

**EIA and EAA Budget and Proviso Requests for FY 2022-23**

**As Recommended by EIA Subcommittee**

**EOC Full Committee  
December 13, 2021**





## Table of Contents

|   | Page number |
|---|-------------|
| <b>I. EIA Funding for 2022-23</b>               | 5           |
| <b>II. Summary of EIA Staff Recommendations</b> | 6           |
| <b>III. Recommendations for EIA Funding</b>     | 7           |
| A. EIA Surplus FY 2021-22                       | 7           |
| B. EIA Projected Growth FY 2022-23              | 8           |
| <b>IV. Evaluation of Alignment of EIA</b>       | 24          |
| <b>V. K-12 Funding Issues</b>                   | 26          |



## I. EIA Funding for 2022-23

Section 59-6-10 of the Education Accountability Act requires the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) to “review and monitor the implementation and evaluation of the Education Accountability Act and the Education Improvement Act programs and funding” and to “make programmatic and funding recommendations to the General Assembly.” To meet this statutory requirement, the EOC required each EIA-funded program or entity to submit a program and budget report detailing the objectives and outcomes of each program for Fiscal Years 2020-21 and 2021-22 and including any additional requests for Fiscal Year 2022-23.

EIA new requests for **Fiscal Year 2022-23** total \$47,501,980.

On November 10, 2021, the Board of Economic Advisors (BEA) issued EIA revenue projections for FY 2022-23. See Table 1.

**Table 1**

| <b>EIA Estimate 2022-23<br/>November 15, 2021</b> |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| EIA Estimate FY23 (November 10, 2021)             | \$ 990,684,000      |
| EIA Base Appropriation 2021-22                    | \$894,399,999       |
| Projected EIA Funds (Recurring)                   | <b>\$96,284,001</b> |
| EIA Revised Estimate FY22 (November 10, 2021)     | \$983,501,000       |
| Projected EIA Nonrecurring (Surplus)              | <b>\$89,101,001</b> |

Based on the November BEA estimate, there is a projected surplus of \$89,101,001 in EIA funds (non-recurring) for 2021-22 and \$96,284,001 in EIA Projected Funds (recurring) for 2022-23.

The EIA and Improvement Mechanism Subcommittee met on the following dates:

- October 25, 2021: Held public hearing for all entities funded by or requesting EIA revenues. EIA Subcommittee requested EOC staff to compile priorities for EIA budget and present at November 15 meeting.
- November 15, 2021: Held public hearing for all entities funded by or requesting new EIA revenues and convened to discuss EIA budget priorities.
- December 6, 2021: Held deliberations and made recommendations on funding 2022-23 EIA programs.

## II. Summary of EIA Subcommittee Recommendations

### Nonrecurring Funds (Surplus)

| Name of Program         | Amount       |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| Instructional Materials | \$20,000,000 |
| USC CAP Program         | \$450,000    |
| Artificial Intelligence | \$3,000,000  |
| Charter Schools         | \$33,216,180 |

|                                 |                     |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Total Nonrecurring Funds</b> | <b>\$56,666,180</b> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|

### Recurring Funds

| Name of Program                             | EOC Subcommittee Recommendations |
|---|----------------------------------|
| PowerSchool                                 | \$3,200,000                      |
| Teacher Supplies                            | \$610,500                        |
| Other State Agencies Teacher Salaries       | \$390,566                        |
| Carolina TIP                                | \$750,000                        |
| Education Data Dashboard                    | \$3,500,000                      |
| School Quality Survey                       | \$1,000,000                      |
| Teacher Working Conditions Survey           | \$475,000                        |
| Additional Contract days for LETRS          | \$34,020,000                     |
| Action Research Project                     | \$500,000                        |
| Online Course Access                        | \$750,000                        |
| SC Mathematics <i>Getting Back on Track</i> | \$1,000,000                      |
| First Steps                                 | \$3,000,000                      |
| Career and Technology Education             | \$5,000,000                      |
| High Dose Tutoring                          | \$50,000,000                     |
| School Safety Program                       | <b>-\$13,000,000</b>             |

|                              |                     |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Total Recurring Funds</b> | <b>\$91,196,066</b> |
|------------------------------|---------------------|

### III. Recommendations for EIA Funding

Based on the discussions at the EOC retreat in August 2021, funding for recommended EIA Programs has been identified according to the following areas.

1. *Access to High Quality Data to Inform Decisions*
2. *Access to Quality Materials for College-and Career-Readiness*
3. *Access to High Quality Teacher Professional Development (Recruitment and Retention)*

#### A. EIA Surplus FY 2021-22

For the current fiscal year, the EIA surplus of non-recurring dollars is estimated to be **\$89,101,001**.

**Recommendation 1: Instructional Materials** **\$20,000,000**  
*Access to High Quality Data to Inform Decisions*

With the request from the South Carolina Department of Education for additional funds for instructional materials and to ensure instructional materials for schools and teachers are up-to-date and aligned with newly revised academic standards, a recommendation is made to utilize \$20,000,000 of the nonrecurring funds for instructional materials with a priority for instructional materials that are evidence-based in grades English language arts (ELA), grades, mathematics, science and social studies. The academic standards for ELA and math subjects were adopted in 2015, social studies in 2019, and science in 2020.

**Recommendation 2: USC CCAP Alternative Certification** **\$450,000**  
*Access to High Quality Teacher Professional Development (Recruitment and Retention)*

The request from USC to continue to advance its alternative certification program using funds from surplus, a recommendation is made to utilize \$450,000 from these nonrecurring monies to fund this program.

**Recommendation 3: Artificial Intelligence: Development and Pilot (H630)**  
**\$3,000,000**

Given the ever-growing need for trained individuals in this industry, a recommendation is made to develop, pilot and implement a high school curriculum for high school students in an artificial intelligence career and technology program. Palmetto Partners, a collection of CEOs across SC, would serve as an advisory group to a selected vendor during the development and implementation phases. The

Palmetto Partners Board decided two years ago to become involved in supporting efforts to develop a plan to launch an initiative statewide in Artificial Intelligence through partnerships at the state level with the SC Department of Education and industrial partners.

The pilot project would involve research, design, and development of a curriculum automotive pathway that includes computer science coding, artificial intelligence and other smart technology platforms to prepare students to graduate college and career ready with certifications in auto smart engineering technology. The program will include a four-course sequential pathway that is aligned to two year and four year college auto engineering pathway with teacher training, third party assessments, and certifications. The pathway would prepare graduates to be prepared to enter the automotive and airline industries in companies like Boeing, Volvo, BMW, and other related affiliate companies.

Up to four sites in South Carolina would be identified to implement the program during the pilot period. The final product would be a 2-3 year long program for high school students and is intended to be an additional career completer pathway. The estimated cost for the development of the curriculum, teacher training and pilot is 3 million.

The request is for one-time funds with a provision for carry over to complete the project.

## **B. EIA Projected Growth FY 2022-23**

All programs funded for 2021-22, except the School Safety Program, are recommended for continued funding at its current level. The EIA additional requests total \$47,501,980 and the available EIA recurring growth funding estimate is **\$96,284,001**.

### **Recommendation 4: Education Data Dashboard **\$3,500,000****

*Access to High Quality Data to Inform Decisions*

A data dashboard is a data visualization tool that provides information that is interactive and transparent, often with real time data. This information can then be monitored and analyzed in a more effective and efficient manner. Data can be aggregated, filtered and then visually displayed in a more meaningful manner. Overall, a data dashboard can assist in measuring performance, providing insights, and making data easier to understand.

Currently, educational data, such as student performance, student attendance and/or financial data, is populated in different databases and do not “talk” to one another. A data dashboard solves this problem by organizing data in a secure, accessible portal.

Schools, districts, parents, and policymakers will benefit from access to a data dashboard in order to make better-informed decisions.

See Appendix A.

*Suggested Proviso: The Education Oversight Committee is directed to pilot an Education Data Dashboard. The data dashboard must interface with existing systems to provide school districts, schools, policymakers, families, and the public with meaningful information on school district, school, and system progress. The Education Data Dashboard would use existing data to document educational attainment and growth as well as financial expenditures of state, local, and federal funds. The Department of Education and public school districts shall provide accountability and financial data as requested by the Committee for the establishment of the dashboard.*

**Recommendation 5: Online Course Access \$750,000**

*Access to Quality Materials for College-and Career-Readiness*

With teacher shortages as well as teachers in rural districts lacking certifications in hard-to-fill areas such as Latin, physics, chemistry, computer science, etc., South Carolina students often do not have access to high quality courses in their schools. A statewide, comprehensive dynamic course catalog from which all South Carolina students could choose can remedy this inequity.

VirtualSC currently exists within the South Carolina Department of Education and provides online learning for students in high schools. Seats for these courses are limited and filled on a first-come-first serve basis. Additional courses offered require expenditures for teacher salary/fringe. Teacher shortages also present an obstacle for offering additional courses.

By creating an Online Course Access program, students can participate in both VirtualSC as well as having access to multiple courses through various vendors. Courses could be offered from elementary through high school levels on a year round basis. Quality and variety are essential in the Course Access Program and providers would include higher education, nonprofits, and business/industry. Some states have joined forces to create reciprocity agreements to share courses. The Course Access Program would be a one-stop shop for students and parents. All courses would be vetted by South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) with standards alignment part of the review.

Several states have taken this approach such as Texas, Florida and Louisiana with positive results. The Course Access Program will:

1. Expand the number of courses available to students in K-12,
2. Provide courses equitably throughout South Carolina to allow ALL students the same opportunity for high quality coursework,
3. Reduce costs to provide additional courses, and
4. Lessen the impact of the teacher shortage.

It is recommended a pilot program for Online Course Access be initiated across South Carolina for 2500 students at a cost of \$300 per course.

*Suggested Proviso: Online Course Access*

*The Department of Education, in collaboration with the EOC and the SC State Board of Education, will work to broaden course access through an online course catalog that may include content from multiple providers.*

**Recommendation 6: Additional Palmetto Literacy Supplement Days**  
**\$34,020,000**

*Access to High Quality Teacher Professional Development (Recruitment and Retention)*

Research supports the single greatest influence on student performance is the effectiveness of the classroom teacher. In order for current classroom teachers to continue to grow and build their teaching content and skills, the opportunity for continued professional learning is critical.

Teachers are graduating from teacher education programs with limited skills in the teaching of reading. Nationally, studies have shown that only 51 percent of higher education teacher preparation programs include the science of reading. Learning to read is incredibly complex, and teaching reading requires a deep understanding of the processes and science behind it.

When teachers do not have the knowledge and skills to teach reading to all students, a number of students lag behind and struggle. Problems compound and the comprehension gap continues to widen, while teachers are left feeling frustrated and ineffective.

The last few years of SC READY student performance data show large numbers of students are underperforming in English language arts. This problem is especially evident at the Does Not Meet level, the lowest level of English Language Arts, with student numbers increasing at this level. Students at this level are often 2-3 years behind. See Table 2 below.

**Table 2**  
**English Language Arts**  
**SC READY Student Performance Results**

| <b>2021</b> | <b>% Does Not Meet</b> | <b>% Approaching</b> | <b>Total % Not Meeting</b> |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 3rd         | 32                     | 25                   | 57                         |
| 4th         | 33                     | 21                   | 54                         |
| 5th         | 28                     | 33                   | 61                         |
| <b>2019</b> | <b>% Does Not Meet</b> | <b>% Approaching</b> | <b>Total % Not Meeting</b> |
| 3rd         | 26                     | 25                   | 51                         |
| 4th         | 28                     | 21                   | 49                         |
| 5th         | 28                     | 31                   | 59                         |
| <b>2018</b> | <b>% Does Not Meet</b> | <b>% Approaching</b> | <b>Total % Not Meeting</b> |
| 3rd         | 23                     | 32                   | 55                         |
| 4th         | 28                     | 28                   | 56                         |
| 5th         | 28                     | 34                   | 62                         |

Source: SC Department of Education, SC Department of Education, <https://ed.sc.gov/data/test-scores/state-assessments/sc-ready>

Two things often impede teacher development. One is time for professional learning. Second is the identification of the appropriate training in a deficient area.

First to address time, additional days would be added as a teaching supplement. Some of the lowest performing schools in South Carolina are the Palmetto Literacy Schools (217 schools with 5500 teachers K-3). This project recommends all of these schools add 10 additional days to their school calendar for the purpose of teacher professional learning. This would provide an average of \$2850 as an incentive for teachers serving in schools where children are in most need of supports.

Second is evidence-based training directed at a deficient area. Since reading is an area with low performance as well as increasing gaps among subgroups, a training program that is based on the science of reading should be selected and implemented to help teachers master the content and principles of effective language and literacy instruction. The program should train teachers across the five essential components of reading – phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension – plus writing and assessment.

A program meeting these descriptions is to be selected by the South Carolina Department of Education to assist teachers in becoming more proficient in the teaching of reading. This will be an investment in teacher literacy knowledge and professional learning. Funds in the amount of \$2,000 per teacher are allocated for the training.

In addition, the EOC recommends the SCDE investigate the addition of Praxis Reading 5205 or other similar assessments as another component of elementary and early childhood teacher certification to further support the need for more highly trained pre-service teachers in reading.

*Suggested Proviso: Additional Palmetto Literacy Teacher Supplement Days*

*The Department of Education is authorized to reimburse districts up to \$34,020,000 for the cost of providing unbudgeted professional development support to teachers in identified Palmetto Literacy Project schools. The additional support should focus on (1) the implementation of a professional development program as identified by the Department of Education in the science of reading and (2) providing identified staff up to 10 additional supplement days at their daily rate for participation in the identified professional development program. School districts and identified staff in the Palmetto Literacy Project schools are required to participate in the additional supplemental professional development days and complete the identified training in the science of reading. Additionally, the Department of Education shall investigate the addition of a science of reading assessment, such as Praxis 5205, for early childhood and elementary teacher licensure.*

**Recommendation 7: SC Mathematics Getting Back on Track      \$1,000,000**

*Access to High Quality Teacher Professional Development (Recruitment and Retention)*

Before and after the pandemic, student performance in mathematics has been anemic. There was a precipitous drop during the pandemic as shown in the 2021 SC READY results. See Table 3 below. Resources to identify student gaps in specific mathematics content/skills with corresponding teacher strategies to support the teaching and learning to erase the unfinished learning would seem to be the next best steps. *SC Mathematics Getting Back on Track* would be such a resource for teachers.

**Table 3**  
**Mathematics**  
**SC READY Student Performance Results**

| <b>2021</b> | <b>% Does Not Meet</b> | <b>% Approaching</b> | <b>Total % Not Meeting</b> |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 3rd         | 31                     | 22                   | 53                         |
| 4th         | 33                     | 26                   | 59                         |
| 5th         | 33                     | 29                   | 62                         |
| <b>2019</b> | <b>% Does Not Meet</b> | <b>% Approaching</b> | <b>Total % Not Meeting</b> |
| 3rd         | 21                     | 21                   | 42                         |
| 4th         | 24                     | 25                   | 49                         |
| 5th         | 25                     | 30                   | 55                         |
| <b>2018</b> | <b>% Does Not Meet</b> | <b>% Approaching</b> | <b>Total % Not Meeting</b> |
| 3rd         | 22                     | 23                   | 45                         |
| 4th         | 25                     | 27                   | 52                         |
| 5th         | 27                     | 28                   | 55                         |

Source: SC Department of Education, <https://ed.sc.gov/data/test-scores/state-assessments/sc-ready>

In 2020, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) created formative assessments that assist teachers in identifying specific gaps in students learning in mathematics called Quick Checks. These resources, developed by Virginia teachers and mathematics leaders, are designed to help teachers identify students with unfinished learning and assist in planning instruction to fill potential gaps “just in time.”<sup>1</sup>

PowerPoints as well as videos for each Quick Check includes teacher notes showing common student errors and misconceptions with suggestions for teachers to assist students. Learning Track Logs have also been developed for teachers to identify content/skills for each student and then monitor the results.

The Mathematics Quick Checks have been developed from kindergarten to Geometry, for each bullet under a standard. They have also been adapted for virtual use. The materials are copyrighted.

South Carolina has two options to duplicate this resource for our teachers. One is to contact the VDOE to inquire as to the possibility of these resources being used as a template for SC to develop its own. Second, SC could develop from scratch a *SC Getting Back on Track* resource for teachers. Teachers in groups of 10 in each grade level could spend several weeks in the summer to create formative assessments for each standard. The teachers and/or the SCDE would then develop teacher resources such as videos, Powerpoints, webinars to facilitate teacher usage in SC classrooms.

<sup>1</sup>[https://doe.virginia.gov/testing/sol/standards\\_docs/mathematics/2016/jit/index.shtml](https://doe.virginia.gov/testing/sol/standards_docs/mathematics/2016/jit/index.shtml)

Student gaps in mathematics understanding exist for a variety of reasons, and *SC Getting Back on Track* can be used to help get student mathematical learning back on track.

The EOC would work to provide a proof of concept in the spring 2022. The EOC would work with mathematics teachers in specific grade ranges to create preliminary *Getting Back on Track* assessments. Focus groups made up of S.C. mathematics teachers and lead teachers would be conducted to determine the utility of the assessments. This information would be shared with the SCDE when they begin to expand the project.

*Suggested Proviso: South Carolina Mathematics: Getting Back on Track*  
*The Department of Education, in collaboration with the EOC, will develop resources to support teachers focused on supporting grade level achievement in K-12 mathematics. The EOC will be responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of the tools.*

**Recommendation 8. Action Research Project- Identifying Promising Practices**  
**\$500,000**

*Access to High Quality Teacher Professional Development (Recruitment and Retention)*

There are pockets of South Carolina schools beating the odds regarding performance on SC assessments on SC READY, End of Course and/or WIN. If these schools were identified, then teams of educators could visit the schools to begin the process of identifying the effective strategies, best practices and/or guiding principles these schools have implemented. Further analysis could be conducted to verify from the evidence collected whether the schools' effectiveness could be attributed to the identified strategies.

Next steps could include sharing these Promising Practices with other schools, throughout the state, including the lowest performing schools. Webinars, on-site visits, as well as professional learning videos could be created to disseminate these Promising Practices.

Schools should be encouraged to use these resources to develop teachers' effectiveness through collaboration and collegiality. Research is abundant indicating the importance and magnitude of teacher collaboration. John Hattie, a proponent of evidence-based teaching, says that the power of teachers is learning from and talking to each other about teaching, planning, learning intentions, progression, success criteria, what is valuable learning, what it means to be 'good at' a subject<sup>2</sup> – which leads to improved student outcomes. The Action Research Project would create a catalog of research and resources and encourage participating schools to use this information for teacher development.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://technologyforlearners.com/summary-of-john-hatties-research/>

**Recommendation 9: Increase Compensation for Teachers**

*Access to High Quality Teacher Professional Development (Recruitment and Retention)*

**1. Other Agencies' Teacher Salary** **\$390,566**

The South Carolina Department of Education has requested that teacher salaries be increased by 2.2 percent in Fiscal Year 2022-23 using General Fund revenues. If the General Assembly approves salary increases for teachers at 2.2%, these funds will allow the special schools to increase salaries of instructional staff by the same percentage as provided by the local school districts in which the special school resides.

**2. Increase teacher salaries**

The South Carolina Department of Education has requested that teacher salaries be increased by 2.2 percent in Fiscal Year 2022-23 using General Fund revenues. Teacher salaries could be funded using the funds in the recurring monies for 2022-23.

States throughout the Southeast are also focusing on increasing the minimum starting salary as well as increasing all teachers by a specific dollar amount. However, the General Assembly decides to increase teacher salaries, the EOC recognizes that the starting salary and the average teacher salary for teachers in South Carolina must be increased to stay competitive with the region. Revenue and Fiscal Affairs projects the average teacher salary for the Southeast to be \$54,695 in Fiscal Year 2021-22. The average teacher salary in South Carolina in school year 2020-21 was \$53,185. See Table 4 below.

**Table 4  
Teacher Salary Comparisons**

| <b>Fiscal Year</b> | <b>Southeastern Average Teacher Salary *</b> | <b>% Increase</b> | <b>SC Actual Average Teacher Salary</b> | <b>% Increase</b> | <b>Difference in SC Actual versus SE Average</b> | <b>% Above or Below SE Average</b> |
|--------------------|--|-------------------|---|-------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| 2013-14            | \$48,289                                     |                   | \$48,430                                |                   | \$141  | <b>0.3%</b>                        |
| 2014-15            | \$48,985                                     | 1.4%              | \$48,561                                | 0.3%              | (\$424)  | <b>-0.9%</b>                       |
| 2015-16            | \$49,363                                     | 0.8%              | \$48,769                                | 0.4%              | (\$594)  | <b>-1.2%</b>                       |
| 2016-17            | \$50,119                                     | 1.5%              | \$50,050                                | 2.6%              | (\$69)   | <b>-0.1%</b>                       |
| 2017-18            | \$50,750                                     | 1.3%              | \$50,182                                | 0.3%              | (\$568)  | <b>-1.1%</b>                       |
| 2018-19            | \$51,713                                     | 1.9%              | \$50,882                                | 1.4%              | (\$972)  | <b>-1.9%</b>                       |
| 2019-20            | \$53,333                                     | 3.1%              | \$53,329                                | 4.8%              | \$116  | +0.22%                             |
| 2020-21            | \$53,367                                     | 0%                | \$53,185                                | 0%                | (\$182)  | 0%                                 |
| 2021-22            | \$54,695                                     | 2.5%              |   |                   |  |                                    |
| 2022-23            | <b>\$55,898</b>                              | <b>2.3%</b>       |   |                   |  |                                    |

\* From Survey of states

Source: SC Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office, September 12, 2021

### **3. New minimum salary schedule**

The EOC recommends that the state consider amending the existing state minimum salary schedule to allow interested districts to pilot a new minimum salary schedule prior to potential state-wide implementation.

Attracting and retaining excellent teachers must always be a top state priority, now more than ever, as South Carolina seeks to help students recover from COVID-related learning losses. Creating more flexibility strategies to pay teachers as the professionals they are, and reward great teaching is vital.

One of the factors that impacts employee satisfaction is salary and the ability to “move up.” The current South Carolina statewide minimum salary schedule is known as a single salary schedule or “steps and lanes.” Teachers are paid based on steps that represent years of services or seniority and on lanes that are their educational attainment (e.g., bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, etc.).

In simplifying the salary schedule and implementing career levels, bands or ladders, the experience of Wisconsin should be considered. A report by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research documents the changes made. All districts moved away from the single salary structure to some degree. Several Wisconsin districts moved away from automatic step increases, choosing instead to create compensation systems that: embraced district goals, recognized teacher contributions to the organization, aligned

with the state’s teacher effectiveness system and moved to a career pathway approach. “The districts limited the number of lanes or change the lanes from education-based to a more career-level approach. All districts modified the steps to reflect a professional path for educators (as opposed to a uniform step and lane system), about half of the districts (in the sample survey) adapted a career level approach, also referred to as career bands or ladders.”<sup>3</sup>

A career-level approach for South Carolina could be implemented to address the following objectives:

- Teachers would be compensated for more than just seniority and educational achievement;
- Such as system might create career pathways that encourage individuals to remain classroom teachers; and
- Provide greater flexibility for schools and districts in recruiting teachers, especially teachers in hard-to-staff disciplines.

In addition to the single salary schedule, districts may give salary supplements or additional pay to teacher through stipends or bonuses. For example, teachers gaining National Board certification at the school may receive stipends. Teachers may also be eligible for hiring or performance bonuses while other districts offer bonuses for teachers who teach hard-to-staff subjects or in hard-to-staff schools.

The South Carolina 2020-21 state minimum salary schedule compensates teachers for years of experience from 0 to 23 years and educational level across five different levels - bachelor’s degree; bachelor’s degree plus 18 hours; master’s degree; master’s degree plus 18 hours; and doctorate.

A single salary schedule is used by most states because it minimizes pay bias regarding favoritism, gender and race. The system also gives predictability to teachers while incentivizing teachers to remain in the profession. The longer an individual is employed in the profession, the more pay he or she earns annually, even if the pay is only a 1 or 2 percentage increase. Most salary schedules “stop” after a certain number of years. In our state, the salary schedule stops at 23 years.

Individual districts, however, have extended the steps in their district salary schedule. Forty three percent or 34 districts have increased the teacher year’s experience to 30 years.

Based on the 2021-22 Minimum Salary Schedule posted on the South Carolina Department of Education website<sup>4</sup>, the following 19 districts have district salary schedules that “stop” at 23 years:

---

<sup>3</sup> Teacher Compensation: Standard Practices and Changes in Wisconsin. August 2016. Wisconsin Center for Education Research. <https://wcer.wisc.edu/docs/working-papers/Working Paper No 2016 5.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <https://ed.sc.gov/finance/financial-data/historical-data/teacher-salary-schedules/>

|           |            |             |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Abbeville | Allendale  | Anderson 4  |
| Bamberg 1 | Bamberg 2  | Barnwell 19 |
| Cherokee  | Colleton   | Dillon 3    |
| Hampton   | Laurens 55 | Lee         |
| McCormick | Marion 10  | Newberry    |
| York 1    |            |             |

The criticisms of the current system focus on its rigidity. The single salary schedule does not give flexibility for compensation to attract, reward and retain teachers. The single salary schedule also favors teachers with more seniority if across-the-board pay increases are implemented. In the event district revenues decline, districts are typically locked into paying teachers. Finally, research questions the link between a teacher’s education and/or seniority and students’ academic performance.

**Recommendation 10: Teacher Supplies \$610,000**

Proviso 1.A9 requires all teachers receive \$275 per school year for classroom/student use. Last year, the SCDE moved funds to cover the additional cost of teacher supply monies.

**Recommendation 11: S.C. Teacher Working Conditions Survey \$475,000**

*Access to High Quality Teacher Professional Development (Recruitment and Retention)*

Increasing the number of teachers entering the teaching profession is one strategy for reducing the teacher shortage. However, simultaneously addressing the problem of teacher turnover is equally as critical to providing high quality teachers for all of our schools. Research on teacher retention indicates teachers cite working conditions as the number one reason for leaving the teaching profession<sup>5</sup>. A growing body of research suggests working conditions for teachers influence the quality of teaching, teacher retention and school improvement<sup>6</sup>.

Currently, teachers can participate, annually, in an optional teacher climate survey online. This survey originated in 1985 as part of the 1984 Education Improvement Act. The survey focuses on six indicators of effectiveness: positive school climate, instructional leadership of principals, emphasis on academic, high expectations for students, frequent monitoring of students’ success and positive home/school relations. The results of this survey are reported on the school report card by three categories: percent satisfied with the learning environment, percent satisfied with

<sup>5</sup> Podolsky, A., Kini, T., Bishop, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016) Solving the Teacher Shortage. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute

<sup>6</sup> Johnson, S.N., Berg, J.H., Donaldson, M.L. (2005) Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature on teacher retention. Cambridge, MA: Harvard School of Education.

the social and physical environment, and percent satisfied with home/school relations.

It is recommended South Carolina the utilize a new Teacher Working Conditions Survey either adopted or adapted from the North Carolina Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning survey (TELL). Multiple states, including Colorado, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, and Oregon, are now using TELL as part of their strategy to learn more about what should be done to retain teachers from a state policy perspective as well as a district/school policy. A South Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey would provide a voice for all teachers in the following areas:

- Community support and involvement
- Teacher leadership
- School leadership
- Managing student conduct
- Use of time
- Professional development
- Facilities and resources
- Instructional practices and support
- New teacher support

The South Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey could be assigned to CERRA, USC's SC-TEACHER or other services bid to secure a vendor for the development and/or administration of the survey. The results would be reported at the state, district and school level. Minimum thresholds for teacher participation at the school level would need to be identified as well as the minimum number of teachers at a school/grade level so as not to be able identify a specific teacher. All teacher responses would be anonymous.

**Recommendation 12: School Quality Survey** **\$1,000,000**  
*Access to High Quality Teacher Professional Development (Recruitment and Retention)*

According to section 1111(c)(4)(B) of ESSA, statewide accountability systems must annually measure, for all students and for each state-identified subgroup in all public schools an indicator of school quality or student success (SQ-SS) that is valid and reliable, is comparable statewide (by grade span), and allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

For school year 2021-22, EOC staff is proposing that the current Student Climate Survey and Teacher Climate Surveys be utilized as the State's SQ-SS indicator – to determine 10 points on elementary and middle school cards, and 5 points on high school report cards. A student engagement survey was previously utilized to measure SQ-SS using the proposed point totals.

The current school climate instruments were developed in 1998, and surveys are distributed annually to parents, teachers, and students. Although the distribution, instructions, and questions have been updated and expanded over time, the climate surveys were not originally designed for inclusion in a school accountability system.

As such, the EOC is proposing a SQ-SS survey project to develop, procure, or revise available climate surveys for the purpose of creating a school quality survey that is a part of the school accountability system. This school quality accountability survey would seek input from a variety of stakeholders (e.g. teachers, students, and parents). This development project would include construct development, item development, field testing, and a full pilot of the proposed school accountability survey, to include an analysis of factor structure and the relationship between factors and relevant school level variables. The development project should also include an investigation of appropriate modes of survey deployment.

**Recommendation 13: PowerSchool/Data System** **\$3,200,000**  
*Access to High Quality Data to Inform Decisions*

The SCDE provides training for a data collection system composed of unique student identifiers (SUNS), an assessment reporting system and a student information system that is use by schools and districts. The increased funding is to:

- a. cloud host the student information system to decrease ransomware attacks (cost savings to districts).
- b. secure software to ensure CERDEP, First Steps and Head Start to have unduplicated SUNS numbers for 4K-12 experience.
- c. procure integrated data system so all data from special education, assessment and PowerSchool “talk” to each other.

**Recommendation 14: First Steps** **\$3,000,000**

First Steps is requesting funds to provide grants to local community partnerships to expand services to children birth to age 3. The EOC is recommending three million dollars be allocated to First Steps for this purpose in high priority counties. For each grant awarded, First Steps should collect documentation from each grantee as to how the grant funds were utilized, submit data to show outcomes and provide narrative as to obstacles/challenges in implementing the grant. This data would be useful providing guidance to future grantees.

**Recommendation 15: USC TIP** **\$750,000**

The USC TIP program has been in existence for several years, mentoring teachers who are in their first and second year of teaching by partnering with the school district to provide mentoring and assistance to these teachers. The teacher retention rate in the pilot districts is over 95%.

The EOC is recommending \$750,000 be allocated to expand this program into districts that meet the criteria to be in the Rural Teacher Recruitment Fund. These are districts with high turnover rates and are in most need of assistance in retaining teachers.

**Recommendation 16: Industry Credentials**

Industry credentials have been funded using EIA funds totaling three million dollars. Districts receive \$10,000 as a base for credentials plus are reimbursed for actual credential testing each year.

Some multi-district career centers are experiencing a lack of reimbursements for credential testing completed at its site. A mechanism to reimburse multi-district career centers should be established by the SCDE.

**Recommendation 17: Charter Schools Same as 2021-22**

Given the uncertainty in charter school enrollment moving forward, the EOC recommends charter schools should be funded at the same level as 2021-22 in the amount of \$162,378,978. Funding from surplus funding will allow for the same flexibility during the past year. Average daily memberships (ADM) over the last few years indicates charter schools, while growing, are not growing at the same rates as projected.

Average daily memberships (ADM) are shown below.

|                | FY 2017-18      | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 | (est)<br>FY 2021-22 |
|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|
| <b>Public</b>  | 25,563          | 19,636     | 20,507     | 15,491     | 18,331              |
| <b>Erskine</b> | NA <sup>7</sup> | 8,415      | 9,824      | 23,031     | 27,023              |
| <b>Total</b>   | 25,563          | 28,051     | 30,331     | 38,522     | 45,354              |

Source: SC Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office, SC Department of Education, 135 ADM Count, 9/2/2021

Actual ADM on the 45 day for 2021-22 is:

|              |                       |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| Public       | 16,790 (+1300)        |
| Erskine      | 23,470 (+ 439)        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>40,260 (+1739)</b> |

The actual 45 ADM for 2021-22 is less than the estimated 135 ADM for 2021-22 for each school as shown on the South Carolina Department of Education website.

<sup>7</sup> First Year of operation for Erskine

Increases expected from new schools in 2021-22 did not materialize, more than likely due to COVID. These schools are operational in 2021-22. Schools with increases in virtual school student membership due to COVID in 2020-21 are now showing declines in student membership in 2021-22.

It is recommended that the 90 ADM be reviewed to determine if additional funds should be allocated to charter schools from surplus dollars.

**Recommendation 18: Career and Technology Education (CATE) \$5,000,000**

Currently, schools are allocated \$20,072,135 for career and technology education equipment. With the cost of equipment increasing and with the importance of technical skill development for high school students, the EOC is recommending an additional \$5,000,000 be allocated to schools for the purpose of securing additional CATE equipment. Monies are to be allocated based on the same formula used for the current allocation. These additional funds are to be used for equipment for pathways that provide for an industry certification.

**Recommendation 19: High Dose Tutoring \$50,000,000**

With the loss of school days due to Covid over the past 18 months, students have fallen further behind in English language arts and mathematics. One of the most powerful strategies that addresses the loss of student learning is High Dose Tutoring<sup>8</sup>. The EOC recommends a pilot be conducted through the South Carolina Department of Education to prioritize those districts/schools with students who have shown the largest decline in performance in English language arts and/or mathematics.

Research indicates High Dose Tutoring is most effective when implemented as one-on-one tutoring or tutoring in very small groups in at three times a weeks or about 50 hours per semester. Tutoring can be held in-school, after school or in summer school. High quality materials should be used in the tutoring process. In order to determine the long-term efficacy of the tutoring, districts who participate are to share formative and summative data from the students who participated in the tutoring. The EOC will be responsible for conducting the analysis of the data.

---

<sup>8</sup> Annenberg Center at Brown University. (2021). *National Student Support Accelerator*. <https://studentsupportaccelerator.com>.

## **IV. Evaluation of Alignment of EIA**

### **Review of EIA Funding Procedures**

Dealing with the educational impact of COVID-19 will require a strategic deployment of all education resources around a set of clearly defined goals and outcomes. While funding many commendable programs, EIA funding has become disjointed and must be refocused around a high-level strategic plan designed to support students and educators with the greatest efficiency and measurable impact. Accordingly, the EOC initiated a process to conduct an independent evaluation of EIA Programs.

The Education Improvement Act of 1984 was established to promote excellence in education in South Carolina schools. Specifically, the Education Improvement Act set out to improve schools in South Carolina by increasing student academic achievement, providing better services to special groups of students and school personnel, improving school conditions, involving extensive community involvement in school affairs, and gaining higher public confidence in our schools.

Currently, the EIA funds 30 programs under the South Carolina Department of Education and 25 programs to other agencies/entities within South Carolina. On an annual basis, each program provides the EOC with a program review that includes goals, strategies and outcomes. Financial data is also provided.

Over the years many of the EIA programs currently funded do not provide the detailed data needed to ensure the programs are working for the purpose stated and/or meet the overarching goals created by the Education Improvement Act. In order to gain a better understanding of the effectiveness/impact an EIA program has, the EOC is conducting program evaluations of EIA funded programs. Because of the need to attract and retain quality teachers, the EOC prioritized the category of Improving Teacher Quality: Teacher Recruitment and Retention, for the year one evaluation. The specific programs to be evaluated in 2021-22 are:

- a. CERRA
- b. Teacher Quality Commission
- c. Teach for America
- d. Recruitment of Minority Teachers
- e. Teacher Loan Program
- f. Call Me Mister
- g. USC Pilot Teacher Recruitment Program
- h. SC State Bridge
- i. Claflin Bridge

The evaluations of these programs will include the data needed to determine if the intended goals of the EIA program are being met, the actual impact on student learning, and/or if the program was appropriate to be funded under EIA. Results of

the evaluations and recommendations from the EOC based on the evaluation results will be shared with the EOC, the Governor and the General Assembly for consideration of future funding.

## V. K-12 Funding Issues

### 1. Re-evaluate the K-12 Funding Formula for South Carolina

Full-scale, systemic reform of school funding (charter and non-charter) is needed to ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability. The recent Education Funding Model created by the Office of Revenue and Fiscal Affairs in 2019 could be a starting point for this process. (Note this model did not address charter schools in its analysis, and charter schools would need to be included in future analyses.)

### 2. Charter School Funding

Charter school enrollments have been increasing each year. Average daily memberships (ADM) are shown below.

|                | FY 2017-18      | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 | (est)<br>FY 2021-22 |
|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|
| <b>Public</b>  | 25,563          | 19,636     | 20,507     | 15,491     | 18,331              |
| <b>Erskine</b> | NA <sup>9</sup> | 8,415      | 9,824      | 23,031     | 27,023              |
| <b>Total</b>   | 25,563          | 29,460     | 30,331     | 38,522     | 45,354              |

Source: SC Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office, SC Department of Education, 135 ADM Count, 9/2/2021

Actual ADM on the 45 day for 2021-22 is:

|         |                |
|---------|----------------|
| Public  | 16,790 (+1300) |
| Erskine | 23,470 (+ 439) |
| Total   | 40,260 (+1739) |

The actual 45ADM for 2021-22 is less than the estimated 135 ADM for 2021-22 for each school as shown on the South Carolina Department of Education website.

With the continuous increase in the number of charter school students, funding charter schools from EIA funds is creating a dilemma.

Requests for additional funding for both charter schools for 2022-23 is \$17,407,470. Total EIA funding for charter schools for 2021-22 was \$162,378,978.

How South Carolina funds charter schools, for the per pupil local share, is at a point that a new method should be considered. Considerations include:

- Instead of funding charter schools at the 135-day membership report, capture actual students enrolled at the 45 day membership report to get an accurate picture of the year's enrollment

<sup>9</sup> First Year of operation for Erskine

- Allow home district's local share to follow the student thereby eliminating the need for the per pupil share in EIA
- Look at funding local per pupil share from other sources in the general fund revenues.
- Be reminded that charter schools receive the full EFA funding and are not funded using the index of tax paying ability as with non-charter public schools.

# Education Data Dashboards

*Protecting Privacy, Promoting Transparency, Providing for Informed Decision-making*



## Why Now?

Now, more than ever, South Carolina needs to prioritize systemic and transformational improvements in education, from kindergarten to college and career readiness. Prior to the pandemic, too few of SC students were performing at sufficient levels to be successful beyond their schooling — and South Carolina’s economic advantage remains in jeopardy. The pandemic has exacerbated the problem; in school year 2020-21, less than half of South Carolina elementary and middle school students were on grade level in math or reading.

Time can’t be wasted. Currently available data could help children, if it is made accessible in a secure, interactive, transparent portal. Once the information is made available in an understandable fashion, good, informed decisions can be made on behalf of children and the people who serve them each day.

## What insights will we gain?

- Visually appealing information which can bring data to life, rather than static files which do not support multiple variables or allow for questions.

*Are there pockets of South Carolina where students in poverty cannot gain access to high-quality, State-funded four-year-old programs?*

- The ability to filter data by multiple variables, leading to greater engagement of all stakeholders.

*Do certain risk factors compound to make some children more vulnerable to lower academic outcomes and if so, what interventions are changing the outcomes for children?*

- Advanced analytics which can identify trends in data, providing a clearer picture of where we have been and how to best move forward.

*What schools have high rates of principal and teacher retention, and do those factors impact student achievement?*



If we can't measure it, we can't manage it.  
*If we can't see it, we won't even know.*

## Who will benefit from an Education Data Dashboard?



**Parents and families** will have the ability to access and understand information regarding the performance of their local school on a mobile, user-friendly platform.

Equipped with information, they can actively participate in their role as part of their child's educational support system and know how to better help schools and students as a whole.

**District/school/classroom leaders** will gain access to integrated information to help shape real-time instructional strategies and decisions for the continuous improvement of schools.

Creating this information equity is especially important in districts that do not have the capacity or expertise to independently develop this type of integrated data system.



**Business/Community Leaders** will have the ability to transparently compare academic performance and funding to drive educational advocacy conversations, and look for innovative ways to support their employees and schools in their home communities.

**Policymakers** will have the ability to determine if programmatic policy and fiscal decisions are improving outcomes for students and making life better overall for their constituents.

### *Proposed budget proviso language which would aid in the creation of an Education Data Dashboard:*

The Education Oversight Committee is directed to pilot an Education Data Dashboard. The data dashboard must interface with existing systems to provide school districts, schools, policymakers, families, and the public with meaningful information on school district, school, and system progress. The Education Data Dashboard would use existing data to document educational attainment and growth as well as financial expenditures of state, local, and federal funds. The Department of Education and public school districts shall provide accountability data as requested by the Committee for the establishment of the dashboard.

