

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Monday, October 14, 2013
1:00 p.m.
433 Blatt Building

- | | | | |
|------|---|----------------|--|
| I. | Welcome and Introductions | Mr. Robinson | |
| II. | Approval of the Minutes of:
August 8 and 9, 2013
September 9, 2013
September 16, 2013 | Mr. Robinson | |
| III. | Key Constituency:

Transform SC
Pamela Lackey, President AT&T South Carolina
Mike Brenan, President BB&T South Carolina | | Neil C. Robinson, Jr.
CHAIR |
| IV. | Subcommittee Reports | | Barbara B. Hairfield
VICE CHAIR |
| A. | Academic Standards and Assessments
Information: Third Grade Reading and Graduation Rates
Discussion: Cyclical Review of Accountability System | Dr. Merck | Phillip Bowers
Dennis Drew
Mike Fair |
| B. | EIA and Improvement Mechanisms
Information: FY2014-15 Budget Update | Mr. Drew | Nikki Haley
R. Wesley Hayes, Jr.
Alex Martin |
| C. | Public Awareness Subcommittee | Mrs. Hairfield | John W. Matthews, Jr. |
| D. | Special Reading Subcommittee | Mrs. Hairfield | Daniel B. Merck
Joseph H. Neal |
| V. | 2013-14 EOC Goals and Objectives | Mr. Robinson | Andrew S. Patrick
Evelyn R. Perry |
| VI. | New Business | Mr. Robinson | J. Roland Smith
John Warner |
| VII. | Adjournment | Mr. Robinson | David Whittemore
Mick Zais |

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting

August 8, 2013
Clemson at the Falls
Greenville, South Carolina

Members Present: Mr. Robinson; Mr. Bowers; Mr. Drew; Sen. Fair; Sen. Hayes; Ms. Hairfield; Sen. Matthews; Dr. Merck; Rep. Patrick; Mr. Whittemore; Mr. Martin, and Mr. Warner

Guests Present: Mr. Jay W. Ragley, South Carolina Department of Education; Sarah Collins, EPIC; Dr. Joseph R. Pye, Dorchester 2 Superintendent; Dr. Sean Alford, Assistant Superintendent, Dorchester 2; Ms. Debi Gilliam, Director of Assessment, Dorchester 2; Ms. Sally Cauthen, Senate Education staff; Mr. Grant Gibson, Senate Finance staff; Ms. Emily Heatwole, House Ways and Means staff; Ms. Rachel Card, Governor's office staff; and Ms. Rachael Fulmer, Budget and Control Board staff

Staff Present: Ms. Barton; Dr. Andrews; Ms. Yow; and Ms. King

- I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Robinson welcomed members and guests to the retreat. He thanked Clemson University for their hospitality and their willingness to donate the space for the meeting. He rescinded the resolution concerning the Common Core Standards that was included in the packet, stating that the intent of the resolution had been misinterpreted. Sen. Fair asked that more time be given to discussions about the standards at a later date. Mr. Robinson reminded members and the audience that they had a number of important items on their agenda to deal with both days.
- II. The minutes of the meeting of June 10, 2013 were approved as submitted.
- III. Recap of the 2013 Legislative Session – Mr. Robinson asked Ms. Barton to provide the committee with a recap of the 2013 legislative session. Referring to the document provided to members in the packet, Ms. Barton told members that the focus of the CDEPP evaluation this year will focus on quality, not administration of the program. She pointed out that the General Assembly appropriated \$1.5 million for summer reading camps for the children who score Not Met 1 on PASS Reading and Research, and the camps will begin next summer. The committee discussed the growing percentage of students in poverty in SC schools. Mr. Ragley discussed details he noted at the federal level in regards to the program. These comments led to a broader discussion of federal funding in education. Mr. Ragley stated that 9-11% of money spent on education comes from federal dollars. Mr. Bowers noted his concerns about federal money as well as the potential mining of student data in Common Core. Mr. Ragley addressed Mr. Bowers' concerns, stating that no student names are reported on the federal government; all personal student data stay at the state level.
- IV. Cyclical Review of the State Accountability System – Ms. Barton provided a comprehensive overview of where the jobs are in today's economy and the credentials that students must have to get these jobs and others that have yet to be developed in the future. Although SC's high school graduation has steadily increased over the past few years, the three-year graduation rate for public two-year colleges is extremely low for students in South Carolina. Ms. Barton discussed the need to focus on the preparation of students in K-12, especially since the state currently spends \$21 million in remediation in two-year technical colleges. Committee members reiterated the need to define what it means for a student to be college- and career-ready, moving students from novice learners to expert cognitive strategists. Ms. Barton discussed the willingness of business members like Jim Reynolds to move swiftly on having these

conversations. Committee members also discussed groups that are actively having discussions about the future of education in SC, like Governor Haley and the SC Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Barton also presented members with performance data on NAEP, ACT, SAT, and AP, noting trends in the data. Other topics during the discussion included the gaps in performance on SAT. Mr. Warner discussed the gap between SC students scoring at the top levels of the SAT has historically been larger than other gaps, when compared with similarly-scored peers in other states. Ms. Barton said she was concerned since a gap was starting to emerge among the lower performing students as well. Based on earlier correspondence from Mr. Bowers, Ms. Barton discussed data from the 2013 Kids Count Profile. She noted the percentage of children in single-parent families has worsened; in 2011, 42% of children were in single-family homes. Sen. Matthews requested that staff provide him with details related to the academic achievement among students in single family homes.

Ms. Collins from EPIC presented information about the process that EPIC used to engage stakeholder groups in the cyclical review process. The main goals of the system (i.e., True North), identified by the stakeholder groups and cyclical review group, were literacy & numeracy and higher order thinking skills. Each of the groups looked at accountability systems of different states and identified what was important in an accountability system. Overall, the process revealed that stakeholders agreed that the goal is to create a 21st century accountability system that measures whether all students are prepared to enter college and careers of the 21st century; federal and state accountability systems should be consistent; and further discussion is needed on particulars. Committee members agreed we must formulate a definition of college and career readiness in SC as well as what is essential for students to learn.

Ms. Barton followed-up with a discussion of a framework developed by staff using the recommendations of the cyclical review group and stakeholder groups. The system uses measures of knowledge, opportunities, skills, and future success. Opportunity measures, as presented, would be part of local accountability and reported to school district school boards. The committee discussed the framework, citing the need for local accountability. Rep. Patrick stated that local accountability was not systemic because it had not been mandated to be systemic. Sen. Matthews discussed the unintended consequences of accountability and how we must do something to address the needs of teachers in poor districts. There is currently nothing to incentivize principals and teachers to go to districts in poor areas or those that are not performing well. Mr. Warner discussed the need to build the capacity of teachers and empower them. Mr. Merck stated that the committee needs to determine what success is; what do we value in an education system. Ms. Hairfield stated that educators are looking for more formative assessments that can drive instruction.

Ms. Barton noted that the EOC was invited to attend a joint meeting with the Cyclical Review panel on September 16, from 2:00 until 4:00 p.m. to discuss and reach consensus on issues related to amending the state's accountability system.

- V. Alternative Assessments Update / Standards and Assessments Update – The committee considered alternative assessment proposals brought forward to them as a result of Proviso 1A.62.

Dorchester School District 2 – Their proposal uses ACT Aspire in grades 3-8 as well as ACT and ACT WorkKeys in Grade 11. Superintendent Joe Pye and Dr. Sean Alford answered questions from members about the proposal. Mr. Ragley expressed pessimism that the USDE would approve the waiver granting Dorchester 2 the flexibility

they seek. If approved, Mr. Ragley believes the district may have to double-test students. The proposal was unanimously approved.

Saluda County Schools – The proposal involves using district-created performance assessments and MAP in grades 3-8 as well as PLAN in 10th grade, EXPLORE and WorkKeys in 11th grade. Lexington One School District wants to partner with Saluda. The committee stated they wanted to hear from the district in person before making a decision. The request was deferred.

Spartanburg 1 – The proposed pilot involves two high schools in the district: Chapman High School and Landrum High School. Each school proposes using an alternative assessments developed by ACT in grades 8-12 and they have asked to receive an alternative school report card instead of a traditional school report card. The proposal for both schools was unanimously approved.

Spartanburg 6 – This proposal was for Dorman High School. Dorman would keep the state report card but would pilot EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT for grades 9-12. The proposal was unanimously approved.

The discussion of alternative assessments led to a discussion about assessments related to Common Core State Standards. Mr. Ragley urged the EOC to make a decision about an assessment tied to the standards. He stated that Dr. Zais would be interested in an ACT-developed assessment in lieu of Smarter Balanced if the ACT assessment proved to have more value. Mr. Ragley stated that the cost of administering the Smarter Balanced assessment in 100% of districts without HSAP would be \$19 million. However, the SCDE estimates only 71% of districts are prepared for online test administration. Members of the committee questioned and discussed aspects of the Smarter Balanced assessment, ACT, and a state-produced test. Members of the committee concluded that they needed additional information to make a decision about the assessment.

- VI. Leadership – Ms. Barton reported to the committee about a survey recently administered to Teach For America corps members. Based on the results of the survey, many corps members would be interested in staying in education if they were provided with alternative paths to leadership. Mr. Ragley stated a state board regulation exists to provide alternative pathways to principalship. The current regulation requires a master's degree. EOC staff was asked to talk to the state board about revising the requirements for alternative pathways to principalship to allow corps members increased leadership opportunities.

Regarding school board leadership, Ms. Barton discussed a growing concern over the lack of ongoing professional development required preparation for school board members. State law requires training for incoming board members, but there is no requirement for continuing education. Mr. Ragley stated that the Department of Education had put together a training module but it was rejected by the State Board of Education. EOC members asked staff to work on developing options that would require school board members to receive continuing education.

- VII. Roundtable Discussion – Mr. Warner led a discussion focused on creating a new education system that prepares students for 21st century reality. He referred to a conversation with Virginia Aldridge, the founder of the Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities. Ms. Aldridge said it was her job to "build them [teachers] a stage to take them [students] to the mountaintop." Warner stressed that building a profession of teachers is the most important thing we can do. We must allow them to take ownership in their profession and own the outcomes. He stated that we currently spend \$9.7 billion on public education. Of that money, the state spends \$3.6 billion on teachers. He

suggested a shift in some of the moneys for education toward teachers, the money in school funding should follow the child, and that we should consider further consolidation of school districts, “flattening the overhead.”

Mr. Robinson stated that we must continue to look at consolidating school districts. Mr. Drew asked if we might have too many standards. Mr. Patrick stated that he felt like we must look at the classroom as the unit of change and rebuild the system including the financial, governance structure and accountability system, from the focus of the classroom. Leadership and innovation are key factors. Mr. Martin asked the question: when were public schools not broken? Ms. Hairfield pointed out that educators become frustrated because they are a profession that doesn't make the rules for themselves. Key points for further exploration that came out of the discussion included:

- Teacher salaries
- Leadership
- Culture / attitudes toward learning
- Training of teachers
- Curriculum/standards
- Teacher empowerment
- Finance
- Organizational structure
- Classroom or school as the unit of change
- Alternatives to school schedules (i.e., year-round schools, 8 AM-5PM schools)
- Early literacy and child development

The committee discussed legislation about the elimination of an elected superintendent and declined to take a position on this legislation.

There being no further business for the day, the Committee adjourned for the day. The Committee publicized its intent to have a reception at 6:30 at High Cotton, followed by dinner.

August 9, 2013

Members Present: Mr. Robinson; Mr. Bowers; Mr. Drew; Sen. Fair; Sen. Hayes; Ms. Hairfield; Sen. Matthews; Rep. Neal; Rep. Patrick; Rep. Smith; Mr. Whittemore; Mr. Martin, and Mr. Warner

Guests Present: Rep. Philip Owens; Ms. Sally Cauthen, Senate Education staff; Mr. Grant Gibson, Senate Finance staff; Ms. Emily Heatwole, House Ways and Means staff; Ms. Rachel Card, Governor's office staff; and Ms. Rachael Fulmer, Budget and Control Board staff

Staff Present: Ms. Barton; Dr. Andrews; Ms. Yow; and Ms. King

Mr. Robinson welcomed members and staff back for the morning meeting. He recognized a special visitor, Rep. Owens, chairman of the House Education and Public Works Committee.

Mr. Robinson also asked staff to invite appropriate representatives to come and speak about ACT, the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and any other testing officials on September 9, from 1:00 until 4:00 p.m. in Columbia. Additionally, Mr. Bowers asked staff to gather information on the costs of a state assessment if one were developed. He noted that Florida is considering developing their own state test to assess Common Core State Standards in grades 3 through 8.

VIII. Update from Special Reading Subcommittee – Ms. Hairfield updated the committee on activities related to reading. Dr. Rainey Knight, former Superintendent of Darlington County Schools, is working with the EOC and instructional leaders from around the state

on developing a model district reading plan. Additionally, Dr. Tony Johnson is working with post-secondary education on the teacher preparation components of the reading legislation and the University of SC children's Law Center is working on early literacy research.

IX. Participation on other Governing Bodies

The Statewide Charter School District nomination of Alex Martin is pending.

Dennis Drew reported on the Charter School Advisory Committee. He stated the board needs more board members; there is often a struggle to get a quorum.

Mr. Warner continues to serve on the Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities Board.

Ms. Barton will represent the EOC on the K-12 Technology Committee. She explained a little bit about the committee and told them the committee meets monthly in Columbia.

Mr. Robinson stated that the committee was waiting until a new educator representative was appointed to the EOC before addressing the pending nomination to the SC Teacher Loan Advisory Committee. Ms. Anne Marie Taylor has resigned from the EOC.

X. Goals and Objectives – Mr. Bowers discussed the need for a P-20 initiative based on the previous day's conversations. Based on the advice of Ms. Hairfield, the committee decided to focus on literacy as its P-20 focus. Other topics discussed included focusing on literacy with teenage mothers as well as low-literate adults; unique partnership opportunities like Nurse Family Partnership; alternative paths to education leadership opportunities; putting good teachers in poor rural districts; the accountability of teacher preparation programs; and the correlation of Common Core State Standards and college-entrance exams. Revisions to the goals and objectives for 2013-2014 were discussed and staff was asked to present the committee with a revised copy in October.

XI. Adjournment

Having no other business, the EOC adjourned.

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
September 9, 2013

Members Present: Mr. Robinson; Mr. Bowers; Mr. Drew; Sen. Fair; Sen. Hayes; Ms. Hairfield; Rep. Smith; Sen. Matthews; Dr. Merck; Rep. Neal; Mr. Whittemore; Mr. Martin, Mr. Warner; and Dr. Zais.

State Board of Education Members Present: David Blackmon; Barry Bolen; Mike Brennan; Traci Young Cooper; and Dru James.

Staff Present: Ms. Barton; Dr. Andrews; Ms. Geiger and Ms. Yow

Welcome and Introductions – Mr. Robinson welcomed the members of the State Board of Education and public to the informational meeting, an update on the status of assessments.

Dr. Zais asked to be recognized to make a short statement. Dr. Zais reiterated his non-support of the Common Core State Standards. He recommended that the state adopt one system of accountability and that the assessment chosen for the one system of accountability be the best test for the lowest price.

Sen. Fair regretted that the forum would not address the Common Core State Standards. He did advise the EOC and State Board to look at actions taken in Oklahoma, Alabama and Michigan to delay implementation of Common Core or to withdraw from the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC).

Mr. Robinson recognized the moderator for the meeting, Dr. Gene Wilhoit, Director of the National Center for Innovation in Education at the University of Kentucky, former director of the Council of Chief State School Officers and former commissioner of the Kentucky Department of Education. Dr. Wilhoit summarized the history of standards and assessments. He noted that no state has yet to align its assessment or accountability system to student expectations. Currently, there is cautious optimism in the country as all states are being reflective and aligning their assessment system to the needs of the key stakeholders: postsecondary education and business. For the first time, businesses and higher education are discussing skills like persistence that students must have to succeed. He noted that all new assessments will have to be aligned with new technology. He cautioned South Carolina to be very thoughtful and deliberative as it considers five options for a state assessment system: (1) state-developed test; (2) Smarter Balanced or PARCC; (3) contract with ACT or other non-profit vendors; (4) review outside vendors; or (5) adopt a hybrid system of assessments. He reiterated that districts should focus in 2013-14 on building the infrastructure needed regardless of which assessment is chosen. The infrastructure should include: university-support system; new teaching and learning materials; and technology. In 2014-15 the accountability system will follow with phases of implementation.

Dr. Wilhoit advised the state to consider a system of assessments:

- Summative is only part of the system;
- Interim assessments;
- Guides for teachers;
- Retake options;
- Ways to measure extremes on either end of the achievement spectrum;
- Digital library resources;
- Technology
- Testing Time

- Costs
- Scoring process
- Timeliness of scoring process
- Information to districts and state
- Validity and reliability for student results

Mr. Robinson then recognized Dr. David Gupta, Vice President and Matt Lisk, Executive Director at the College Board who discussed the current assessments used in South Carolina including the SAT, PSAT, and Advanced Placement (AP) test program. Currently, SAT has established 1550 on all three portions of the SAT as the benchmark for college and career readiness. Research indicates that students scoring a 1550 have a 65% likelihood of a B- in the first year of college. The presenters noted that the SAT, PSAT and NMSQT will be redesigned.

The new SAT will be more rigorous and include skills required in the Common Core State Standards. In the near future, the College Board is going to develop data and support tools for students in grades 6 through 11 to help with instructional framework and performance tasks. Questions were raised about how College Board chooses schools to field test the changes and how College Board will improve upon math and science with STEM being such an emphasis. Currently, the College Board is not designing an assessment to measure Common Core State Standards in grades 3 through 8.

Mr. Robinson then recognized Paul Weeks, Vice President for Career and College Readiness at ACT, Inc. Mr. Weeks discussed ACT's Aspire assessment program in English language arts, mathematics, science and writing for students in grades 3 through 8. Aspire will measure college and career readiness and is aligned to Common Core. The test will also be a predictor of college and career readiness. The test will be available in the spring of 2014. States that enter into a contract for the full battery of tests before the end of calendar 2013 will be charged a discount fee of \$11.70 per student. Currently 27 states use Explore, PLAN and ACT. Thirteen states give ACT to all 11th graders. Questions were asked concerning: (1) ability to use the battery of tests for teacher evaluation; (2) turn-around time for test results; (3) importance of preserving creativity in the classrooms; and (4) availability and importance of interim and formative assessments for classroom teachers.

Then Mr. Robinson recognized Elizabeth Jones, Director of Assessment at the South Carolina Department of Education. Ms. Jones presented an overview of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium including the amount of time that students would spend taking the Smarter Balanced Assessment in ELA and mathematics and the costs of the assessment. Questions were raised regarding the costs of technology and infrastructure at the district level to administer the test; the window of testing; the possibility of formative assessments being developed in the future; and the paper and pencil administration option which is available for three years.

Dr. Wilhoit then concluded by making several observations. South Carolina should be clear on the outcome or expectations of the summative assessment. If the expectation is that all students are college and career ready, South Carolina must define what that means for its students and citizens.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
September 16, 2013

Members Present: Mr. Robinson; Mr. Bowers; Mr. Drew; Sen. Fair; Sen. Hayes; Ms. Hairfield; Rep. Smith; Sen. Matthews; Dr. Merck; Mr. Whittemore; Mr. Martin, and Dr. Zais.

Panel Members Present: Cynthia Ambrose; Mike Brennan; Jennifer Coleman; Jim Delisle; Jim Dunn; Glenda Morrison-Fair; Jan Hammond; Chuck Middleton; Darryl Owings; Jim Reynolds; Janet Rose; Phil Waddell; Gary West; Leila Williams; Carol Wilson.

Note: Dr. Zais serves on both the EOC and the Panel

Staff Present: Ms. Barton; Dr. Andrews; Ms. Geiger and Ms. Yow

Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Robinson welcomed members and guests to the joint meeting of the cyclical accountability review panel and the EOC. He thanked the members of the panel for their work.

Discussion – The EOC and panel then reviewed a draft accountability framework and draft working document. Those in attendance discussed such issues as: (1) the role of testing in instruction and learning; (2) the importance of authentic assessments in early childhood education and in primary schools; (3) the challenges of implementing and using extended performance tasks or competency-based learning in an accountability system; and (4) the importance of having a state accountability that complements or mirrors a federal accountability system.

Having no other business, the EOC adjourned.

2013

Relationship Between 3rd Grade Reading Performance & Graduation in SC



**SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

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

Relationship between 3rd Grade Reading Performance and Graduation in South Carolina

There is substantial evidence supporting the commonly held belief that strong positive relationship exists between reading proficiency and high school graduation. In 2004, the Education Oversight Committee examined the relationship between reading proficiency, as measured by the performance of eighth graders on the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test (PACT), and four –year graduation rates. Cohorts of entire grades were used for the study in the absence of a student ID system. The relationship between graduation rates and reading proficiency was found to be statistically strong and robust. If a student did not read proficiently in the eighth grade, there was a 50 percent change they would not graduate on-time four years later. Despite its limitations matching individual students, the study also pointed out the need to develop reading policy that was aimed at developing reading proficiency earlier in a child's academic career.

In April of 2011 The Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Center for Demographic Analysis at the State University of New York at Albany released a study, *Double Jeopardy*, evaluating the link between third grade reading skills and poverty and high school graduation. The longitudinal study used a national database of 3,975 students born between 1979 and 1989. "The researchers divided the children into three reading groups which correspond roughly to the skill levels used in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): proficient, basic and below basic." The children were also separated into three income categories: those who have never been poor, those who spent some time in poverty and those who have lived more than half the years surveyed in poverty." The findings of the study were:

- One in six children who are not reading proficiently in third grade do not graduate from high school on time, a rate four times greater than that for proficient readers.
- The rates are highest for the low, below-basic readers: 23 percent of these children drop out or fail to finish high school on time, compared to 9 percent of children with basic reading skills and 4 percent of proficient readers.
- Overall, 22 percent of children who have lived in poverty do not graduate from high school, compared to 6 percent of those who have never been poor. This rises to 32 percent for students spending more than half of their childhood in poverty.¹

During the 2013 session of the South Carolina General Assembly, three pieces of legislation were introduced to improve third grade reading proficiency. The legislation all addressed the critical linkage between third grade reading proficiency and the future success of students.

Consequently, the question was raised: what is the relationship between third grade reading performance and eventual graduation in South Carolina?

Data Analysis:

The first step was to analyze the performance of third grade students on the English language arts test of the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test (PACT), which was the precursor to the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS). This step involved going back to the 2000 cohort of 3rd graders in the state of South Carolina. In 2000 there were approximately 52,175 students who had 3rd grade PACT scores. PACT had five achievement levels: Below Basic 1, Below Basic 2, Basic, Proficient and Advanced. Below Basic 1 was the lowest achievement

¹ Hernandez, Donald J., et. al. *Double Jeopardy*. April 2011. Published by The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

<<http://www.aecf.org/~media/Pubs/Topics/Education/Other/DoubleJeopardyHowThirdGradeReadingSkillsandPoverty/DoubleJeopardyReport040511FINAL.pdf>>.

level with Advanced being the highest. Table 1 below shows the percentage of students scoring at each level of PACT ELA in 2000.

Table 1. 2000 PACT 3rd Grade English Language Arts Scores

Performance Level	Number of Students	Percentage of All Students
Below Basic 1	8,441	16.18%
Below Basic 2	4,974	9.53%
Basic	17,952	34.41%
Proficient	18,750	35.94%
Advanced	<u>2,058</u>	3.94%
TOTAL:	52,175	

Not until 2006 did students have a unique student identifier. Therefore, to determine if these 52,175 students progressed across grades and graduated, demographic information from student records was used to identify children through time. Used for identification purposes were the child's name, date of birth, gender, and ethnicity. If a child changed his or her name, then the child likely was not matched. The data were carefully scrutinized to look at retention throughout the continuum.

Of the 52,175 students in the initial cohort, 32,117 were able to be identified as being enrolled in public schools in South Carolina in 2008, which equates to 11th grade if students were routinely promoted. As Table 2 illustrates, approximately 44 percent of the students who initially scored Below Basic 1 were still enrolled as compared to 73 percent of students who initially scored Advanced. The students who were no longer enrolled had either dropped out of school, moved away, or were unable to be identified.

Table 2. Cohort Enrolled in 11th Grade in 2008

Performance Level	Number of Students	Number of Students	% of Original Cohort
Below Basic 1	8,441	3,742	44.33%
Below Basic 2	4,974	2,684	53.96%
Basic	17,952	11,068	61.65%
Proficient	18,750	13,111	69.93%
Advanced	<u>2,058</u>	<u>1,512</u>	73.47%
TOTAL:	52,175	32,117	

Looking at these 32,117 students, the analysis addressed three questions. Having identified 32,117 students in 11th grade from the original 3rd grade cohort, how many graduated the following spring, 2009 or on time? How many graduated in 2009 or 2010, on-time or at least within five years? And, is there a statistically significant relationship between the 3rd grade ELA scores of these students and their likelihood of graduating on-time or within five years?

Of the 32,117 students in 11th grade, approximately 24,550 or 76 percent graduated in the spring of 2009 (Table 3). However, for the students who scored Below Basic 1 on their 3rd grade ELA PACT test, only 45 percent graduated while 87 percent of those who scored Proficient graduated and 91 percent of those who scored Advanced graduated. For students who could be traced from 2000 to 2009, is there a relationship between 3rd grade reading performance in 2000 and graduation in 2009? The answer is yes. Using a Chi-Square analysis,

there was a statistically significant relationship between 3rd grade ELA performance and the likelihood of graduating.

Table 3. Initial Cohort Restricted by Graduating in 2009

3rd Grade ELA Performance, 2000	Did NOT Graduate 2009	Graduated 2009	Total
Below Basic 1	2,071 (55.34%)	1,671 (44.66%)	3,742
Below Basic 2	981 (36.55%)	1,703 (63.45%)	2,684
Basic	2,683 (24.24%)	8,385 (75.76%)	11,268
Proficient	1,700 (12.97%)	11,411 (87.03%)	13,111
Advanced	<u>132</u> (8.73%)	<u>1,380</u> (91.27%)	<u>1,512</u>
TOTAL:	7,567	24,550	32,117

Chi-Square 3355.0936 <.0001

A second question was raised. Is there a difference in the percent of students who graduated in 2009 or 2010 as a function of 3rd grade reading performance in 2000? In essence, looking at a five-year graduation rate, did students scoring at the lowest level on the 3rd grade PACT ELA test graduate at a comparable level to their peers? The answer is no. While 80 percent of the original third grade cohort graduated in 2009 or 2010, only 56 percent, of the students who scored Below Basic 1 on the ELA PACT test graduated in 2009 or 2010. And, using a Chi-Square analysis, there was a statistically significant relationship between 3rd grade ELA performance and the likelihood of graduating within five years.

Table 4. Initial Cohort Restricted by Graduating in 2009 or 2010

3rd Grade ELA Performance, 2000	Did NOT Graduate 2009 or 2010	Graduated 2009 or 2010	Total
Below Basic 1	1,654 (44.20%)	2,088 (55.80%)	3,742
Below Basic 2	725 (27.01%)	1,959 (72.99%)	2,684
Basic	2,264 (20.46%)	8,804 (79.54%)	11,068
Proficient	1,596 (12.17%)	11,515 (87.83%)	13,111
Advanced	<u>132</u> (8.73%)	<u>1,380</u> (91.27%)	<u>1,512</u>
TOTAL:	6,371	25,746	32,117

Chi-Square 2087.9909 <.0001

Another analysis was done to look at those students who repeated a grade in the 3-8 grade span and scored Below Basic 1 or 2 on the PACT ELA test. Table 5 below shows that 58 percent of the students who were retained in 3rd grade graduated as compared to 39 percent of the students who were retained in 8th grade. In essence, if a student is to be retained for a grade then the “earlier-the-better.”

Table 5. Students Retained Once and Graduation Rates

Grade Repeated	Did NOT Graduate (%)	Number Graduated (%)	Total
3	184 (41.63%)	258 (58.37%)	442
4	122 (49.39%)	125 (50.61%)	247
5	74 (48.37%)	79 (51.63%)	153
6	95 (47.26%)	106 (52.74%)	201
7	100 (55.87%)	79 (44.13%)	179
8	58 (61.05%)	37 (38.95%)	95

The analysis also revealed that there were 200 students who repeated two grades. Looking at the 2011 graduation data file, it was determined that 13 of these 200 students graduated in 2011, and an additional 13 students were determined to have graduated in 2010. Consequently, Table 6 below summarizes the initial results of the 2000 ELA PACT results.

Table 6. Summarizing Graduates as a function of 2000 PACT 3rd Grade ELA Reading

3rd Grade ELA Performance, 2000	Initial Number	2005 Students Retained No more than One Grade (%)	Students Graduated in 2009	Students Graduated in 2010	Students Graduated in 2011	Total Graduates
Below Basic 1	8,441	5,665 (67.1%)	1,671	417+7	8	2,103 (37.1%)
Below Basic 2	4,974	3,679 (74.1%)	1,703	256+2	2	1,963 (53.3%)
Basic	17,952	13,696 (75.8%)	8,385	419+4	3	8,811 (64.3%)
Proficient	18,750	14,967 (79.8%)	11,411	104	0	11,515 (76.9%)
Advanced	2,058	1,672 (81.2%)	1,380	0	0	1,380 (82.5%)
TOTAL:	52,175	39,679	24,550	1,209	13	

Because there was attrition between 2000 and 2005, it is also true that some students were “lost” by moving, dropping out of school, etc. Thus, the percentage that 37.1% of children who scored Below Basic 1 and graduated is an underestimate, but how much of an underestimate?

Finally, an analysis was conducted to attempt a very rough estimate of the number of students who persevered to the end of 2009, the first year that students in the cohort could graduate. The analysis used the loss from 2000 to 2005 to project four more years and estimate the number at 2009. For example, the rate of loss of students in the Below Basic 1 category from 2000 to 2005 was 32.9%. Extending this out for four more years, the projected loss for the total nine-year

period was estimated at .592 (.329 X 1.8). The figure .592 is considered a “loss rate” with .408 considered a “perseverance rate.”

Table 7 shows below an estimated graduation rate using the initial problems in locating all children who scored Below Basic 1 on 3rd grade PACT ELA in 2000. Children who score Below Basic 1 in 3rd grade have an estimated graduation rate of 61.1 percent.

Table 7. Estimated to Have Persevered to Have Graduated in 2009 as a function of 2000 PACT 3rd Grade ELA Reading

3rd Grade ELA Performance, 2000	Initial Number	2005 Students Retained No more than One Grade (%)	Estimated to Have Graduated 2009	Graduated All	Graduation %
Below Basic 1	8,441	5,665 (67.1)	3,444	2,103	61.1
Below Basic 2	4,974	3,679 (74.1)	2,655	1,963	73.9
Basic	17,952	13,696 (75.8)	10,132	8,811	87.0
Proficient	18,750	14,967 (79.8)	11,932	11,515	96.5
Advanced	2,058	1,672 (81.2)	1,356	1,380	>100
TOTAL:	52,175	39,679	29,159	25,772	

Conclusion:

1. Students who scored at Below Basic 1 on the 2000 PACT ELA test were less likely to be able to be identified as still being enrolled in public schools in South Carolina and were less likely to graduate than all other students. There was a statistically significant relationship between 3rd grade PACT ELA scores in 2000 and the likelihood that the student graduated in 2009 or 2010.

2. Using the various methods of estimating the graduation rate for students who scored Below Basic 1 on the 2000 PACT ELA test:

About 20 percent (19.8%) of students who initially scored Below Basic 1 on the 2000 3rd Grade PACT ELA assessment and who could be located graduated in 2009.

About 37 percent of the students who initially scored Below Basic 1 on the 2000 3rd Grade PACT ELA assessment and who could be located graduated in 2009, 2010 and 2011 (Table 6).

Finally, projecting over time the mobility of students based upon actual enrollment declines, approximately 61 percent of the students who scored Below Basic 1 on the 2000 3rd Grade PACT ELA assessment are projected to have persevered to graduate (Table 7).

3. The percent of students graduating from high school decreases from 58.37% for 3rd grade repeaters, to 38.95 % for those students who repeated grade 8. In essence, if a student is to be retained for a grade then the “earlier-the-better.”

EOC Goals and Objectives for ~~2012-13~~2013-14

1. Continue the implementation of the Education Accountability Act of 1998, *as amended*, and fulfill other responsibilities assigned by the General Assembly including those within the Teacher Quality Act, the Parental Involvement in Their Children's Education Act, the Education and Economic Development Act and those made by special requests, including:
 - a. Monitoring the development of assessments, technology needs and related resources linked to the **state standards** ~~Core Curriculum~~ and communicating alignment with SC aspirations and instruction;
 - b. Implementing the cyclical review of the state accountability system **and reporting to the General Assembly and Governor**;
 - c. Increasing the impact of the accountability system on decisions which impact state, school and student performance;
 - d. Ensuring the system is effective for the young people currently enrolled and for those young people to come;
 - e. Evaluating the progress of all schools including separate reporting for public charter schools and schools in technical assistance;
 - f. Reporting on growth in achievement across ~~four~~ **five** years of PASS data for the four core academic subjects;
 - g. ~~Reviewing the Palmetto Gold and Silver Award Program criteria with new growth indices~~; Supporting and promoting innovative practices in South Carolina public schools and other initiatives that encourage innovation and creativity **including the pilot assessments in Dorchester 2, Spartanburg 1 and Spartanburg 6 school districts**; and
 - h. ~~Participating in the development~~ **Review and approve** new science standards
2. Measure progress toward the 2020 vision for statewide educational performance including:
 - a. Ensuring that no student is enrolled in a school rated At Risk;
 - b. Working with stakeholder groups including higher education to understand state aspirations and the tasks necessary to achieve those;
 - c. Adjusting or expanding reporting methods and content to increase sensitivity to growth in performance; and increased knowledge of the performance of students disaggregated by student instructional needs (i.e., EFA and EIA program codes) for the four core academic subjects;

- d. Recommending actions for policy, practice and funding to accomplish the 2020 vision; and
- e. Promoting more open dialogue about the gains, challenges and strategies to accomplish the 2020 vision.

3. Increase the level of student reading proficiency by:

- a. Examining the performance of students, individual and in groups, to understand how and where emphasis is needed in policy and practice;
- b. Linking student performance to instructional strategies and policies and promoting those which are most effective;
- c. ~~Engaging the higher education community and other stakeholder groups in discussions of reading achievement to promote changes in teacher preparation and pre-kindergarten through grade twelve policies and practices;~~ **Piloting a P-20 initiative focused on improving reading performance;** and
- d. ~~Using the recommendations of the South Carolina Reading Achievement Systemic Initiative and group of stakeholders to develop a systemic reading initiative.~~

4. Develop a long-term strategy for increasing the utility of technology, including:

- a. Identifying the availability and distribution of virtual courses in public schools;
- b. Identifying lead districts and examining how technology in instruction has been supported, utilized and with what impact on student achievement;
- c. Identifying cutting-edge strategies for use of technology to address traditional education functions; and
- d. Promoting a statewide commitment for world-class technology in our schools **including broad-band, hardware and infrastructure for online assessments.**

5. Examine the performance of students to achieve at the highest level including:

- a. Expanding a longitudinal PASS data base for the four core academic subjects; and
- b. Determining opportunities for high ability students to access the gifted and talented programs and advanced college preparatory work generally and in low-performing schools.

6. Fulfill responsibilities outlined in the General Appropriations Act.

7. **Expand outreach to educators, parents, business and community to expand awareness of opportunities to impact educational attainment of children.**