Description of Program:

The Greenwood Genetic Center (GGC), as South Carolina’s premier genetics institute, considers education a top priority and is uniquely positioned to provide engaging opportunities in this field that capture students’ attention and create an incentive to learn.

In response to the educational and economic challenges in South Carolina, GGC has developed a mobile science laboratory – known as the Gene Machine – to promote science, technology, and genetic literacy, as well as career exploration, through an “outside the classroom” approach.

GGC’s Mobile Science Laboratory Program began serving students across South Carolina in 2010 and has worked with more than 31,000 students, offering exposure to modern biotechnology and equipment, direct contact with genetics professionals, and engagement in inquiry-based activities – all on their school’s campus. This program has helped to equalize the educational disparities that exist among districts by providing consistent laboratory instruction, all the needed materials / supplies, and modern laboratory equipment for student use; equipment and access often unavailable in districts with a high minority and underserved student population.

Teachers are the direct link between content and students. An effective science teacher is one who is well versed and confident in the subject matter. For 22 years, GGC has offered graduate level courses in genetics on the Greenwood campus. This proposed program will modify these courses into an online, hybrid format for didactic content combined with a two day hands on laboratory experience. The mobile labs will be used to provide the lab exercises for teachers too distant to come to Greenwood.

It is our hypothesis that continued and direct interaction with genetics professionals and exposure to genetic health information, exposure to modern technology and equipment, and engagement in inquiry-based activities will result in:

- A better understanding of the role of genetics in both good health and disease
- Increased student interest in the life sciences
- A desire for continued education
- An exploration of careers in the sciences and healthcare fields

Request for EIA Program for Fiscal Year 2017-18

We seek to expand this successful and proven program to ensure that students in South Carolina, regardless of their geographical location, can benefit from this innovative educational opportunity.

This program addresses the current focus on STEM knowledge and supports the defined world-class skills for South Carolina graduates: creativity, critical thinking, teamwork, and technology.

Person Submitting Request:

	Leta M. Tribble, PhD Director of Education, GGC	08/29/2016
Signature	Name and Title	Date

Program Description

1. Goals

What are the primary goals of the program? The goal is the Overall purpose or long-term outcome of the program.

There are three primary goals of the program:

1. Through the use of the current mobile lab and the addition of a second lab dedicated to serve counties and districts identified by EOC with the most need, the program will seek to enhance students' genetic understanding and knowledge, to introduce students to biotechnology through lab equipment and experiences, and to encourage students to pursue post-secondary education and enter careers in the sciences.

2. In addition, the training of teachers is a significant component to the success of the student. A teacher, trained in laboratory skills, biotechnology, and genetics is the most direct link to exciting students to this field. The GGC has a 22 year history of providing four graduate level courses that have been held on the GGC campus in Greenwood. The location is now proving to be a limiting factor in reaching more teachers; therefore, this proposal has a goal of creating online, hybrid versions of the GGC courses, allowing teachers electronic access to didactic content. To complete the courses, teachers will have a two-day, hands-on workshop offered on the Greenwood campus for those teachers who can drive to Greenwood. For teachers from distant areas, the two mobile lab units would be used as the workshop training site in their regions.

3. A third goal of this proposal is to take a fully evaluated, proven and successful science outreach program statewide, in order to serve **ALL** SC students and teachers, regardless of their geographical location and means, with the focus being on underserved districts.

There are questions as to why in the six years of the program there remain unseen districts / counties. There are several possible explanations including:

- A small staff of two instructors and driver, one mobile lab and a very full calendar that doesn't offer many open dates in the school year.
- Teachers and administrators in these districts being unaware of the outreach program. To address this possibility, direct and personal contacts will be made with the superintendents.
- Perhaps there is an 'attitude' that permeates that these students cannot do and would not benefit from these experiences. We contend the direct opposite and

believe that all students can learn and benefit and perhaps one will be inspired to achieve.

Rapid advances in genetic technologies, the popularity and extensive coverage of genetics topics in the press, and the increasing role that genetics is playing in healthcare, necessitate a basic understanding of science by everyone. In recent decades, the immense expansion of genetics knowledge has placed much attention and expectation on the field. With the rapidly growing career opportunities in genetics and biotechnology, today's students are not equipped to excel in these in-demand fields.

As a result, there is a tremendous need for better educated students who are more likely to graduate and pursue additional education. Students who develop science literacy are more likely to have advanced skills, to secure competitive employment, and to make better informed healthcare choices. These students will drive economic growth and development in South Carolina, while experiencing personal growth and career satisfaction.

Due to geographic and economic disparities, many South Carolina students do not have equal access and exposure to relevant science equipment and skills to encourage interests in these careers.

While the GGC has successfully been providing these services statewide since 2010, current GGC resources and limitations in budget, personnel and time do not allow expansion of the program. Additional funding is needed to expand the outreach education program to work specifically with these teachers and students in the fields of genetics, biotechnology, and life science.

Goals	
1	Enhance genetic literacy
2	Enable students to excel in the fields of genetics and biotechnology
3	Encourage a career in the life sciences

2. Research / Evidence:

In 2012, the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) defined science literacy as:

'An individual's scientific knowledge and use of that knowledge to identify questions, to acquire new knowledge, to explain scientific phenomena, and to draw evidence based conclusions about

science-related issues; understanding of the characteristic features of science as a form of human knowledge and inquiry; awareness of how science and technology shape our material, intellectual, and cultural environments; and willingness to engage in science-related issues, and with the ideas of science, as a reflective citizen' (PISA, 2012). Table 2 provides a description of each of the science proficiency levels.

Table 2: PISA proficiency levels on science literacy scale.

Proficiency level	Task descriptions
Level 6	Students can identify, explain, and apply scientific knowledge and knowledge about science in a variety of complex life situations. Students can use scientific knowledge and develop arguments in support of recommendations and decisions that center on personal, social, or global situations.
Level 5	Students can use well developed inquiry abilities, link knowledge appropriately, and bring critical insights to situations. They can construct explanations based on evidence and arguments based on their critical analysis.
Level 4	Students can reflect on their actions and they can communicate decisions using scientific knowledge and evidence.
Level 3	Students can interpret and use concepts from different disciplines and can apply them directly. They can develop short statements using facts and make decisions based on scientific knowledge.
Level 2	Students are capable of direct reasoning and making literal interpretations of the results of scientific inquiry or technological problem solving.
Level 1	Students have such a limited scientific knowledge that it can only be applied to a few, familiar situations.

In 2012 the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) released data on U.S. 15 year old public school students and their PISA science literacy scale by proficiency level as related to free or reduced lunch eligibility. Results indicated that when 50-74.9% of students within a district are eligible for free or reduced lunch, 80.6% of the students had science proficiency on the lower end of the scale from below Level 1 to Level 3.

Many of the underserved SC counties / districts have high percentages of free or reduced lunch.

In the same year, the NCES reported the PISA science proficiency level as compared to race/ethnicity. For the Black population of 15 year old students in public schools, 89.8% of students had science proficiency ranging from below Level 1 to Level 3. Many students in these underserved counties are minority students.

For the counties served by this project the effects of eligibility for free or reduced lunch and the high minority population predict dismal standings in science proficiency levels. The low standings were confirmed by end of course (EOC) testing performance.

EOC testing is administered to all high school students in South Carolina at the end of each school year and includes Biology 1 and Applied Biology 2. Results of 2015 testing for some of the counties that would be served by the expanded program are listed in Table 3 and lend significant support for the need of focused programs to serve students in these disciplines (ed.sc.gov).

Counties	All Students	Black or African American Students
Statewide	50.7%	72.4%
Allendale	91.8%	91.5%
Dillon 4	67.7%	75.2%
Florence District 4	81.5%	85%
Hampton 2	97.1%	97%
Jasper	89.6%	92%
Lee	84.1%	86.4%
Marion	66%	68.9%

Table 3: 2015 End of Course (EOC) results for Bio 1/Applied Bio 2: Percentage with a grade of C and below. (<https://ed.sc.gov>)

This proposed project will enhance science education opportunities in these and similar underserved communities with large minority populations and high poverty rates. The target participants will include students in grades 7-12 and teachers in these districts.

3. Resources

Current resources are provided through GGC institutional support and include one mobile lab, its teaching team of two and all equipment and supplies. For the expanded program that would reach all SC counties, particularly districts in need on a regular and annual basis, an additional mobile unit and team are required and this is beyond the budgetary capabilities of the GGC.

To provide broader teacher training in biotechnology and genetics, video equipment and recording space are needed to produce online, hybrid graduate level courses. Increased video capabilities will allow support of SC Virtual School through distribution of taped laboratory demonstrations and provide supplemental lectures for both classroom and home-based use. Additional funding is required to achieve these expanded outreach education measures.

4. Strategies

Strategies are actions that are needed to implement proposed program. They describe how program resources will be used in order to achieve program outcomes and goals.

In Fiscal Year 2016-17, what primary program strategies are being implemented to facilitate progress in reaching the goals provided in Question 1?

Fiscal Year 2016-17		
	Strategy	Progress (completed, in progress, not begun)
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GGC will continue to educate students in the fields of biotechnology and genetics through the current Mobile Lab and on-site Genetic Education Center in Greenwood - GGC will explore funding opportunities with the EOC to implement an expanded program with a second mobile lab, equipment and staff to allow service to students in all 46 counties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In progress and on-going -In progress

Request for EIA Program for Fiscal Year 2017-18

2	<p>GGC will seek outside funding in 2016-2017 that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Expand teacher education and training through online, hybrid graduate level courses -Provide free online teaching resources -Produce videotaped demonstrations and lectures to supplement and support SC Virtual School -Offer professional development events -Host special topic seminars for school staff (for example: autism and GGC research) 	-In progress
4	<p>In 2017-2018, GGC and SCDE will conduct robust quantitative and qualitative evaluation components for the expanded outreach education</p>	Not begun

5. Indicators

Fiscal Year 2016-17		
	Indicator	Progress (completed, in progress, not begun)
1	<p>From 2010-2016, the Mobile Lab served more than 30,000 students in 39 counties. GGC will continue to schedule trips in 2016-2017 using current resources to increase the numbers of students seen.</p>	Completed for previous years and in progress for 2016-2017
2	<p>From 2010-2016, students demonstrated 100% improvement in pre and post assessments of laboratory activities/skills. Assessments will continue in 2016-2017 school year</p>	Completed for previous years and in progress for 2016-2017
3	<p>Conduct and analyze teacher and student surveys as indicators of effectiveness of the outreach program</p>	Completed for previous years and in progress currently
4	<p>Seek support from statewide partnerships</p>	In progress

6. Outcomes

Past Outcomes: What has the program accomplished in the past one to two years?

Past Outcomes		How does the outcome contribute to the Profile of the SC Graduate?
1	Data showed 100% improvement in pre/post student lab assessments in outreach activities	Supports STEM, critical thinking and problem solving in case study based lab activities
2	Increased interest by HS students for career shadowing opportunities at the GGC (25 in 2015-2016 school year)	Lab shadow experiences introduce HS students to teamwork, skills needed in science workplace
3	Multiple and repeat requests from teachers to work with their students. In 2015-2016, the program had a 'wait list' of requests. 131 Mobile Lab trips were made to schools in 2015-2016.	Illustrates teachers' confidence in GGC curriculum and confirms that the outreach program supports STEM standards and SC Science Standards
4	Data reveal an increased number of students served during each school year. In 2010, we worked with approximately 3,200 students. In 2015-2016, the number increased to more than 6,500 students.	Program presents students with information on science careers, the needed skills and technology used in these careers and the educational requirements

Future Outcomes: In the future, during the 2017-18 through 2020-21 timeframe, what should the program accomplish over the next three to five years?

	Future Outcomes Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2020-21	How does the outcome contribute to the Profile of the SC Graduate?
1	<p>- Addition of a second mobile lab and teaching team that allows mobile outreach program to serve all 46 counties and districts, particularly those with most need</p> <p>-The second mobile lab would be housed in either Florence or Charleston (GGC clinic sites) to target and focus on those regions of the state</p>	<p>Increased number of students exposed to science careers, laboratory skills, educational requirements for these careers, and collaboration in lab work and technology: All of these support the Profile of the SC Graduate</p>
2	<p>More and better prepared teachers to instruct students in science and technology.</p>	<p>Better prepared teachers have a direct impact on student achievement and preparation</p>
3	<p>Students from high-risk, underserved districts will have the same opportunities to learn about and use the tools of science and technology.</p>	<p>Students are exposed to biotechnology, science careers and workplace skills regardless of students' geographical location or economic status of the area</p>
4	<p>Increase the number of minority students and females pursuing post-secondary education.</p>	<p>Supports the knowledge, skills, and traits required of the SC Graduate</p>
5	<p>Increase the number of students entering science and research fields</p>	<p>Supports the knowledge, skills, and traits in the Profile of the SC Graduate</p>
6	<p>Maintain outreach program at no charge to SC schools and students</p>	<p>Students are exposed to biotechnology, science careers and workplace skills regardless of geographical location or economic status of the region</p>

7	In 2017-2018, GGC and SCDE will conduct robust quantitative and qualitative evaluation components for the expanded outreach education	Rigorous goals require stringent evaluation for success of program
---	---	--

7. External Factors: In the event that GGC institutional support decreases due to overall budget constraints, adjustments to the outreach program would have to occur if outside funding and support are not available.

Program Evaluation

Outcomes

A number of measures have been and will be used to gauge the impact of the outreach program:

- 1) Results of teacher surveys and comments
- 2) Analysis of pre/post lab assessments of the students’ knowledge
- 3) Receiving student feedback and discussion
- 4) Analysis and comparison of the number of repeat requests by teachers and the number of new requests for services

Examples of teacher surveys, assessments, and data that are in use for the current program are found in the Appendix.

External Evaluation

Has an independent program evaluation external to the organization been conducted? Yes

If yes, please describe. What was the date of the most recent evaluation? What were the findings and recommendations?

The first two years of the outreach program were supported through an NIH grant. Since that time, it has been institutionally supported. As part of the NIH grant, a formal, outside evaluation was conducted. This evaluation, conducted in 2012 is attached to this application in the Appendix.

Request for EIA Program for Fiscal Year 2017-18

It is our plan to take an existing program that is fully vetted and proven to succeed, and make it an even more effective science outreach program. To assist in this goal, we would ask for a professional evaluator from the SC Department of Education to conduct this assessment. An expert evaluator would be an asset to the program and to the prudent use of EIA funds for this program.

In summary, the benefits of an expanded outreach program with two mobile units are many and include:

- Expanded training to teachers through hands-on workshops and online opportunities
- Broadened service to targeted areas in the state at no cost to schools
- Opportunities to support and enhance the SC Virtual School Program
- Ability to provide free and extensive online teaching resources and supplemental classroom materials
- Ability to provide consistent service to all geographical areas of the state
- Enhanced understanding of the role of genetics in individual / family health

Please complete the following charts to describe estimated funding sources and expenditures for Fiscal Year 2017-18, the year for which EIA funds are requested.

Funding Sources	2017-18 Estimated
EIA	\$750,000
State Funds:	
General Fund	
Lottery	
Fees	
Federal Funds (specify):	
Other Sources:	
Grant	
Contributions	
Non-Profit (Foundation, etc.)	
Other (specify): GGC Institutional Support	\$75,000
Carry Forward from Prior Year	
TOTAL:	\$825,000

Request for EIA Program for Fiscal Year 2017-18

Expenditures	2017-18 Estimated
Personal Service	
Contractual Services: Construction of 2 nd mobile lab	* \$360,000 NR
Supplies & Materials: Lab supplies/equipment	70,000
Fixed Charges	50,000
Travel: Overnight trips for mobile labs staff	25,000
Equipment: Video room and equipment	* 45,000 NR
Employer Contributions: (salaries/fringe)	200,000
Allocations to Districts/Schools/Agencies/Entities	
Other (specify)	
Balance Remaining: GGC support	75,000
TOTAL:	\$825,000
# FTES:	6.0

*NR: non-recurring expenditures



ATTACHMENT: Profile of the South Carolina Graduate

PROFILE OF THE South Carolina Graduate

WORLD-CLASS KNOWLEDGE

Rigorous standards in language arts and math for career and college readiness

Multiple languages, science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM), arts and social sciences



WORLD-CLASS SKILLS

Creativity and innovation
Critical thinking and problem solving
Collaboration and teamwork
Communication, information, media and technology
Knowing how to learn

LIFE AND CAREER CHARACTERISTICS

Integrity • Self-direction • Global perspective • Perseverance • Work ethic • Interpersonal skills

© SCASA Superintendents' Roundtable

Adopted by: SC Arts Alliance, SC Arts in Basic Curriculum Steering Committee, SCASCD, SC Chamber of Commerce, SC Council on Competitiveness, SC Education Oversight Committee, SC School Boards Association, SC State Board of Education, SC State Department of Education, TransformSC Schools and Districts.



	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 EOC Recommendations	2017-18 Governor's Executive Budget	Explanation and Notes	House Budget March 24
A. STANDARDS, TEACHING, LEARNING, ACCOUNTABILITY						
1. Student Learning						
Personal Service Classified Positions	58,629	58,629				\$58,629
Other Operating Expenses	136,739	136,739				\$136,739
High Achieving Students						
Aid to Districts	37,386,600	37,386,600				\$37,386,600
School Health & Fitness Act -- Nurses	6,000,000	6,000,000				\$6,000,000
Tech Prep	3,021,348	3,021,348				\$3,021,348
Modernize Vocational Equipment *	7,260,261	13,798,983				\$13,798,983
New: Mobile Device Access & Management						
New: Student Connectivity Infrastructure						
Arts Curricula	1,487,571	1,487,571				\$1,487,571
Adult Education	15,073,736	15,073,736				\$15,073,736
Students at Risk of School Failure	79,551,723	79,551,723				\$79,551,723
High Schools That Work	2,146,499	2,146,499				\$2,146,499
Summer Reading Camps	1,500,000	1,500,000				\$1,500,000
Reading Coaches	4,961,278	9,922,556				\$9,922,556
EEDA	6,013,832	8,413,832				\$8,413,832
Subtotal	164,598,216	178,498,216				\$178,498,216
2. Student Testing						
Personal Service Classified Positions	488,518	488,518				\$488,518
New: Additional Positions		60,000				\$60,000
Other Operating Expenses	332,948	678,748				\$678,748
Assessment / Testing	27,261,400	27,261,400				\$27,261,400
Subtotal	28,082,866	28,488,666				\$28,488,666
3. Curriculum & Standards						
Personal Service Classified Positions	126,232	126,232				\$126,232
Other Personal Service	4,736	4,736				\$4,736
Other Operating Expenses	41,987	41,987				\$41,987
Reading	6,542,052	6,542,052				\$6,542,052
Instructional Materials	20,922,839	20,922,839				\$20,922,839
Subtotal	27,637,846	27,637,846				\$27,637,846
4. Assistance, Intervention, & Reward						
Personal Service Classified Positions	1,236,436	1,236,436				\$1,236,436
Other Operating Expenses	1,174,752	1,374,752				\$1,374,752
EAA Technical Assistance	8,800,000	12,801,301				\$11,301,301
PowerSchool/Data Collection	7,500,000	7,500,000				\$7,500,000
Subtotal	18,711,188	22,912,489				\$21,412,489
B. Early Childhood						
Personal Service Classified Positions	376,246	376,246				\$376,246
New: Additional Positions		455,000				\$455,000
Other Operating Expenses	556,592	556,592				\$556,592
Alloc EIA - 4 YR Early Child	15,513,846	15,513,846				\$15,513,846
SCDE-CDEPP	34,324,437	34,324,437				\$34,324,437

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 EOC Recommendations	2017-18 Governor's Executive Budget	Explanation and Notes	House Budget March 24
Subtotal	50,771,121	51,226,121				\$51,226,121
C. TEACHER QUALITY						
1. Certification						
Personal Service Classified Positions	1,068,102	1,068,102				\$1,068,102
Other Personal Service	1,579	1,579				\$1,579
Other Operating Expenses	638,999	638,999				\$638,999
Subtotal	1,708,680	1,708,680				\$1,708,680
2. Retention & Reward						
Special Items						
Teacher of the Year Award	155,000	155,000				\$155,000
Teacher Quality Commission	372,724	372,724				\$372,724
Teacher Salary Supplement	127,640,691	150,823,453				\$150,823,453
Allocation-EIA Employer Contributions	18,266,752	18,266,752				\$18,266,752
National Board Certification	54,000,000	54,000,000				\$54,000,000
Rural Teacher Recruiting Initiative	1,500,000	9,748,392				\$9,748,392
Teacher Supplies	13,596,000	14,346,000				\$14,346,000
Subtotal	215,531,167	247,712,321				\$247,712,321
3-4. Professional Development and ADEPT						
Special Items						
Professional Development	9,515,911	9,515,911				\$9,515,911
New: Additional Positions						\$65,000
New: Other Operating						
ADEPT (includes \$65000 for new position)	873,909	938,909				\$873,909
Subtotal	10,389,820	10,454,820				\$10,454,820
D. LEADERSHIP						
1. Schools						
2. State						
Personal Service Classified Positions	82,049	82,049				\$82,049
Other Personal Service	83,121	83,121				\$83,121
Other Operating Expenses	279,032	279,032				\$279,032
Technology	12,271,826	12,271,826				\$12,271,826
Employer Contributions	1,064,221	1,249,821				\$1,249,821
Subtotal	13,780,249	13,965,849				\$13,965,849
E. PARTNERSHIPS						
1. Business and Community						
2. Other Agencies & Entities						
State Agency Teacher Pay (F30)	73,861	73,861				\$73,861
Education Oversight Committee (A85)	1,793,242	1,793,242				\$1,793,242
Center for Educational Partnerships (H27)	715,933	715,933				\$715,933
SC Council on Economic Education	300,000	300,000				\$300,000
Science PLUS	563,406	563,406				\$563,406
Gov. School Arts & Humanities (H63)	959,994	1,192,439				\$1,192,439
Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School (H71)	605,294	605,294				\$605,294

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 EOC Recommendations	2017-18 Governor's Executive Budget	Explanation and Notes	House Budget March 24
School for Deaf & Blind (H75)	7,439,286	7,439,286				\$7,439,286
Disabilities & Special Needs (J16)	613,653	548,653				\$548,653
John De La Howe School (L12)	417,734	417,734				\$417,734
Clemson Ag Ed Teachers	889,758	989,758				\$989,758
Centers of Excellence-CHE (H03)	1,137,526	1,137,526				\$1,137,526
Teacher Recruitment Program-CHE (H03)	4,243,527	4,243,527				\$4,243,527
SC Program for the Recruitment and Retention of Minority Teachers, SC State University (Base: \$339,482)						
Center for Ed. Recruitment, Ret, and Adv	531,680	531,680				\$531,680
Teacher Loan Program-State Treasurer (E16)	5,089,881	5,089,881				\$5,089,881
Gov. School Science & Math (H63)	533,130	719,425				\$719,425
STEM Centers SC	1,750,000	1,750,000				\$1,750,000
Teach For America SC	3,000,000	3,000,000				\$3,000,000
ETV - K-12 Public Education	2,829,281	3,394,281				\$3,394,281
ETV - Infrastructure	2,000,000	2,000,000				\$2,000,000
SC Youth Challenge Academy	1,000,000	1,000,000				\$1,000,000
Literacy & Distance Learning	415,000	415,000				\$415,000
Regional Education Centers (P32)	1,302,000	1,802,000				\$1,802,000
Reach Out and Read (A85) **	1,000,000	1,000,000				\$1,000,000
Arts Education Programs (H910)	1,000,000	1,000,000				\$1,000,000
Family Connection		300,000				\$300,000
Subtotal	40,204,186	42,022,926				\$42,022,926
F. TRANSPORTATION/BUSES						
Other Operating	12,575,684	12,575,684				\$12,575,684
New: Allocation to Districts - Driver Salaries						
New: Hazardous Transportation Route						
Subtotal	12,575,684	12,575,684				\$12,575,684
G. Charter School District						
Charter School District	68,131,619	81,118,747				\$81,118,747
Charter Schools Chartered by Institutions of Higher Education	1,440,000					
Subtotal	69,571,619	81,118,747				
H. First Steps to School Readiness						
Personal Services	2,182,993	150,000				\$150,000
Classified Positions		1,911,453				\$1,911,453
Unclassified Positions		121,540				\$121,540
New: New Positions		268,432				\$268,432
Other Operating	1,872,789	1,906,225				\$1,906,225
County Partnerships	12,693,265	14,435,228				\$14,435,228
CDEPP	9,767,864	9,767,864				\$9,767,864
BabyNet Autism Therapy	1,699,848	3,686,408				\$5,186,408
Employer Contributions		1,015,485				\$1,015,485
Subtotal	28,216,759	33,262,635				\$34,762,635
EIA TOTAL	\$681,779,401	\$751,585,000	\$0	\$0		\$751,585,000

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 EOC Recommendations	2017-18 Governor's Executive Budget	Explanation and Notes	House Budget March 24
Non-Recurring Appropriations						
Proviso 1A.52						
EOC Partnerships for Innovation		\$3,100,000				\$2,800,000
Allendale County School District		\$150,000				\$150,000
Modernize Vocational Equipment		\$1,501,307				\$1,501,307
Industry Certification		\$3,000,000				\$3,000,000
Adult Education		\$1,000,000				\$1,500,000
PowerSchool/Data Collection		\$1,952,000				\$1,952,000
IT Academy		\$750,000				\$750,000
Digital Content Curation		\$393,443				\$493,443
Plaintiff District STEM Labs		\$3,000,000				
Subtotal:		\$14,846,750				\$12,146,750

#####

High School Task Force Report



**SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**



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

**High School Task Force Report
to the
South Carolina Education Oversight Committee
June 13, 2016**

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	3
Executive Summary	6
Findings	13
Recommendations	17
Next Steps	24
Conclusion	26
References	27
Appendix	
A. Meeting agendas	29

Resources made available and used by Task Force Members (available online at <http://www.eoc.sc.gov/Pages/HSTaskForce.aspx>):

- *Meandering Toward Graduation: Transcript Outcomes of High School Graduates.* Marni Bromberg and Christina Theokas. (April 5, 2016). Education Trust (edtrust.org)
- *Closing the Expectations Gap.* (February, 2014). Achieve (Achieve.org)
- Information from the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff regarding (a) the state and district results of the 2015 administration of ACT and WorkKeys assessments; and (b) data on the percentage of students who retain LIFE, Palmetto Fellows and HOPE lottery scholarships.
- *Increasing Student Access and Success in Dual Enrollment Programs: 13 Model State-Level Policy Components* (February, 2014). Education Commission of the States (ECS.org)
- *Using Assessments to Inform 12th-grade Interventions and Accelerations.* (March 2015). Education Commission of the States (ECS.org)
- *State Approaches to Funding Dual Enrollment by Education.* (May 2015). Education Commission of the States (ECS.org).
- *High School to College and Careers – Aligning State Policies* (2002, 2012 electronic version 2014). Southern Regional Education Board (SREB.org)

- *Credentials for All: An Imperative for SREB States.* (July 14, 2015). Southern Regional Education Board (SREB.org) – available online
- *The Unprepared Student and Community Colleges.* (2016). Center for Community College and Student Engagement. (CCSE.org)
- *South Carolina College and Career Readiness Toolkit.* (2016). Center of Excellence for College and Career, Francis Marion University, SC. (screadiness.org).

Introduction

The High School Task Force was chaired by Dr. Lee D'Andrea, a retired public school educator, who served most recently as district superintendent of Anderson 4, and included the following 17 individuals representing public education, higher education and business and industry:

Dr. Sean Alford, Superintendent, Aiken County School District

Ms. Cynthia Bennett, SC Chamber of Commerce

Dr. James Couch, Director of Center for Advanced Technical Studies, Lexington 5 and Member of the EOC

Dr. Johnny Hilton, SC School Boards Association

Dr. Darrell Johnson, Superintendent, Greenwood School District 50

Dr. John Lane, Director of Academic Affairs, SC Commission on Higher Education

Rep. Dwight Loftis, SC House of Representatives and Member of the EOC

Drs. Meredith Love and Matt Nelson, Center of Excellence for College and Career Readiness, Francis Marion University

Dr. Frank Morgan, Superintendent, Kershaw County School District

Dr. Darryl Owings, Superintendent, Spartanburg School District 6

Dr. George Petersen, Dean, Moore School of Education, Clemson University

Dr. Kelly Pew, Superintendent, York School District 3

Dr. Hope Rivers, SC Technical College System

Ms. Ann-Marie Stieritz, SC Council on Competitiveness

Dr. Helena Tillar, Superintendent, Marlboro County School District

Dr. Fran Welch, Dean, School of Education, Health, and Human Performance, College of Charleston

Dr. "Jimmie" C. Williamson, President and Executive Director, SC Technical College System

The Task Force met between December 9, 2015 and April 22, 2016 on five different occasions. Copies of the meeting agendas are in the Appendix.

The Task Force focused on the following questions:

1. What is the current high school experience?
2. How well is the current system preparing students for college and careers?
3. What are the current barriers or system roadblocks?

At its meetings, the Task Force discussed the following topics:

1. Career and Technical Education Course Offerings were presented by Dr. Bob Couch.
2. Dr. John Lane, Director of Academic Affairs at the SC Commission on Higher Education and Vice President of Academic Affairs at the SC Technical College System, Dr. Hope Rivers presented information on the state's current dual credit policies and remedial coursework.
3. Dr. John Hughes and Mr. Kevin Smith of the Regional Education Laboratory at Florida State University provided information on college readiness policies implemented in Florida and other states and research on the impact of those policies.
4. Mr. John Squires, of Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) provided information on measuring college readiness and on initiatives to prepare students for being college ready, including *Ready for College* courses in *Literacy Ready* and *Math Ready*. These senior-year courses were designed by SREB to assist underprepared students to have the foundation needed to pursue and succeed in postsecondary studies.

The Task Force members also received the following data and reports that informed the discussion and recommendations. These documents are included in the Appendix as well:

1. *Using Assessments to Inform 12th-grade Interventions and Accelerations* by Education Commission of the States

2. Information from the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff regarding (a) the state and district results of the 2015 administration of ACT and WorkKeys assessments; and (b) data on the percentage of students who retain LIFE, Palmetto Fellows and HOPE lottery scholarships.
3. *Increasing Student Access and Success in Dual Enrollment Programs: 13 Model State-Level Policy Components* by Education Commission of the States.
4. *State Approaches to Funding Dual Enrollment* by Education Commission of the States.
5. *High School to College and Careers – Aligning State Policies*, by Southern Regional Education Board.
6. *Credentials for All: An Imperative for SREB States* – Southern Regional Education Board.
7. *The Unprepared Student and Community Colleges* – Center for Community College and Student Engagement (CCSE).
8. College Foundation of NC website – <https://www.cfnc.org/index.jsp>

Executive Summary

Pursuant to action and directions at the October 2015 meeting of the Education Oversight Committee (EOC), the High School Task Force is hereby providing findings and recommendations following an examination and evaluation of the design of the high school experience in South Carolina. The investigation is based on the desired outcomes as articulated in the South Carolina Superintendents' Roundtable document, *South Carolina Profile of the Graduate*, described in the *South Carolina College and Career Ready Standards*, and espoused by the Education Oversight Committee, South Carolina Department of Education, South Carolina State Board of Education, Commission on Higher Education, South Carolina School Administrators Association, South Carolina Arts in Basic Steering Committee, South Carolina Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, South Carolina Chamber of Commerce, and TransformSC schools and districts, and *South Carolina Council on Competitiveness*. Since the investigation is based on established desired outcomes, multiple perspectives were analyzed for process understanding, efficacy and efficiency.

The need for the work of the Task Force is clearly demonstrated in data reviewed from both the state and national level.

- Between 2013 and 2030, 553,884 new jobs will be created in South Carolina. Fifty-two percent of the new jobs created will require higher education.
- Between 2013 and 2030, the percent of all jobs requiring higher education will increase from 61.5percent to 66.7 percent.
- From Fall 2013, percentage of freshman who retained scholarship in same institution in Fall of 2014:
 - 89.0 percent Palmetto Fellows Scholarship Recipients
 - 51.4 percent LIFE Scholarship Recipients
 - 24.6 percent HOPE Scholarship Recipients
- In 2014-2015, 11th graders in South Carolina taking The ACT, a college readiness exam, scored as follows:

Subject Test	ACT Benchmarks	SC Average Score	% Students in SC Meeting Benchmarks
English	18	16.5	38.7%
Math	22	18.1	21.6%
Reading	22	18.3	25.8%
Science	23	18.1	17.9%
Composite	Not Specified	17.9	Not Specified

- In 2014-2015, 11th graders in South Carolina taking ACT WorkKeys, scored as follows:

Level	Examinee has necessary foundations skills for:	Percentage Students in SC Earning
Platinum	99% of jobs	1%
Gold	93% of jobs	22%
Silver	67% of jobs	40%
Bronze	16% of jobs	25%
TOTAL:		88%

The current learning design is not working *systemically*. There are currently examples of high achievement and successful preparation for the South Carolina workforce; these examples are most often where there is strong and innovative leadership at the school and/or district level. In many of these schools/districts, the system requirements have been waived, challenged or circumvented to yield the results. The South Carolina learning design for college and career readiness is in critical need of *systemic renovation*.

The process of preparing students for careers in South Carolina is, in fact, a continuum of learning experiences with multiple possible exit points to college or career. Multiple entities in South Carolina, such as school districts, South Carolina Department of Education, South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, and the South Carolina Technical College System have a responsibility for the total process of college and career readiness. The design of the process, including rigorous and relevant learning experiences, aligned assessments and

smooth transitions for students and families exiting high school, is the critical first step in ensuring *systemic* opportunities for achievement and success. In this report, the process is identified as the **learning design for college and career readiness**; not simply high school design, in order to capture all the steps/phases experienced by students and families. (See graphic below.)

Learning Design for College and Career Readiness

Continuum of Education for Career Preparation	Careers with HS Diploma and Specialized Training or Certifications	Careers with HS Diploma and Specialized Training or Certifications	Careers Certifications or Associates Degree	Careers with Degrees from 4-year College/University
	HS Diploma (ready to enter workforce from here)	HS Diploma (ready to enter 2-4 college/university without need for remediation)	Technical College Certificate or Degree	College or University Degrees (Bachelors, Masters, Terminal)

The design of a new college and career readiness system must focus on the desired outcomes while including two additional parameters necessary for systemic success: (1) the system allows for flexibility and diversity at both the district level and the student navigation level, and (2) the system is broadly communicated and entrenched as the new landscape for college and career preparation and engagement.

The Task Force review included the following elements of the current high school design:

- Content/course work
- Assessments
- Transition to High School
- Communications
- Data

The Findings and Recommendations center on these elements. For the Executive Summary, descriptions and background information are as follows:

Content/course work

College and Career Ready Standards are the basic knowledge set required for the workforce of today. Whether the student exits the continuum of learning experiences after grade twelve or the sixteenth year, the body of knowledge necessary for jobs at the respective exit levels is demanding, rigorous, and most often integrated technologically. In multiple studies, the knowledge is both most engaging and enduring for the student when the content/knowledge is learned in real world applications, projects and/or relevant experiences.

The 24 units currently required for graduation are distributed as follows:

- English/Language Arts: 4 units
- U.S. History and Constitution: 1 unit
- Economics (1/2 unit) & US Government (1/2 unit): 1 unit
- Other Social Studies: 1 unit
- Math: 4 units
- Natural Science: 3 units
- Computer Science (includes keyboarding): 1 unit
- Physical Education or JROTC: 1 unit
- Electives: 7 units
- (Other)*1 unit

* For students in a college preparatory course of study, one additional unit must be earned in a foreign language (as defined by the SC Board of Education), or

* For students in a course of study designed to enter the workforce, one additional vocational unit must be earned (as defined by the SC Board of Education).

Currently, the courses identified to fulfill the core requirements for English/Language Arts, Math and Science do not include courses in Career and Technical Education.

Assessments

The learning design for college and career readiness relies heavily on assessments which accurately reflect the intended outcome – the College and Career Readiness of an individual student. The current learning design is focused on four groups: (1) careers immediately after high school, (2) two year colleges, (3) four year colleges, or the (4) military. Assessments for each group cannot be random and must give a student and/or the student's family an accurate indication of readiness or proficiencies. The assessments must be specifically aligned and carefully selected for the purpose of identifying a student's proficiency level as appropriate for the workforce, military, two-year college or four-year college.

The effectiveness of the learning system is also dependent on assessment alignment. Measuring something other than the intended outcome skews all future decisions in addition to wasting time and resources.

In addition to summative assessments that measure a student's preparedness for desired outcomes, high school experiences shall include formative assessments which are vertically calibrated to predict summative results. Random choices of assessments in a learning system provide no data on growth/progress and little meaningful data about the student and his/her college and career plan.

Transition from High School

By definition, a learning system has intentional, coherent and well-communicated transitions from one phase/step to the next phase/step. High school staff and students must clearly understand the respective expectations for two-year and four-year colleges, business and industry, and the military. Students and their families making decisions without clear understanding of transitions often eliminate choices, incur extra expense, miss deadlines, and may perhaps choose an inappropriate pathway. High school staff without clear information and understanding may provide limited choices, erroneous information and weaker guidance services. It is essential for high school, college, business/industry and military administrators and planners to develop a framework with defined, desired results, such as a seamless entry (without remediation) and content/course identifications for general admission and specific majors. Teachers, professors, human resource staff and other staff must operationalize the framework.

In the most effective learning systems, the transition offers multiple pathways to the student based on his/her desired graduation plan. High school credits, dual credit, articulated agreements, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate courses are examples. The success of these opportunities is rooted in systemic communication to students, parents, teachers, guidance counselors as well as college admissions and higher education advising. Further, the successful learning design system minimizes and/or eliminates barriers, such as access and costs.

Communications

There are many stakeholders and participants involved and engaged in a well-designed, effective learning system for college and career readiness. It is easy for each entity or group to operate in isolation with minimal communication. This closed environment makes navigation in the system from the student and family perspective difficult at best, and dysfunctional in many incidences. Students often drop out and often fail to reach their potential or find the most rigorous and rewarding careers. The state workforce and citizenry suffer this loss as well.

The ultimate success of the well-planned learning system for college and career readiness depends on the extent of implementation statewide. A critical element of the communications plan includes building understanding by sharing clear and accurate communication and creating demand from students and families by demonstrating the positive impact of a well-planned learning system for young people and their families.

Data

During the examination of the current high school design, data to answer questions was often not available. While databases exist for students enrolled in public schools, certified teachers in South Carolina, and students enrolled in public colleges and universities, these are most often silos of information and research on disaggregated or synthesized results are not available. A longitudinal data system from state 4K to four-year college is a necessary tool and is nonexistent in South Carolina. One member of the Task Force from a public South Carolina university reported the need for information to meet the standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The data is currently not available and reportedly the state is unwilling to collect and aggregate the data. This lack of data for decision

making and transparency serves no student, school district or institution of higher learning favorably in the long term, regardless of how difficult the current information is to see in print. In a systemic learning design for college and career readiness, collective and specific results as well as return on investment (ROI) are necessary for accountability, transparency and system corrections. Failure to use data tools is a wasteful use of taxpayers' funds and human resources.

Findings

A. The current South Carolina high school diploma requirements reflect 20th Century thinking and planning. Twenty four Carnegie units across math, science, social studies, English and elective courses may or may not prepare the student for college and/or career. The options available to students vary greatly across the state. The 120 hours of seat time limit the delivery of instruction and engagement time for the student. The academic and career-specific courses are not fully integrated to allow students to earn core course requirements or encourage rigorous career preparation. This fact, combined with the current Uniform Grading Policy, discourages the pursuit of career courses for many students. South Carolina is one of only a few states that require twenty four units for graduation; this is the maximum number required in any state. The design of the current system does not ensure the best opportunity for desired results. In fact, the unintended consequences of parts of the current system *negatively* impact the desired results. To protect scholarship opportunities, students often avoid rigorous course choices in the senior year. Many students do not take a math course in the senior year as a result of earning high school credit in middle school. Nearly all of the high schools in South Carolina, schedule a seven or eight period day (and often a hybrid of the two). These schedules provide every student with 28-32 course opportunities. This part of the design is neither the most effective in terms of student preparedness nor efficient in terms of funding.

The Education and Economic Development Act of 2005 (EEDA) clearly outlines a plan for students to explore and engage in career readiness. There are examples of excellence in implementation, and yet, there remains a lack of systemic integration in the majority of the state. The fact that most of the students have an Individual Graduation Plan (IGP) does *not* signify understanding of the workforce preparedness landscape and opportunities. Career and Technical Education (CATE) courses are systemic to the core choices for fulfilling high school requirements for a diploma. CATE courses are often seen as add-ons, in schools or centers where the choices are more systemic and where local leadership has facilitated this environment.

B. The current assessments in South Carolina do not provide an aligned metric of learning progress of a student. The student, or the student's parents, can not document his/her

progress on the current sequence of state assessments. Transitions, to two- and four-year colleges or to the workplace lack alignment and well-defined goals. In some incidences, a career major has a national exam; however, this is the exception. State achievement tests for other career completer courses are not necessarily aligned to business and industry standards, not connected to a student's grade in a course, and sometimes not even reported. Students and families describe an ambiguity in understanding the goals/meanings of the assessments and their uses.

Of significant concern linked to this finding is accountability. Students, teachers, schools and districts can not be held accountable for growth and development of learning content and skills, when the continuum of assessment is random and not vertically aligned.

At the time of this report, a high school assessment to measure college readiness has not been approved. However, in order to determine if students are college ready, an assessment must be in place for 11th grade high school students. One Task Force member reported, in his district, 9th grade students are taking an assessment for college preparedness; this provides students and parents with meaningful assistance in planning the next steps in the Individual Graduation Plan (IGP).

WorkKeys, a nationally recognized career readiness assessment, is in statue for use with high school students. This assessment provides students and employers with information about a student's career readiness that is meaningful and recognized across disciplines and fields of works. Currently, this assessment is the one given in South Carolina most aligned with career readiness and providing meaningful feedback to students, districts and business/industry.

- C. The work on seamless transitions from high school to higher education has slowed significantly in the immediate past. In its report, *Sixth Annual Report on the Implementation of the Education and Economic Development Act of 2005*, the Education and Economic Development Coordinating Council, "included in this report recommendations to the SCDE that we believe are critical to the future sustainability of this all-important legislation." Later, the implementation of Regional Education Councils (REC) was moved to the South Carolina Department of Commerce. The implementation of EEDA remained at the SC Department of Education. The Task Force finds that implementation, understanding and coordination of all parts of the EEDA has diminished

without the Coordinating Council (sunset in June 2012). Superintendents on the Task Force and representatives from higher education reported gaps in knowledge and practice across the state.

Task Force superintendents reported inconsistent practices among technical schools regarding tuition (waivers, lottery use and location requirements for dual credit). For example, it may be helpful for admissions officers/counselors to meet on a regular basis with guidance services in K-12 was a suggestion made to increase communication.

- D. A significant void in communication regarding college and career readiness and the South Carolina workforce needs/demands exists at many levels. There are several outstanding examples creating awareness and the need for college and career readiness as well as workforce demands in South Carolina. The South Carolina Council on Competitiveness, TransformSC, some Regional Education Advisory Boards, Ready SC and Apprenticeship Carolina (both parts of the South Carolina Technical College System) have very positive communication plans and initiatives in place. However, School District Superintendents report this information is not systemically reaching teachers, guidance counselors and, most importantly, students and families. This failure in the system may explain some of the information collected from human resources and the South Carolina Chamber regarding lack of enough workers in high demand jobs in South Carolina.

The South Carolina workforce has changed significantly over the last two generations: from agriculture and textiles to manufacturing and industry. Many parents and grandparents do not have this information and are therefore, are unlikely to encourage their students in one of these directions, or even to discuss the workforce landscape. The paradigm shift in the South Carolina workforce is evident in economic development, the Governor's Office and even education institutions. To have the needed workforce and fulfill the demands, the paradigm shift must also happen at the grassroots level among families, students, teachers and guidance counselors. Currently, no statewide entity or plan exists to coordinate communication and ensure the engagement of students and families.

- E. A significant lack of available data is evident when simple questions and requests are made regarding progress, correlations, disaggregated situations. Funding was appropriated and some work done in the area of building information databases;

however, implementation and follow-up are not evident. The frustration with this element appears across Pre-K – 12 and higher education. The sharing of databases takes place on a limited basis at the commission on Higher Education. Given the capacities of databases, the teacher certification, higher education and pre-K – 12 databases are stocked with information that is not being analyzed or synthesized for decision making. One such example is the request to disaggregate by high school the percent of students retaining HOPE scholarships after the first year of college. The data exists for all students but is not disaggregated by high school; yet each high school has a unique BEDS code and each student a unique number identifier. When funds are limited as they are and should be at the government level, making accurate, timely assumptions and, hence, decisions, depend on data quality and access.

It must be clear that this information is not to track individual students or teachers. Appropriated funds for programs, initiatives, schools, colleges, or other entities should show return on the taxpayers' investment. Collective data is necessary for these kinds of decisions.

There simply is no one place in South Carolina for the data to reside or coordinate the information and make it available to the legislature, higher education or even PK4 - grade 12.

Recommendations

- A. ***The content/coursework requirements for a high school diploma must be updated to reflect the needs of workforce readiness in the current environment.*** This must include Career and Technical Education (CATE) courses as options for core requirements. South Carolina high school requirements must reflect the need for skills beyond the acquisition of knowledge; through apprenticeships, extensive projects, work experiences, or internships students must demonstrate the application of knowledge. A thorough study of the list of course options must take place and should include courses such as the SREB Literacy Readiness and SREB Math Ready options. In addition to the wider range and more relevant courses, research-based and demonstrated delivery methods should be identified; every district should have some options for students. One Task Force member reported success with STEM Premier. Other Task Force members shared examples of project-based learning, senior projects, cross curricular courses as well as online and distance learning. All of the examples shared included extensive professional development for teachers and staff. This is an integral part of implementation and student success.

The rubric will outline multiple possible combinations, all of which maintain academic rigor based on the South Carolina College and Career Ready Standards. The possibilities include online courses, proficiency exams, and distance learning courses as well as traditional high school courses and/or Career and Technical Education (CATE) courses.

The discussion to change the number of units required for the diploma must be addressed as the evidence from SREB, REL and other studies indicates, the paths of study, course offerings and learning experiences are the essential determinants in successful preparation for college and/or career. Additionally, once the content/course work/experiences in the learning design for college and career readiness is framed, then weightings can be assigned.

Below is a sample rubric on courses and experiences which prepare students for multiple options beyond high school. The rubric also demonstrates flexibility or students while maintaining rigor. The next steps help to determine the preparations for entering the next step, i.e. business human resource leaders, college admissions and faculty, etc.

Sample Learning Design High School Requirements					
Content/ Course Work	Step After High School				
		Workforce	2 Year College	4 Year College	Military
	English (4)	Req. one of the following courses: technical writing, public speaking, meetings and presentations	Req. one of the following courses: technical writing, public speaking, meetings and presentations	Current requirements and senior year course required	Req. one of the following courses: technical writing, public speaking, meetings and presentations
	Math (4)	Req. one of the following courses: personal finance or a CATE completer with math focus, i.e. accounting	Req. one of the following courses: personal finance, SREB math ready or a CATE completer with math focus, i.e. accounting	Current requirements and senior year course required	Req. one of the following courses: personal finance or a CATE completer with math focus, i.e. accounting
	Science (3)	Current requirements and senior year recommended	Current requirements and senior year recommended	Current requirements and senior year recommended	Current requirements and senior year recommended
	Technology (1)	Career Completer course level 3 or 4 in identified pathways or general programming course or general media course			
	PE (1)	Course options: traditional PE, nutrition/wellness, DNR course, ROTC, exercise, weightlifting, dance			
	Social Studies (3)	US History & Constitution, Government/Economics, one option from some CATE courses, current courses, courses in conflict resolution and team building			
	Electives (6)	One elective may be exempted with Gold Score on WorkKeys	One elective may be exempted with ACT score of ?	One elective may be exempted with SAT score of ?	One elective may be exempted with ASVAB score of ?
Total 22 units					
Career Readiness	Plus 2 of the choices (on the transcript but not calculated for state scholarship purposes)	Apprenticeship, Approved Work Experience, Approved Independent Study, Senior Project, AP or Dual credit course (these are beyond the AP and dual credit courses taken to meet the requirements above; the student must pass course to meet this requirement but not calculated in state scholarship determination)			
Assessment Scores	Bronze/Silver WorkKeys and Career Completer proficiency exam	Silver WorkKeys and Readiness Exam to 2-year college	Gold Work Keys and ACT/SAT score of ??	Bronze/Silver WorkKeys and ASVAB exam	

In the design of a learning system, the desired results are weighted more heavily. Generally, this higher weighting is designated to the most rigorous courses and capstone courses in career majors and courses which bridge transitions such as dual credit. Following the decisions for requirements to graduate, the Uniform Grading Policy (UGP) must be revised. The highest weighted courses must be assigned to the most rigorous courses in all pathways and used as incentives for students and families in the pursuit of scholarships at both the two- and four-year colleges. Careful consideration must be given to creating a new rubric which offers flexibility and accessibility for students in earning the South Carolina diploma.

The SREB document, *High School to College and Careers, Aligning State Policies: A Useful Policy Tool*, is an excellent source of sample rubrics in the other SREB states. The website described in the document provides an interactive comparison of South Carolina and other states in areas such as content/courses required, academic/course assessments mandated and career readiness assessment. (The document is included in the appendix). During the Task Force meetings, rubrics from Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky and North Carolina were discussed. Of note, these states are all competitors of South Carolina when economic development options are being pursued. The following questions are outlined as guiding tools in the development of policy and practice:

- Are state policies on high school standards, assessments and college readiness in my state aligned and do they promote smooth transitions from secondary to postsecondary education?
- Do the high school standards, courses and assessments in my state prepare students for success in college courses when they enroll as freshmen?
- Are high school assessment results in my state used to make postsecondary placement decisions in state college and universities?
- Do state policies encourage high school students in my state to use the senior year productively, or do these policies allow many seniors to waste the last year of high school?
- Does my state recognize more than one path to graduation, including an option for students who plan to pursue careers after high school?
- How does my state compare in the way it provides financial aid to students?

This recommendation is an extensive undertaking that must be accomplished in collaboration and concert because time is of the essence; students' lives and the preparation of the South Carolina workforce is at stake.

B. *A coherent continuum of assessments must be established. The assessments must reliably measure content/knowledge as well as college and career readiness.* Colleges and business and industry must be a part of the choices of assessments in order to accurately predict readiness. South Carolina has used self-made tests as exit exams (BSAP and HSAP) with little evidence that either of these indicated a readiness for college and/or career. In fact, in recent legislation, students who did not pass the test are now eligible for a South Carolina High School Diploma. The next high school assessment chosen to evaluate a student's high school content proficiency should be reliable, valid, rigorous and of merit in other states. The WorkKeys assessment provides employers nationally information about the student's work readiness. In addition, a "soft skills" assessment should be included in the high school experience. One Task Force member reports a few districts are implementing this at the local level. These three assessments, if chosen correctly, will provide students, families, colleges and employers an accurate picture of the student's preparedness in the college and career readiness. When baseline scores are decided, flexibility, without loss of rigor, must be available to students. In its recent report, the National Governors Association, *Creating a College and Career Readiness Model for High Schools*, three principles serve as the base of a system that is reasonable and accountable:

- 1. Use multiple measures to determine school and district performance.*
- 2. Provide incentives for preparing the hardest-to-serve students for college and careers.*
- 3. Set realistic targets for accountability measures.*

A rubric with variable combinations of the three assessments allows for differentiated strengths while also establishing baseline college and career readiness. Once the assessments are decided, this rubric should be established with colleges and business and industry defining the minimum baselines. The continuum of assessments must be clearly communicated to students and parents. Extensive professional development must be provided to teachers and guidance counselors on expectations, content and use of the results.

C. ***A Coordinating Council or P-20 Council should be re-established and directed to fully implement the Education and Economic Development Act.*** Legislation with wholesale systemic change and multiple transitions takes long periods of time to fully implement. One body must be responsible for the coordination of transitions to ensure seamlessness, effectiveness and efficiency. The Task Force frequently noted that the comprehensiveness of its composition was unique; in fact, this should be the norm as it represents the students' and families' perspective of a learning system for college and career readiness.

D. ***An extensive communication initiative should be developed and implemented.***

The degree of success of the previous three (3) recommendations depends on this recommendation. Too often, in the findings, information was reported for one part of the state or one district. This is not to disallow local and regional collaborations, but rather to enhance these successes through communication. The changes in the South Carolina workforce landscape and its needed skills and demands must be communicated to all of South Carolina citizens, especially parents and families of students. The reasons for the changes observed in the recommendations regarding **Content/coursework requirements** and a **Coherent Continuum of Assessments** must be not only understood but expected and even demanded by parents.

The communication plan must employ multiple strategies to ensure effectiveness, including but not limited to social media, web links for all districts and schools, and traditional media (television, billboards and newspapers). The state should develop the plan and provide umbrella structure. One example of a tool that would help parents and students in providing information for high school planning, college planning and career planning is the following website operated by the College Foundation of North Carolina – www.CFNC.org

The state should provide multiple resources to use as most appropriate to the local demographics. These ideas and resources do not have to be costly. One Task Force member reported implementing an inexpensive, yet visible display of the equal importance of graduating career ready, the school district is recognizing high school seniors who earn a Bronze, Silver, Gold or Platinum WorkKeys certificate with graduation cords.

Another aspect of a communication is the creation of meaningful professional development for teachers and administrators. As the model changes radically, a new and systemic understanding by educators must be incorporated into implementation. Higher education and the South Carolina Department of Education must work in concert to create and provide multiple pathways to building this knowledge and understanding. In addition, a review of current teacher certification requirements must closely align content and real world work. For districts to provide multiple pathways to college and career readiness, districts must have multiple options to staff and/or deliver the learning experiences.

- E. **A comprehensive design for data must be established.** The plan should include the collection and reporting (manipulation) of information necessary for policy makers and practitioners in K-12 and higher education to make prudent decisions *without comprising individual student privacy*. The systemic review of taxpayer investments is essential to creating the most effective and efficient learning design for college and career readiness. Other states have implemented such data systems. For example, the state of Washington has created a robust longitudinal data system that links from year to year and allows educators, decision-makers, students and parents to understand education and workforce outcomes for students in a school, district or program. “ERDC works to protect student privacy while providing data and information to promote a seamless, coordinated preschool-to-career experience for all learners.”

In a review of adequate data and needed information, funds may be redirected for more effective use or a more efficient design.

Recommended Next Steps and Suggested Timelines

Three of the Recommendations should be addressed in concert:

- A. The content/coursework requirements for a high school diploma must be updated to reflect the needs of workforce readiness in the current environment.
- B. A coherent continuum of assessments must be established. The assessments must reliably measure content/knowledge as well as college and career readiness.
- C. A Coordinating Council or P-20 Council should be re-established and directed to fully implement the Education and Economic Development Act.
 - 1. Convene the Coordinating Council or P-20 Council to make recommendations for updating/revising or fully implementing the EEDA. Include in the recommendations an evaluation of the various components, i.e. regional centers. (Due December 2016; statute changes in 2017)
 - 2. Convene across function team/task force (including state and district decision makers in K-12, 2 and 4 year colleges, as well as business/industry) to determine the course work/content rubric with multiple pathways to high school graduation. Include changes in statute needed. (Due December 2016; the new rubric plan to be implemented with incoming 9th graders in 2017-2018 - first graduates in 2021; some changes for existing high school students could be offered/encouraged to change/explore through scholarship opportunities and/or dual credit paid tuition)
 - 3. Delegate to the state entities responsible for steps in the Learning Design the task of establishing a continuum of assessments that provide growth information and summative results for students, families and state/district decision makers. (Continuum of assessments due December 2016; implementation school year 2017-2018)
- D. An extensive communication initiative should be developed and implemented.
 - 1. Delegate to appropriate state entity/group for design and implementation of the plan. (Begin January 2017 and ongoing) Option for development of the graphics, writings, etc. could be to offer a competition between South Carolina public colleges and university departments or teams of student.

Host a charrette and provide all finalists and overall winner scholarships or the department some funds.

2. Develop one-stop resource for students and families to use in planning for college and career after high school graduation. This electronic resource would include information from South Carolina public and private colleges and universities, SC Ready, Economic Development, and SC Department of Commerce.

E. A comprehensive design for data must be established.

1. The South Carolina Department of Education and Commission on Higher Education must convene a committee/task force to identify needed data for decision making by educators, legislators, accreditation bodies, and significant grantors. Standard reports identified as well as a process of securing other information.
2. A database system should be chosen to house the data. A data quality manual should be developed and provided to everyone entering the data. Extensive communication and professional development must be provided to ensure data quality.

Conclusion

The work of the Task Force initially sounded simple: examine the high school experience and make recommendations for change, give attention to funding and college and career readiness. The results of the work **strongly** indicate, as one superintendent on the Task Force said, “we need a revolution in the high school experience!” At the same time, the Task Force members agreed, the meetings *were revolutionary* in that all entities on the continuum of the learning design were included and at the table.

The **Findings** are concerning because South Carolina is behind other states in the establishment of a college and career ready system. The data to make decisions is not available. The needed assessments are not aligned. Millions of dollars have been spent in these areas with negligible return on the investments. The opportunities are here and many of the resources. The challenge is to design the system with purposeful intention and implement the system with relentless passion. Edward Deming wrote, “A bad system will beat a good person every time.”

The five **Recommendations** should be considered in collaboration as each has dependency on the other; without one in the design, success is doubtful. Many resource articles and models currently exist; this wealth of information should be used to design the new **Learning Design for College and Career Readiness in South Carolina**. The members of the Task Force are grateful for the opportunity to invest in South Carolina’s future.

References

- Annual Report (6th) on the Implementation of the Education and Economic Development Act of 2005 (EEDA)*. Issued by Education and Economic Development Coordinating Council to the Governor of South Carolina, the General Assembly and the State Board of Education. December 1, 2011.
- Bromberg, M. and Theokas, C. *Meandering Toward Graduation: Transcript Outcomes of High School Graduates*. (April 5, 2016). Education Trust (edtrust.org)
- Closing the Expectations Gap*. (February, 2014). Achieve (Achieve.org)
- College Foundation of North Carolina. www.cfnc.org
- Credentials for All: An Imperative for SREB States*. (July 14, 2015). Southern Regional Education Board (SREB.org)
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Performance Counts: Assessment Systems that Support High-Quality Learning*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Edutopia. (2015) *Multiple Intelligences: What Does the Research Say?* Retrieved from www.Edutopia.org
- Hattie, John and Yates, Gregory C.R. (2014). *Visible Learning and the Science of How We Learn*. NY: Routledge.
- Hattie, John (2008). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. NY: Routledge.
- High School to College and Careers – Aligning State Policies* (2002, 2012 electronic version 2014). Southern Regional Education Board (SREB.org)
- Information from the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff regarding (a) the state and district results of the 2015 administration of ACT and WorkKeys assessments; and (b) data on the percentage of students who retain LIFE, Palmetto Fellows and HOPE lottery scholarships.
- Postal, Leslie. *More U.S. 12th graders struggle with basic math, reading, tests show*. (May 9, 2016). FL: *Orlando Sentinel*.
- STEM Premier. www.stempremier.org
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- The Unprepared Student and Community Colleges*. (2016). Center for Community College and Student Engagement. (CCSE.org)

Zinth, Jennifer. *Increasing Student Access and Success in Dual Enrollment Programs: 13 Model State-Level Policy Components* (February, 2014). Education Commission of the States (ECS.org)

Zinth, J. & Millard, M. *Using Assessments to Inform 12th-grade Interventions and Accelerations*. (March 2015). Education Commission of the States (ECS.org)

Zinth, Jennifer. *State Approaches to Funding Dual Enrollment by Education*. (May 2015). Education Commission of the States (ECS.org).

Appendix A

High School Task Force Meeting Agendas

High School Task Force Meeting

Agenda

Wednesday, December 9, 2015

10:00 a.m.

305 Blatt Building

I.	Welcome and Introductions	Lee D'Andrea
II.	Outline Purpose and Work of the Task Force	Melanie Barton
III.	Share Draft Format for Report to EOC	Lee D'Andrea
IV.	Discuss Reasons/Needs for the Work (College and Career Readiness data)	Lee D'Andrea
V.	Create a List of Current Barriers/Issues	Lee D'Andrea
VI.	Identify Additional Needed Information	Lee D'Andrea
VII.	Identify Any Additional Resources (in-state or out-of-state)	Lee D'Andrea
VIII.	Finalize Meeting Schedule for January-April/May	Lee D'Andrea

Questions to Answer

- What is the current preparation system? How do we know it is not working?
- What results will insure we have a prepared workforce and a system that has choices for students and families? What are the current barriers or system roadblocks?
- Where are there redundancies or gaps? Where are the opportunities?

High School Task Force Meeting

Agenda

Friday, February 12, 2016

9:30 a.m.

305 Blatt Building

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Review Purpose, Discuss Updated Continuum of Learning and Career Preparation
- III. Review Barriers Discussed and Outline Workgroup Process
- IV. Update on Uniform Grading Policy Work at SDE – Lee D’Andrea
- V. Update on Career and Technical Course Sequences - Dr. Bob Couch
- VI. Update on Dual Credit Opportunities and Process - Dr. Jimmie Williamson
- VII. Establish Workgroups and Plans for Next Meeting
- VII. Discussion and identification of data needed

High School Task Force Meeting

Agenda

Thursday, February 25, 2016

1:00 p.m.

305 Blatt Building

- I. Welcome and Summary of prior meeting Dr. Lee D'Andrea
- II. Measuring College Readiness Dr. John Hughes
(1:15 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.) Deputy Director
Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) - Southeast
Florida State University
- Kevin Smith
Research Alliance Manager
Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) - Southeast
Florida State University
- Break (3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.)
- III. Credentials for All: An Imperative for SREB States Dr. Gene Bottoms
(3:15 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.) Senior Vice President
Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)

High School Task Force Meeting

Agenda

Friday, March 11, 2016

10:00 a.m.

305 Blatt Building

- I. Welcome and Review of Past Meeting Dr. Lee D'Andrea

- II. Presentation from the Commission on Higher Education Dr. John Lane
Director of Academic Affairs
SC Commission on Higher Education

- III. Presentation from Technical Schools Dr. Hope Rivers
Executive Vice President
State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education

- IV. Small Group Work (barriers, recommendations, findings, data)

- V. Determine Next Meeting Date

- VI. Adjourn

High School Task Force Meeting

Agenda

**Friday, April 22, 2016
10:00 a.m.**

**The Center for Advanced Technical Studies
916 Mount Vernon Church Road
Chapin, SC 29036**

- | | | |
|------|--|------------------|
| I. | Welcome and Overview of Draft High School Report | Dr. Lee D'Andrea |
| II. | Small Group Work Session I | |
| III. | Small Group Work Session II | |
| IV. | Small Group Work Session III | |
| V. | Consensus Discussion on Content of Report | Dr. Lee D'Andrea |
| VI. | Adjourn and lunch | |

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 at 803.734.6148.

School of Fine Arts and Humanities	School of Business Management and Information Systems	School of Engineering, Manufacturing, and Industrial Technology	School of Health Science, Human and Public Services
<p>Arts, Audio-Video Technology and Communication Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital Art & Design (The Center) Interdisciplinary Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP IB (IHS) Journalism Liberal Arts Media Technology & Visual Arts (The Center, DFHS) Performing Arts Visual Arts & Design World Language <p>Education and Training Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early Childhood Education (DFHS, IHS) Teacher Training 	<p>Business Management and Administration Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business Information Management General Management Leadership (SHHS) Operations Management (DFHS, SHHS) <p>Finance Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting Business Finance (SHHS) <p>Hospitality and Tourism Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Culinary Arts & Technology (The Center) Hospitality Management & Operations (SHHS) <p>Information Technology Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cyber Security Technology (The Center) Programming & Software Development Web & Digital Communications <p>Marketing, Sales, and Service Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketing Management 	<p>Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agriculture & Biosystems Engineering Technology (The Center) Environmental & Natural Resource Management (The Center) Veterinary Science & Technology (The Center) <p>Architecture and Construction Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Architecture Building Construction Design & Integrated Technology (The Center) Electrical Design & Integrated Systems (The Center) <p>Manufacturing Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Machine Tool Technology & Engineering Design (The Center) Mechatronics Systems Technology (The Center) Welding Technology (The Center) <p>Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aerospace Engineering (The Center) Alternative Energy & Engineering Systems (The Center) Engineering & Engineering Technology Life Science Mathematics Physical Science <p>Transportation, Distribution and Logistics Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automotive Collision Technology & Design (IHS) Automotive Service & Maintenance (The Center) 	<p>Government and Public Administration Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Military Science <p>Health Science Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biomedical Sciences & Nanotechnology (The Center) Health Diagnosis and Treatment Medical Science and Research Physical Education Sports Medicine <p>Human Service Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cosmetology (IHS) Counseling, Mental Health, and Social Services Family & Consumer Sciences -- Nutrition (IHS) <p>Law, Public Safety, and Security Cluster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency & Fire Management Services (The Center) Law and Legal Services Law Enforcement (The Center)