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, October 22, 2012
10:00 AM, Room 433, Blatt Building

I.	Welcome and Introductions	Dennis Drew
II.	Approval of the May 21, 2012 Meeting Minutes	Dennis Drew
III.	Information: Presentations from EIA-Funded Programs and Entities To Prepare for FY2013-14 EIA and Public Education Funding Recommendations to Full EOC	

<u>EIA & Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee Members:</u>
Mr. Dennis Drew, Chair
Mr. Alex Martin, Vice Chair
Rep. Joseph Neal
Mrs. Evelyn Perry
Rep. J. Roland Smith
Mr. John Warner
Mr. David Whittemore

Neil C. Robinson, Jr.
CHAIR
Barbara B. Hairfield
VICE CHAIR
J. Phillip Bowers
Dennis Drew
Mike Fair
Nikki Haley
R. Wesley Hayes, Jr.
Alex Martin
Daniel B. Merck
Joseph H. Neal
Andrew S. Patrick
Evelyn R. Perry
J. Roland Smith
Ann Marie Taylor
John Warner
David Whittemore
Mick Zais

Melanie D. Barton
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Subcommittee on Academic Standards and Assessments

Minutes of the Meeting
May 21, 2012
10:00 AM, Room 201 Blatt Building

Subcommittee Members Present:	Dr. Danny Merck (chair), Sen. Fair, and Sen. Hayes
EOC Staff Present:	Kevin Andrews, Ms. Melanie Barton and Hope Johnson-Jones
SCDE Staff Present:	Mr. J.W. Ragley and Ms. Charmeka Bosket

Welcome and Introductions
Dr. Merck welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

Recommendations for Changes to the Science Standards
Ms. Barton reminded the Subcommittee that pursuant to Section 59-18-350(A) of the EAA, the EOC and the State Board of Education are responsible for reviewing South Carolina's standards and assessments to ensure that high expectations for teacher and learning are maintained. In keeping with the statute and the *Procedures for the Cyclical Review of Current South Carolina K-12 Academic Standards and for the Development of New Academic Standards,* the first stage has been completed. This stage includes the review of the content standards, coordinated by the EOC for three groups and by the SCDE for in-state educators. In December and January the EOC staff enlisted the names of individuals to serve on three panels: (1) a national expert team; (2) a business and community team composed of parents, business and community leaders; and (3) teachers of students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency.

Ms. Barton then recognized Kay Gossett who summarized the recommendations of each panel and overall recommendations common to all three panels. Ms. Gossett began by documenting that South Carolina's science standards have been nationally recognized. The Fordham Foundation recently reviewed all states' science standards gave South Carolina an A-. Ms. Gossett then referred the subcommittee to the most recent PASS science scores. Between 28.3 and 39.2 percent of students in grades 3 through 8 scored "Not Met" on PASS science in 2011. The three panels also recognized that student achievement in science and technology are not at levels needed to prepare students for careers and college. Therefore, the panels focused their recommendations on how the existing science standards, which have good content, can be amended to improve the teaching and learning of science and to reflect the most recent research in how students learn. The overall goal of the recommendations of the panelists was to decrease the scale of standards and indicators and allow depth of content to be the focus, not the breadth. Standards using "recall, summarize, know, etc…. should be removed and combine these ideas to formulate higher level standards.

Sen. Fair asked why the state was initiating a review of the science standards, given the Fordham Foundation's high marks for our science standards. Staff responded that the seven-year cyclical review of standards as required by law is the impetus for the review. Sen. Fair also asked for clarification from the South Carolina Department of Education if the recommendations of the panels will allow the agency to proceed forward with its review and revision of the standards. Ms. Charmeka Bosket, Deputy Superintendent of Policy and Research at the South

Carolina Department of Education, responded that the review will assist the agency as it begins writing the new South Carolina science standards. With all members reserving their rights, the subcommittee voted unanimously to recommend that the full EOC approve the report, which will then be formally provided to the South Carolina State Board of Education and the South Carolina Department of Education.

Innovation Initiative

Dr. Gerrita Postlewait updated the Subcommittee on the background, goal and strategy of the South Carolina Education Innovation Initiative. Dr. Postlewait described the formation of a Steering Committee, the development of a broad-based group of stakeholders to support the initiative, and the results of a May symposium on innovation. To date, two distinct objectives of the initiative exist: (1) creation of an Innovation Network; and (2) implementation of an Education Incubator. The Innovation Network would comprise several schools and districts in the state that develop, implement, evaluate and share innovative practices and policies. The Education Incubator would comprise three to five schools focusing on career, college and civic readiness by changing the existing K-12 delivery model, including changes to assessment, learning, and accountability approaches, requiring quick correction cycles and scaling success. Dr. Postlewait noted that non-traditional K-12 innovation initiatives will also present to the EOC at its June meeting. The EOC will likely have a role in implementing the Incubator pursuant to a proviso in the 2012-13 General Appropriation Bill.

Palmetto Gold and Silver Criteria

Ms. Barton summarized the data and information provided to the subcommittee members on various models for amending the Palmetto Gold and Silver Criteria. Due to the late hour she recommended that the subcommittee defer any action on the criteria until its next meeting.

Longitudinal Analysis of Three Years of PASS

Dr. Andrews provided a summary of important issues revealed in studying three years of PASS data. Six student cohorts were studied, with each cohort defined by their grade in the first year of PASS testing (grades 3 through 6). The rate at which students were retained was consistent across grades and relatively low (from 0.5 to 1.3 percent of students). Students retained scored higher on PASS for the second year at the same grade level, but retained students did not score higher at the next grade level as compared to students who had similar initial PASS scores but were not retained. Based on the data analyzed, retention did not appear to be an effective strategy.

Overall patterns of student achievement as measured by the percentage of students scoring Met or Exemplary were presented for Mathematics and Reading. Differences were not found by gender for Mathematics; however, differences were present for Reading. Large differences were found among students by the student's lunch status. Full-pay students scored highest, followed by students receiving reduced lunch rates, with students receiving free lunch scoring lowest. Analyses also showed this same pattern was present when considering the gains students make from one year to another. These patterns were consistent across cohorts and subject areas.

There being no further business, the Subcommittee adjourned.