

**SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**Minutes of the Joint Meeting
February 8, 2010**

EOC members present: Mr. Robinson, Mr. Stowe, Dr. Woodall, Rep. Anthony, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Sen. Fair, Mrs. Hairfield, Sen. Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin, Mrs. Murphy, Rep. Neal, and Dr. Rex

- I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Robinson and Mr. Moore, Chairman of the State Board of Education, welcomed members and guests to the meeting.
- II. Common Core Initiative: Dr. Rex made brief remarks about the Common Core Standards Initiative, a state-led effort initially endorsed by the National Governors' Association and the Council of Chief School State Officers. He introduced Gene Wilhoit, Executive Director of the Council of Chief State School Offices. Joining the group via conference call, Mr. Wilhoit discussed the history of the Common Core Initiative and the goal of producing higher, clearer, and fewer standards. He discussed the adoption timeline. For states to take advantage of \$350 million of federal monies to develop assessments, the initiative must be approved by August 2, 2010.
- III. The Process for Decision-Making/Transition to Common Core: Dr. Valerie Harrison, SCDE Deputy Superintendent for Standards and Learning, discussed the process for decision-making related to the Common Core as well as the transition from the current standards to the Common Core. She discussed details of the upcoming comparative review process and the objective to produce end results that are going to be good for students. If the schedule holds, 2012-2013 will be the implementation year for Common Core, translating high-level standards into classroom practice.
- IV. Assessing the Common Core: Liz Jones, SCDE Director of Assessment, discussed the consortium which are available to states. Consortium members are working to develop curriculum and assessments tied to the Common Core.

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
April 19, 2010

I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Robinson welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He asked that the agenda be amended to provide for the Academic Standards and Assessments Subcommittee report following other subcommittee reports and to provide for an executive session to discuss a personnel matter. The change to the agenda was approved.

II. Minutes of the February 8 Meeting: The minutes of the February 8 meetings were amended to add the following statements to the end of the minutes, "The EOC led an extended and vigorous discussion of the Common Core. A number of questions were raised about the benefits of adoption to South Carolina and the potential for lowering the expectations held for our students." The addition was approved subject to Mr. Robinson's approval of the language. The minutes were approved as amended.

III. Subcommittee Reports:

(B) EIA and Improvement Mechanisms: Mr. Drew asked that Mrs. Barton report on the Status of the General Appropriations Bill. Mrs. Barton shared information to supplement the summary (through the House of Representatives actions) provided in the meeting packet. This information included the following actions taken by the Senate Fiancé Committee (SFC):

- The Education Finance Act and related fringe benefits were funded at the House-passed level. This provides for a base student cost of \$1,630. The result is an EFA funding level \$800 million lower than the level required to fund the EFA at the projected base student cost of \$2,720, including restoration of all mid-year cuts;
- Companion joint resolutions are moving forward which provide for PASS assessments in reading and research, mathematics, science and social studies as now tested and limiting PASS writing assessments to grades 5 and 8. The Resolutions also provide for electronic versions of the school and district report card and the establishment of a task force to examine the utility of the high school exit exam and if alternatives could be identified which are less costly;
- The SFC modified the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards program to provide for a \$5,000 supplement to new entrants and that new entrants must pay for their application; and
- The SFC deleted a House proposal to amend the statewide minimum teacher salary in 2010-11 by freezing step increases, contending that the amendment violated Senate Rule 24. In response, a joint resolution H.4838 was introduced to allow local school district boards of trustees to freeze step increases uniformly for all teachers for the next school year. Similarly, school district boards of trustees could not increase the salary and compensation of administrators.

Members discussed a number of aspects of the decisions including the difficult choice between keeping the step increases and retaining teachers. Senator Hayes and Senator Fair provided information on the process and decisions. Rep. Anthony discussed the impact of Act 388 and the quick shift from a \$1.6 billion surplus to today's limited revenues.

(A) Academic Standards and Assessments: Mr. Stowe introduced the report on the review of the social studies academic standards. He asked Dr. Anderson to review the process by which the recommendations were developed and how they are to be used. Senator Fair asked what "update" meant in the context of standards on history. Mrs. Hershey clarified that these standards were not linked to the Common Core standards under review. Ms. Bosket asked a number of questions regarding the potential difficulty of the revised standards and the impact of the revisions on assessments. Mr. Drew shared his concern that students not develop myopic views.

The recommendations were approved for transmittal to the State Superintendent of Education.

IV. General Report: Findings from the 2009 Parent Survey - Mrs. Barton presented information on the analysis of results of the 2009 parent survey. She outlined a number of issues including:

- There were no changes in the administration of the parent survey in 2009;
- Approximately one-third of all eligible parents completed the survey, an average response rate considering the mode of distribution;
- The results showed a significant annual increase as well as a significant increase over time in parent satisfaction with the learning environment, home and school relations, and social and physical environment of their child's school;
- Unlike previous years the results could not be analyzed based on the absolute rating of the schools because the data were not available until release of report cards on April 16, 2010;
- Comparing the results of the parent survey with the results of the 2009 survey of teachers and students, satisfaction with home and school relations was consistent among parents, teachers and students. Teachers were overwhelmingly more satisfied with the learning environment and social and physical environment of the school. And, several questions on the three surveys focus on homework. The responses by teachers, parents and students revealed a concerted effort to support learning at home through the monitoring of homework; and
- The state of California has developed a workbook to assist schools in using survey data along with assessment and financial data to improve school climate and close achievement gaps.

The recommendations included joint EOC-SCDE development of a tool kit for schools to use in working with the data and using electronic responses for parents. Mr. Robinson asked if there was a cost estimate for the tool kit. Mrs. Hershey expressed concerns with parent access to computers.

V. Discussion of the 2009 Ratings: Mr. Potter presented a report on the 2009 ratings, using the Discussion Points as a guide. Mr. Potter also summarized the study underway by the 2010 High School Working Group. After his presentation a number of questions were posed. Senator Fair asked for information regarding the inclusion of students in group homes, residential treatment facilities and similar settings. Senator Hayes asked about the impact of the transition from PACT to PASS. Mr. Neal wants information on the impact of including students from special schools, alternative schools and other non-traditional school organizations. He asked why the charter schools performed at such a low level. Members asked questions regarding performance on each of the high school measures. Mr. Robinson noted the stress that families and their students as well as educators are undergoing during this difficult economic time.

VI. Other Business: Upon the motion of Mr. Martin, the EOC went into Executive Session.

The veil was lifted from Executive Session. Mr. Robinson announced that no votes or actions had been taken in executive session.

Senator Hayes moved that Dr. Anderson's contract be set at 80 percent level beginning June 1 and that her contract be extended. Mr. Robinson indicated that the contract extension is through June 30, 2011. The motion was seconded and passed.

The meeting adjourned.

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
June 14, 2010
As corrected on August 9, 2010

Members present: Mr. Robinson, Rep. Anthony, Ms. Bosket, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Senator Fair, Mrs. Hairfield, Senator Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin, Mrs. Murphy, Superintendent Rex, Mr. Stowe and Mr. Willis.

- I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Robinson welcomed members and guests to the meeting.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of April 19, 2010: Mr. Stowe moved and Mr. Drew seconded that the minutes of April 19 be approved as distributed.

III. Subcommittee Reports:

- A. Academic Standards and Assessments. Mr. Stowe reported on behalf of the subcommittee.

(1) The Common Core Academic Standards - Mr. Stowe indicated that the subcommittee had held two lengthy meetings to consider recommendations to adopt the Common Core Academic Standards, with implementation scheduled for 2013-2014. He outlined the process by which comparisons to the current standards had been accomplished. The Subcommittee recommended adoption of the Common Core, as a minimum of 85% of the state's content standards.

Senator Fair asked a number of questions regarding the national approach to curriculum and if the Common Core would strengthen the education we offered our young people. Dr. Valerie Harrison, on behalf of the SC Department of Education (SCDE), responded to the questions indicated that the Common Core deepened what student are to learn, did not lower the state standards and cultivated conceptual thinking. Dr. Rex affirmed statements that the Common Core is not a federal government initiative but an on-going process. He urged adoption. Mr. Willis inquired about online assessments and the burden placed upon local districts. Dr. Harrison described the process of international benchmarking. Mrs. Liz Jones, on behalf of SCDE, outlined the state's participation in two consortia for the development of assessments. Mr. Stowe asked about the state's need to invest in technology. Mrs. Jones said there would be some investments needed; however, the secure testing window would be longer and reduce the hardware costs. She stated that the state could opt out of the consortia at any time. Mr. Cotty asked what penalty (what would the state lose) by waiting to adopt until a later time. He liked the concept of the Common Core but felt too many questions were unanswered. Mrs. Hershey asked why other states were not adopting or were not adopting this soon, pointing out the Race to the Top requirements and the link to federal dollars (although those dollars are less than 1 percent of SC expenditures). Dr. Harrison indicated that the reason to adopt must be for the good of students, not an incentive external to the state. Senator Fair indicated the unresolved issues include the cyclical review of the standards as defined under the EAA and the lack of information regarding any periodic review of the Common Core as well as a process for resolving differences in emphasis and content. Mrs. Hershey expressed concern over the federal use of the Common Core as incentive or requirement. Rep. Anthony cautioned against ideological positions and indicated support for the common assessments. Mrs. Bosket expressed appreciation for the work of the SCDE. She stated that no data exist to indicate that the Common Core would lead to higher achievement and asked how the Common Core would change classrooms. Mrs. Hairfield asked about strategies to support students who currently are not achieving; how will these students be supported as we implement more rigorous standards?

Mr. Drew called the question. Rep. Anthony seconded. Dr. Rex commented that the Common Core is not risky for SC as the state already has high standards; the Common Core is risky for those states with lower standards.

Mrs. Hershey asked for a roll call vote.

The members voted as below:

| | |
|----------------|---------|
| Mr. Anthony | yes |
| Mrs. Bosket | no |
| Mr. Cotty | no |
| Mr. Drew | abstain |
| Sen. Fair | no |
| Mrs. Hairfield | yes |
| Mrs. Hershey | no |
| Sen. Hayes | yes |
| Mr. Martin | yes |
| Mrs. Murphy | yes |
| Mr. Robinson | yes |
| Mr. Stowe | yes |
| Mr. Willis | yes |

The Common Core was adopted by a vote of 8 yes, 4 no and 1 abstain.

(2) Recommendations: Biology End-of-Course Test - Mr. Stowe reviewed the response of the SC Department of Education to the EOC recommendations and moved approval of the assessment. The assessment was approved.

(3) Recommendations: SC-Alternate Test: Social Studies - Mr. Stowe reviewed the response of the SC Department of Education to the EOC recommendations and moved approval of the assessment. The assessment was approved.

B. EIA and Improvement Mechanisms: Mr. Drew reported on the progress of the Fiscal Year 2011 budget and the vetoes pending before the General Assembly.

C. Public Awareness: Mr. Willis expressed concern with the 2020 Vision benchmarks in regards to the inclusion of severely disabled children and involvement of other groups in receiving information.

IV. Special Reports

A. 2010 High School Working Group: Mr. Martin reviewed the work and recommendations of the 2010 High School Working Group. The report is to be posted on the EOC website for public comment through July 20 with action anticipated at the August 9 meeting. Dr. Rex indicated the report was strong and thanked the group for their work. Senator Hayes asked if legislative action would be needed on those recommendations; Senator Fair asked if there was a discussion of the Carnegie units required to graduate from high school, particularly in comparison to other states. He also suggested that the workforce and business community needed to advocate for the changes.

B. District Ratings: Mr. Potter outlined the models for re-centering the district ratings. The report is to be posted on the EOC website for public comment through July 20 with action anticipated at the August 9 meeting.

Mr. Robinson asked that a staff recommendation on these two issues be offered at the August meeting.

V. New Business

Mr. Robinson read a resolution acknowledging Mr. Potter's service to the EOC and to the young people of South Carolina. Committee members stood and applauded.

Mr. Robinson expressed appreciation to the members for their deep and spirited discussions and thanked legislators for their support. Dr. Rex suggested that the EOC plan for succession of these discussions, perhaps in conjunction with the State Board of Education.

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
August 9, 2010

Members present: Mr. Robinson, Rep. Anthony, Ms. Bosket, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Senator Fair, Mrs. Hairfield, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin, Dr. Merck, Rep. Neal, Mr. Stowe, Mrs. Taylor, Mr. Willis

Invited Guests: Mr. Holleman, Dr. Zais, Mrs. Cauthen, Ms. Heatwole, Mrs. Marini, Dr. Siskind, Mrs. Smith

I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Robinson welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He introduced recently-appointed EOC members, Dr. Danny Merck and Mrs. Ann Marie Taylor to those present. He also introduced Dr. Kevin Andrews who is beginning the position of Director of Research on September 1. He asked public attendees to introduce themselves.

Mr. Robinson opened the meeting for any comments from the public. Dr. Debbie Hamm addressed the group on behalf of the SC Association of School Administrators regarding benchmarks by which attainment of the 2020 Vision is to be measured.

Mr. Robinson congratulated school personnel and students on the improvements in PASS performance.

Mr. Robinson asked for approval of the minutes of June 14. Mr. Willis asked for an elaboration of his position stated under Item III.C. Senator Fair asked for additional language addressing the cyclical review process under Item III.A. Mrs. Hershey asked for additional comments regarding Item III.A. Mr. Robinson asked that the minutes be revised and brought to the EOC at its October meeting for approval.

Mr. Robinson asked to amend the agenda to provide for the election of a vice-chairman at the end of the meeting.

II. 2020 Vision

A. Information: Where Are We Now: Dana Yow provided the EOC members with a twelve-year perspective on improvements in statewide student achievement. She presented information relative to the 2010 Goal and the 2020 Vision. Members had a number of questions: Senator Fair asked about the relationship between dual credit courses and the Advanced Placement program. Mr. Willis asked about the relationship between the SAT and the AP programs. Mrs. Taylor had questions about SAT rankings. Mrs. Hershey expressed concerns that the number of schools at risk was lowered by re-centering rather than improvements in achievement. Mr. Willis asked if a statewide occupational diploma would be included in the reported graduation rates.

Mrs. Yow informed EOC members that a tool kit regarding afterschool programs in literacy which was developed in partnership with the SC After school Alliance had drawn the attention of the White House director for community and faith-based partnerships. We have been asked permission for duplication.

B. Information: Public Perception: Mrs. Yow presented a historical perspective of public attitudes toward schools in South Carolina, drawing from reports published between 1944 and 2009. Mr. Robinson commented that the issues remain the same; however, we are

educating more students to a higher level of performance. Mrs. Hershey commented about the emphasis on character in earlier years and the shift toward value-free curriculum in the 1970s.

C. Information: Technical Assistance and Professional Development: Mrs. Barton presented a twelve-year perspective on technical assistance and professional development. She outlined the interventions used, the allocations of funds by intervention and the successes (and lack of successes) demonstrated among schools. Mrs. Hairfield asked about stability in the principal leadership roles; Mr. Willis asked if the enrollment declines meant a loss of “good students.” (Losses are associated with the decline in population generally in about half of SC school districts.) Mr. Stowe questioned if technical assistance dollars are being used to supplant other state funds lost during the recession. Rep. Neal asked how we could monitor the optimum use of funds and how policy could address the economic distress in these schools. Mrs. Hershey asked if we had data on a student’s next enrollment. Mr. Martin commented that private and charter school options are virtually non-existent in many rural communities. Mrs. Taylor addressed issues of teacher recruitment and retention. Rep. Neal discussed the need to address language differences among children and to recognize that differences in language were not indicative of disability or aptitude. Senator Fair asked how we address these issues in the Common Core. Members expressed concerns with over-diagnosis of disabilities and how to address teacher readiness. Interest was expressed in issues and policies to ensure that children enter school ready to learn. Rep. Neal described a model used in Hawaii. Senator Fair described the Duke-funded nurse home program operating in six South Carolina communities. After additional discussion members concurred with Rep. Neal’s call for greater flexibility to respond to local needs and the needs of individual children.

The EOC recessed for lunch.

Discussion with the Candidates for State Superintendent of Education. Mr. Robinson introduced Mr. Holleman and Dr. Zais. Each made remarks and then responded to questions from members of the EOC.

D. Information: Achieving the Vision - Dr. Anderson outlined the process by which the EOC had solicited comments and recommendations from education groups and the general public. These included direct correspondence and placement on the EOC web page. Comments were available from sixteen organizations and were summarized in the meeting packet. Generally there is consensus around the following issues:

- Common Core standards
- Uniform Assessments for early literacy
- Expansion of full-day 4k opportunities (through all public and private providers)
- Greater emphasis on reading in teacher preparation and professional development
- Strong state policies on reading
- Improved data systems and usage

Other recommendations include the following:

- Further integration of arts and academics to develop cognitive skills
- Emphasis on physical needs of children (pre-natal through school years)
- Workforce credential for high school
- Improve assessments and related instruction for students with disabilities

E. Action: 2020 Benchmarks - Dr. Anderson provided members with information on the parsing of the 2020 goal across three year benchmarks as had been requested by the EOC. She outlined the concerns expressed in Dr. Rex’ letter with the 2011 benchmark and with the differences in closing the gap and graduation rate objectives. Members discussed the utility of

benchmarks as indicators of progress. Mr. Willis indicated that there should be a single set of objectives, not different ones as we have with the Race to the Top application, the EOC, the State Chamber of Commerce, etc. Other members suggested that different benchmarks and aspirations would always occur among organizations. Mrs. Hershey and Mrs. Bosket expressed support for differing and higher benchmarks. Ms. Bosket indicated that the EOC is formed to be an independent body and that the Race to the Top application would yield less than one percent of education spending in SC. After discussion, Mr. Drew moved that the benchmarks be referred to the Academic Standards and Assessments subcommittee for further consideration. Mr. Willis seconded; the motion passed 11-4.

F. Action: Fall Meetings - Mrs. Yow outlined the purpose, materials and plan for the fall meeting with legislators. Members were enthusiastic and committed to participate and fund the meetings.

III. Testing and Accountability

A. Information: Scope and Costs of Testing - Dr. Anderson reviewed a summary document detailing the components of state testing and the costs. Testing programs used in the accountability system were highlighted.

B. Action: Recommendations of the High School Working Group - The recommendations of the High School Working Group were discussed and actions taken as noted below:

Ninth Grade Students

1.1 The Working Group recommends that the Education Oversight Committee, the State Board of Education and the SC Department of Education pursue changes in federal policies and regulations to address the Working Group's concern;

The EOC adopted the recommendation.

1.2 Within the authority of the SC Department of Education to interpret federal guidelines, the Working Group recommends that only those students enrolled on the 45th day of their first enrollment as a ninth grader (applying the current rules for transfers) be included in the calculation of graduation rates; and

The EOC adopted the recommendation.

1.3 The district should be held accountable for students who may have left the middle school, yet not enrolled in the high school. The Working Group believes that the new student information system (i.e., Power School) gives districts and the state the capacity to track students across schools and that the districts have resources to find the students not enrolled as ninth graders.

The EOC adopted the recommendation.

Students Experiencing Extended Illness

2.1 The Working Group requests that policies and procedures be established so that a district superintendent may provide documentation and request that the State Superintendent of Education reassign a student to a different graduation year cohort because of a catastrophic and/or extended illness which precludes the student from pursuing the high school diploma over the four-year period.

The EOC deferred action on the recommendation.

Students in Adult Education

3.1 The Working Group applauds the efforts of the adult education program leaders and teachers and celebrates the successes of that program. The Working Group recommends that additional information about the successes of adult education be published within the profile data section of the annual district report card, reporting not only on the diplomas and General Equivalency Diplomas (GEDs) earned in adult education program but workforce readiness and other credentials recognizing student proficiency as well as the attainment of federal performance levels; and

The EOC adopted the recommendation.

3.2 The Working Group recommends that the SC Department refine intra-agency data sharing so that the adult education students may be included in the high school fifth-year-graduation rates.

The EOC adopted the recommendation.

Students with Disabilities

4.1 The Working Group recommends the General Assembly provide for the development and implementation of a uniform state occupational diploma and that the State Board of Education regulate its award to students. The diploma requirements should include limited eligibility, earned Carnegie units, community living and service learning experiences and be a credential option *only* for students with disabilities whose Individual Education Plan (IEP) provides that they are not on the diploma track. The Working Group calls upon the General Assembly and the State Board of Education to ensure that this uniform state occupational diploma does not become a “dumping ground.” The addition of this option should be accompanied by programmatic changes to provide additional teaching, learning and school engagement opportunities for all students with disabilities, even those earning Carnegie units, so that they may succeed in high school and in the work force when they finish high school;

With respect to Recommendations 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, the EOC requests additional information and definition for eligibility and program design prior to acting. Action was deferred until the information is received and reviewed by the Academic Standards and Assessments subcommittee.

4.2 While the Working Group acknowledges the federal barriers to reporting those students who earn the uniform state occupational diploma as a graduate in the calculation of the state graduation rate, the Working Group urges policymakers to advocate for their inclusion in state rates; and

4.3 The Working Group further recommends that assessments which provide information about the progress of students with disabilities be adopted and used, particularly for students working toward a uniform state occupational diploma. The current assessments (SC-Alt, HSAP and end-of-course tests) do not reflect the progress made by these students.

End-of-Course Scores Earned in Virtual and Dual Credit Settings

5.1 The Working Group recommends that end-of-course test passage rates for students enrolled in virtual and dual credit courses be collected and reported for each agency or institution offering the courses; and

The EOC adopted the recommendation.

5.2 The Working Group recommends that the end-of-course test scores linked to virtual and dual credit courses be excluded from the high school rating calculation.

The EOC adopted the recommendation

High School Assessment Program

6.1 The Working Group asks that the responsibilities of the High School Assessment Program task force, pursuant to H4823, be expanded to include study of the use of a workforce readiness credential in lieu of the HSAP exit examination. The study should include alignment with the content standards, comparison of performance for those students already taking both HSAP and a workforce readiness exam and a pilot study to compare student and school performance.

The EOC adopted the recommendation

Fifth-year-graduation Rate

7.1 The Working Group recommends that the fifth-year-graduation rate be included as a separate criterion in the calculation of high school ratings. While results from the SCDE 2009 study (www.eoc.sc.gov) suggest that an overall two percent increase was realized by responding high schools, the Working Group believes that attention to the fifth-year can result in much higher rates over time; and

The EOC adopted the recommendation

7.2 The Working Group recommends that the EOC monitor those rates to ascertain impact over the next five years.

The EOC adopted the recommendation

Workforce Readiness

8.1 The Working Group recommends that the EEDA Coordinating Council collect and publish data on the success of students and the IGP process; and

The EOC is requesting copies of the currently published report and does not request additional action.

8.2 The Working Group recommends that Work Keys be considered as an alternate method by which students can demonstrate competency to satisfy state-mandated testing requirements.

The EOC adopted the recommendation

Re-centering the High School Absolute Ratings Criteria and Indices

9.1 After study of each of the criteria included in the calculation of the high school ratings, the performance of schools on these criteria and the weights and values assigned to these in the ratings calculation, the Working Group recommends the following be used in the determination of absolute ratings for the 2010-2011 school year and beyond:

- (a) Five criteria should be used in the calculation of the high school rating: First-attempt HSAP, longitudinal HSAP, end-of-course test scores, on-time graduation rate and fifth-year-graduation rate (Model Two);

- (b) The criteria should be weighted as below:
 - 1. First-attempt HSAP 20%
 - 2. Longitudinal HSAP 20%
 - 3. End-of-course test scores 20%
 - 4. On-time graduation rate 30%
 - 5. Fifth-year-graduation rate; 10%
- (c) A 0.75 standard deviation applied to the 2009-centered performance should be used to establish point weights for each criterion;
- (d) Values for the longitudinal HSAP and fifth year graduation rate should be changed so that a school may earn five points for performance at the 97 percent level;
- (e) The Elementary-Middle values for indices should be used to determine the ratings.

The EOC adopted the recommendation

9.2 For the determination of absolute ratings in 2010 (i.e., report cards published in fall 2010), the 2009-centered performance on each criterion at the 0.75 standard deviation, using Elementary-Middle values for indices should be used.

The EOC adopted the recommendation

C. Action: District Criteria and Ratings - Dr. Anderson reviewed the recommendations regarding the criteria and calculation of district ratings. The EOC approved the following:

The EOC staff recommends adoption of Model 2 for the criteria, effective with the academic year 2010-2011, as shown below:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| State Assessment Results, grades 3-8 | 50% |
| On-time Graduation Rate | 30% |
| 1 st Attempt HSAP | 5% |
| End-of-Course Test Results | 5% |
| Fifth Year Graduation Rate | 10% |

The EOC staff recommends use of the 0.75 Standard Deviation shown in Table 12 for Model 2 to be used in the index values associated with ratings categories.

The EOC staff recommends use of 0.75 Standard Deviation shown in Table 12 for Model 1 for the 2009-2010 report card calculations.

The EOC staff recommends that Growth ratings for 2008-2010 and 2010-2011 be determined using common criteria.

The EOC adopted the recommendations.

IV. Participation on Other Governing Bodies

A. Information: Education and Economic Development Act - Mr. Martin reported on the progress of IGP implementation. He noted that the reduction in funding for career development facilitators is leading to combination of career development facilitator and guidance counselor functions as well as increases in the student to counselor ratios. He indicated that virtual job shadowing and other innovative strategies are being used to maintain the substance of the approach. 2011 is graduation year for the first cohort of students.

B. Information: Statewide Charter School District - Mr. Robinson indicated that Mr. Martin is the EOC's nominee for the position on the SCPCSD board which was vacated when Mr. Brennan resigned from the EOC.

C, Information: Charter School Advisory Committee - Mr. Drew reported on the work of the Advisory Committee which is limited to verification that charter school applications meet the criteria outlined in law. In 2009-2010 37 charter schools were operational; 8 are opening in the fall of 2010 and another 5 are scheduled to open in the fall of 2011.

D. Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities - Dr. Anderson reported on the school noting the opportunity afforded to a limited number of artistically gifted students. She shared a *Celebration of Achievement* document and drew members' attention to the post-high school plans of the graduates.

V. EOC Roles and Responsibilities

A. Action: Objectives for 2010-2011 - Mr. Robinson asked Dr. Anderson to draft the objectives, taking into consideration the discussions of the August 9 meeting and bring those to the full committee at its October meeting.

B. Action: Election of a Vice Chairman - Mr. Anthony moved that Mrs. Hairfield be elected vice chairman. Rep. Cotty seconded. Mrs. Hairfield was elected unanimously.

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting

October 11, 2010

Members present: Mr. Robinson, Mrs. Hairfield, Rep. Anthony, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Senator Fair, Senator Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin, Dr. Merck, Rep. Neal, Supt. Rex, Mr. Willis

- I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Robinson welcomed members and guests to the meeting.
- II. Approval of the Minutes:
 - A. The Minutes of June 14 were presented and adopted.
 - B. The Minutes of August 9 were presented and adopted.
- III. Subcommittee Reports:
 - A. Academic Standards and Assessments: Mr. Stowe indicated the subcommittee had no report.
 - B. EIA and Improvement Mechanisms: Mr. Drew reported on behalf of the subcommittee.
 - (a) FY12 Budget Process: Mr. Drew outlined the schedule for the development of the FY12 recommendations; the schedule was approved.
 - (b) Information: Mr. Drew introduced Dr. Bill Brown from USC, the principal investigator in the CDEPP evaluation. Dr. Brown presented findings that demonstrate across three cohorts of four-year-olds modest but meaningful gains. These gains are both statistically and practically significant. This is an important public policy achievement. The young people have not caught up with their more economically advantaged peers; however, it is unrealistic to expect them to catch up in one year. Dr. Brown also detailed findings from the CLASS. He noted that the range of scores on the instructional support dimension suggest opportunities for improvement, particularly with respect to incidental teaching. Mrs. Hairfield asked about differences between teachers in public settings who are certified and teachers in private setting who are not. Mr. Drew commented on the need for a consistent support structure to facilitate improvement in all areas. In response to Mrs. Hershey's question, Dr. Brown indicated there is a need for greater support in both public and private settings. Mr. Stowe asked about the differences between SC scores on CLASS and the national mean or the scores in neighboring states. SC scores are lower.
 - C. Public Awareness: Mr. Willis indicated that there is no report.
- IV. Special Items
 - A. Objectives for 2010-11: Dr. Anderson presented draft objectives for 2010-2011. Members, particularly Mr. Robinson, Mr. Willis and Mr. Drew, requested reinstatement of Objective 4 from 2009-2010 to communicate the EOC's continuing interest in technology. Mrs. Hairfield asked that statements regarding research and student progress emphasize each of the four academic content areas. She also requested that the EOC revisit the issue of sample testing. The objectives were approved as amended.
 - B. Reading Study and Collaboration: Dr. Anderson presented information on the reading study and the differences among student population and students needs despite similarities in practices used. Rep. Neal emphasized the influences of student language and the need for schools to recognize the language of the home. He urged that other models be used. Mr. Robinson indicated that he understood that we are teaching dissimilar groups in the same way. Rep. Neal indicated that we needed a laboratory approach so that we could examine different practices closely. Mrs. Hershey asked about the differences in leadership and community expectations for a school. Dr. Anderson responded that the system must provide relentless experiences for each child and that while some settings benefit from heroic efforts, we have a responsibility to make those results typical. Mr. Cotty indicated we should examine the strategies used in charter and private schools. Mr. Stowe affirmed Rep. Neal's concerns and indicated we

need specific strategies. Rep. Neal indicated we needed to examine the role of culture and to build bridges between non-standard and standard English. Mrs. Hairfield expressed concerns that some CDEPP teachers are not certified. Supt. Rex shared members' frustrations and described the efforts of the SCDE reading academies. He concurred that too many of the programs are built upon middle-class, majority cultures and that poverty influences language development more than development in other content areas. Rep. Neal asked him where is the best place to start. Supt. Rex indicated that there is no one place--we must begin in primary grades or before, we must engage parents and we must fund pilots. Dr. Anderson indicated that a proviso was under development (through the Annie E. Casey partnership) and would be brought forth as part of the budget recommendations.

- C. Status of the High School Working Group Recommendations: Dr. Anderson described the progress of the recommendations which go before the USDE for approval. If all are not approved, the EOC must consider technical changes which might result in a different graduation rate for state purposes from the rate for federal purposes. She also informed members that the growth ratings for high schools and districts would be published after the winter break.

- V. Special Report: Dr. West presented information on the Statewide Longitudinal Data System grant, a three-year, \$15m federal grant. A power point was included in the meeting materials. Members expressed enthusiasm and asked Dr. West for annual information on progress. The curriculum management system is of particular interest.

- VI. Other Business: Senator Fair raised issues regarding the EOC action to approve the Common Core, reminding members that these are *de facto* national standards. He expressed concerns over the changes in the standards over time, expansion to science and social studies and the lack of a clear governance structure. He recommended that a member who voted on the prevailing side (June 2010 meeting) move to reconsider the vote by which the EOC approved the Common Core. He also recommended discussing the issue with members of the General Assembly. Rep. Neal reminded members that the Common Core was developed through organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers, supported by the Gates Foundation and, although supported by the Obama administration, the Common Core is not a federal project. He urged that our conversation be on the quality of education. Sen. Fair responded that we are sacrificing individual and state freedom. Supt. Rex stated that the State Board of Education also approved the Common Core, that while it may be a national movement, it is not a federal movement and that we needed common standards to measure across states. He also indicated that SC could drop out at any time. Though other comments, members asked for continuing current information on the development of both the Common Core and the assessments aligned to it. Mr. Robinson expressed reservations if the scope of the Common Core is extended to science and social studies.

Having no other business, the EOC adjourned.

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting

December 13, 2010

Members present: Mr. Robinson, Mrs. Hairfield, Rep. Anthony, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Senator Fair, Senator Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin, Rep. Neal, and Mr. Stowe

- I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Robinson welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He extended a particular welcome to State Superintendent-elect Mick Zais and indicated the EOC members looked forward to his membership on the committee and to working with him for the betterment of SC schools.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of October 11, 2010: Mr. Robinson asked for approval of the minutes. The motion to approve was made by Mr. Stowe, seconded by Mr. Martin and adopted.
- III. Austerity: SC Financial Report: Mr. Robinson introduced Mike Shealy, Chief of Staff for the Senate Finance Committee. Mr. Shealy presented an extensive report on the SC economic forecast, the patterns that brought us to today's challenges and the choices before the General Assembly over the next several years (power point presentation available).

Members asked a number of questions. Rep. Anthony asked about the impact of legislative actions on school budgets and the increases in costs. Mr. Shealy reminded him that for the last decade or more, legislation includes provisions that the programs or services are not required if there is not state funding. Senator Fair asked about changes in either Medicaid co-pay requirements or reimbursable services. He also asked about the potential for revenues from collecting taxes on Internet sales. Mr. Cotty asked if the bottom line for FY12 is a \$500-600 million cut.

- IV. The 2010 Goal: Where Are We Now - Mr. Robinson presented the report in Mr. Willis' absence. He outlined progress toward the 2010 goal and the 2020 vision noting areas and periods of time in which SC had made considerable progress and those in which SC had not shown gains. Senator Fair asked about the relationship between dual credit earnings and Advanced Placement. He wondered if there were national data though which we could compare SC to other states. Rep. Neal questioned the rate of SAT-administrations to students who were not college-bound. Mrs. Hershey indicated that she was appreciative of the statements regarding re-centering on the mail-out brochure and commented on the lack of news coverage on the impact of re-centering. Rep. Anthony supported the stable, rather than moving, targets for school performance. Rep. Neal expressed concern that we and our schools continue to fail to address reading aggressively and to incorporate the assets students bring from home, even when those assets are culturally specific.
- V. Subcommittee Reports
 - a. Academic Standards and Assessments: Mr. Stowe reported on behalf of the subcommittee.
 1. He presented the benchmarks used to gauge progress toward the 2020 Vision. Dr. Anderson explained how the progress expectations are parsed across time. The benchmarks were adopted as presented.

2. Mr. Stow presented information on the uniform, statewide, occupational diploma. He drew members attention to the memorandum included in the packet and indicated that public comment was requested. Mr. Robinson asked members to read the document and be prepared to discuss the issue at the February meeting.

b. EIA and Improvement Mechanisms: Mr. Drew presented on behalf of the subcommittee.

He presented the budget and proviso recommendations. These recommendations call for any new EIA funds to be dedicated to teacher salaries and the maintenance of teachers in classrooms.

He also asked members to respond to a survey (distributed as an addendum) to establish a priority ranking among EIA programs. Senator Fair questioned the priority setting in an era of complete flexibility. Mr. Drew asked if there were not programs or services we wished to hold safe. Senator Hayes differentiated between total flexibility and the flexibility to use funds differently or to relax requirements without losing a program (e.g., the arts). Mr. Martin reiterated the need for local flexibility. Mr. Anthony indicated that the priority-setting was useful.

The recommendation regarding funding for teachers and the provisos was adopted by a vote of 10 to 1.

Members were asked to complete the survey in the addendum by December 27.

VI. New Business

Members had, at their desks, a memorandum from Dr. Danny Merck drawing their attention to the process of calculating 2010 high school graduation rates. Mr. Robinson asked Dr. Anderson to explain the concerns and the options considered. Rep. Neal asked if the numbers indicated students were falling through the cracks. Dr. West (SCDE) explained that the biggest issue is the ninth grade “no-shows” and that while the number of students may not be large the impact on the graduation rate could be 7-8 percent. Rep. Neal asked about the SUNS id and why it was not working; were districts not completing the data requests. Dr. West indicated that we are likely to have poor data for another two years as the full implementation of SUNS progresses. He suggested that school year 09-10 is the first year with significantly reliable numbers to match students across a four-year period. In school year 10-11 the SCDE is to be able to document exit from one school and entrance to another through matching the dates. Mrs. Hairfield asked if the transition from SASi to Power School contributed to the problem. Dr. West discussed the size of the student file and the need to use procedures through which districts could provide the most information. He also indicated that EOC-approved changes (ending the 8th grade roll up and using the 45th-day enrollment) were awaiting federal approval.

The SCDE has extended the deadline for district submissions.

With no action pending, the Chairman called for a motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned.