

**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**  
**February 9, 2009**

Members present: Mr. Stowe, Dr. Woodall, Ms. Bosket, Mr. Brenan, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Senator Fair, Mrs. Hairfield, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin, Mrs. Murphy, Rep. Neal, Supt. Rex, and Mr. Willis

I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Stowe welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

II. Approval of the Minutes: Following a motion to approve the minutes, Mrs. Hershey asked that the minutes note that she did not support the recommendation for "elimination of the minimum SAT score as a separate requirement to receive a loan; instead an applicant would need to have the minimum SAT score or finish in the top 40 percent of their high school class" which was approved during the report of the EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee (Item 3, recommendation 2). The minutes were approved with this addition.

III. Subcommittee Reports:

A. Academic Standards and Assessments: Mr. Stowe asked Mr. Potter to provide a status report on the Development and Approval of PASS. He shared the completion of the alignment review, the awarding of the student performance standard-setting contract and related activities.

B. EIA & Improvement Mechanisms: Mr. Brenan reported on behalf of the Subcommittee.

(1) Principals' Views of First Year Teachers: Dr. Horne provided information on the survey of principals' regarding their views of first year teachers. The study was designed (1) to determine the perceived strengths and weaknesses of teachers new to classroom; (2) to determine the specific concerns regarding new teachers, and (3) to determine the perceived strengths and weaknesses of teachers new to the classroom. The survey, conducted in Spring 2008, asked principals and directors of special schools and career centers to rate up to three first year teachers as strong, between strong and weak or weak. Respondents provided information on 971 first year teachers, examining how often first year teachers exhibited behaviors in six areas: Content Knowledge, Classroom Management, Instruction, Curriculum, Assessment and Interpersonal Relationships. Findings of the study include the following: areas in which first year teacher exhibited behaviors most often, regardless of whether they were strong, between strong and weak, or weak were Content Knowledge and Interpersonal Relationships; first year teachers exhibited behaviors the least, again regardless of performance levels, in Assessment; differences did not vary across school level; data indicate that first year teachers rated weak were just as likely to receive a contract for the next school year with only a very few either given a contract with an improvement plan or no contract.

(2) Status of Budget Recommendations: Mrs. Barton summarized the Governor's Budget proposal noting its similarities and differences to EOC recommendations. Members discussed the Governor's recommendation to

eliminate the ADEPT program of teacher evaluation and asked that their concerns regarding elimination of the state teacher evaluation program be communicated to policymakers.

(3) Study of Teaching of Economics: Mr. Brenan reported that Helen Myers, Executive Director of the Council on Economic Education, had provided subcommittee members with information regarding the teaching of economics in public schools. The response level to the survey was small; therefore, the Council is exploring avenues to gain more information.

C. Public Awareness: Mr. Stowe drew members' attention to the draft annual report and asked members to provide Mrs. Yow with changes and corrections. Mrs. Yow demonstrated the EOCbiz website that is to be used for member information and sharing of materials.

#### IV. Special Reports

(1) Palmetto Priority Schools: Dr. Anderson presented information regarding the first year of work in the sixteen (16) schools designated as Palmetto Priority Schools. The formative, collaborative evaluation includes an analysis of student and school performance data, examination of school climate as reported by school personnel, students and families and monitoring the degree to which the elements have been implemented. The evaluation is intended both to inform decisions about the Palmetto Priority Schools and to inform state-level policy decisions regarding actions to increase student and school performance. First year data were provided and discussed.

(2) Child Development Education Pilot Program: Mrs. Barton, Mr. Potter and Dr. Brown presented information regarding the CDEPP annual evaluation report. The report, which documents the implementation of the program during the first two pilot years, includes information on: (1) the number of children served; (2) projected increases in the number of four-year-olds in the state and in school districts, including the number of four-year-olds in poverty; (3) total expenditures of the program; (4) results of individual student assessments; (5) a facilities survey of public and private providers; and (6) the results of a 2008 survey of parents whose children attended the program. The report provides data and recommendations to assist the General Assembly in making cost-savings measures and in expanding the program in the future to improve school readiness of children in poverty including: (1) funding the program with recurring revenues; (2) collaborating and/or consolidating the administration of and technical assistance provided in the program; (3) expanding the program into school districts with at least 90% of the children in poverty; and (4) establishing minimum class size requirements and minimum provider participation commitments of at least three years.

**SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**April 13, 2009**

Members present: Mr. Stowe, Dr. Woodall, Rep. Anthony, Ms. Bosket, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Sen. Fair, Mrs. Hairfield, Sen. Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mrs. Murphy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Willis and Dr. Poda for Supt. Rex.

- I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Stowe welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He introduced Representative Mike Anthony, designee of the Chairman of the House Education and Public Works Committee.
- II. Approval of the February 9, 2009, Minutes: The minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Subcommittee Reports
  - A. Academic Standards and Assessments: Mr. Robinson reported on behalf of the subcommittee. He outlined the three major tasks before the EOC through December: approval or deferral of the PASS assessments, establishment of student performance levels and establishment of the criteria for school and district ratings. Mr. Potter reviewed the processes by which the EOC would receive information and advice and the sequence of decision-making. Dr. Anderson reminded members of the changes in meeting schedules to accommodate the decisions.
  - B. EIA & Improvement Mechanisms: Mrs. Barton outlined the status of the FY10 Appropriations Bill and the development of budget alternatives, with and without the federal stabilization funds. Dr. Horne updated the EOC on the status of technology investments in education and the potential for extending utilization. Dr. Poda indicated that the SCDE is moving ahead with a 2009-2010 pilot of electronic textbooks, hopefully, involving ten districts. Mr. Drew asked if the top three areas for action could be identified. Mr. Stowe asked which agency is the lead on school technology; Mr. Drew reiterated the question. Mr. Willis indicated access is always the first issue and that decisions regarding classrooms are made at the district level. Ms. Bosket asked if a tiered approach could be implemented. Mr. Cotty reminded members that the teacher is critical and we must have the courage to demand competency.
  - C. Public Awareness: Mr. Willis reported on behalf of the subcommittee. He outlined the changes in the public awareness activities to rely on electronic transmissions of documents, the use of webinars and the interactive report card. Mrs. Yow provided details on the interactive report card, the involvement of the SCDE, USC and Midlands Technical College and a web address for the Illinois report card. Dr. Poda suggested that the *Race to the Top* funding might be a revenue stream to fund the multi-agency project.
- IV. Report from a Key Constituency: Mr. Chuck Saylor, member Greenville County School Board and President-Elect of the national Parent Teachers Association (PTA), addressed the members on changes in the PTA including its advocacy program, approaches to engaging fathers and a "3 for me" commitment for school volunteering.
- V. General Discussion: Mr. Drew requested a glossary to facilitate understanding when discussions use several abbreviations and/or technical terms.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

**SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**June 8, 2009**

Members present: Mr. Stowe, Dr. Woodall, Rep. Anthony, Ms. Bosket, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Sen. Fair, Mrs. Hairfield, Sen. Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin, Mrs. Murphy, Rep. Neal, Supt. Rex, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Willis

State Board of Education Members present: Mrs. Maguire, Mr. Moore, Mr. Bowers, Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Disney, Mr. Thompson, Mrs. Norton, Mrs. Pye, Mrs. Sheheen, Mrs. Swad

I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Stowe welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He asked EOC and State Board of Education members to introduce themselves.

II. Approval of the Minutes of April 13, 2009: Mr. Brennan moved approval of the minutes of April 13, 2009. The minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Presentation: Clemson University-EOC Public Opinion Research Project. Mr. Stowe introduced Dr. Jane Clark Lindle who in turn introduced Dr. James Witte. Dr. Lindle led members through the summary presentation of data from the project. (NOTE: EOC and SBE members had access to copies of a general report and to a project briefing document).

Results from the statewide public engagement project show that South Carolinians are concerned about their schools and the future of public school students and hold high expectations for both. Drs. Lindle and Witte discussed four key findings from the project:

1. All four groups of stakeholders (parents, business, educators and taxpayers) share high expectations for schools and students;
2. Stakeholders differ in views about achieving those expectations;
3. Many South Carolinians are not familiar with educational trends regionally or nationally; and
4. South Carolinians expressed a large degree of surprise or no knowledge concerning achievement gaps among student groups.

Discussion, requests for additional analyses and clarification included the following:

- Requests for national comparative data on the questions for which those data are available, with attention to “family support for learning”
- Requests for analyses by community type (i.e., rural-urban), respondent ethnicity
- Requests for linkage between response and either parent income or school poverty level in which teachers are working

Dr. Lindle noted several areas in which respondents confuse *content* standards, *student performance* standards and *school and district ratings* standards.

IV. Establishment of the 2020 Goal: Mr. Stowe opened the issue of the 2020 goal. The discussion included questions including:  
Why set a goal?  
How was the 2010 goal established?  
Do we have data to determine what is “realistic?”  
Do we know the resources we have available?  
What is the connection between education aspiration and achievement and economic development?  
How can we accelerate progress (we have made some, but not enough)?  
How can we express our desire for “every child reading” or “every child on grade level in reading, math and writing at 4<sup>th</sup> grade, 8<sup>th</sup> grade?”  
How can we “warranty a child?”

If we incorporate the basic skills in the goals, does not achievement on other measures (e.g., NAEP, AP/IB, graduation rate) follow?  
What is the balance with economic development?  
Is the goal a vision statement?  
What is the rationale for a ten year goal; should we focus on five years?  
How do we achieve reciprocal accountability?  
How can we explain the goal and our progress efficiently?  
High expectations are necessary but are they sufficient?  
Should the goal be product-oriented to answer the taxpayer question of what are you getting for your money?  
Should the measures of goal attainment include those other organizations are reporting?  
Should we speak to all students or single out particular groups?  
Can the goal be written to communicate the value of students and teachers, while not overly emphasizing data and tests?  
Should we include all the disciplines separately?  
Should we avoid a time limit?  
Should the goal be melded with the 2013 cyclical review?  
Does the goal have to include a national ranking?

Mr. Stowe raised the issue of an ad hoc group to develop a draft. Members indicated that the job belongs to the EOC and that members should talk with the people in their communities. Mrs. Maguire recommended language supporting every child having access to a school rated Good or Excellent.

Mr. Stowe asked Dr. Lindle what goal statement she would recommend. She indicated that the public opinion research data suggest the goal or its measures should include the 3Rs, workforce readiness and graduation rates at the 90 percent level). Rep. Neal recommended that the EOC be more aggressive in its policy initiatives to support the goal that would include structural changes. Mr. Thompson recommended actions regarding teacher preparation.

Mrs. Debbie Elmore spoke on behalf of the SC School Boards Association and Dr. Debra Hamm accompanied her on behalf of the SC Association of School Administrators. A copy of the joint statement is attached. Dr. Rex asked Dr. Hamm what she would recommend as a goal. She indicated that she did not have a recommendation but would consider the goal including students meeting the grade level standards as well as encouraging growth among our highest performing students. Dr. Rex indicated that on-time graduation rate measured through the uniform formula should be included as well as skills measurements.

#### V. Subcommittee Reports

A. Academic Standards and Assessments: Mr. Robinson reported on behalf of the subcommittee. He reviewed a set of working assumptions to be used in developing models for the ratings system. These assumptions include the following:

A1: For the ELA component of the elementary and middle school ratings, the LEA score is to be weighted 2 parts reading and 1 part writing.

A2: The rigor of the ratings expectation shall not increase prior to the FY2012 ratings, at which time PASS performance is to be compared with the 2009 and 2011 NAEP performance and the 2020 goal and a decision about future increases in rigor made.

A3: The mean statewide performance level/index on the 2009 PASS is to be designated as Average for ratings determinations.

A4: To the extent possible, the five-point scale shall remain in effect for all school groupings.

A5: Changes in the high school ratings criteria (with related impact on the calculation of the district rating) should be considered after data collection and ratings simulations with the fifth-year graduation information.

G1: For the 1009 ratings, growth is to be calculated based upon comparisons of PACT to PASS, excluding writing assessments from the ELA score, if a defensible linkage can be achieved. For 2010 and beyond, growth is to be calculated based upon PASS to PASS comparisons, including writing assessments.

G2: A vertical scale is to be used for the growth rating in those areas in which PASS is technically sound. If not available growth ratings will be based on growth to vertically moderated standards.

Dr. Woodall asked that A2 be amended to reflect her understanding that any increases would not occur until the FY2013 ratings. There was discussion of the timing relative to NAEP and the cyclical review. The EOC agreed to amend A2.

The assumptions, as amended, were adopted.

B. EIA and Improvement: Mr. Brenan reported on behalf of the subcommittee. Mrs. Barton presented a summary of the parent survey responses and a template for combining information from the three surveys in a format that is easy for school communities to use. As in the Clemson study, student behavior is identified as a concern. Rep. Neal suggested that we develop definitions for behavior, safety and control and identify the intensity of the events and the challenges before schools. Mr. Brenan reminded folks that the issue was “number one” in the Clemson report. Sen. Fair inferred student frustration with being bothered so they cannot learn. Supt. Rex asked what schools can do to counter this. Mr. Neal asked for a report on how we can address this to be provided at the August retreat.

Mrs. Barton presented information on the budget for FY10. Senator Fair clarified the differences between federal stabilization funds and stimulus funds.

C. Public Awareness: Mr. Willis indicated that the Public Awareness Subcommittee had met jointly with the EIA Subcommittee and a separate report was not available.

#### VI. Other Business

Dr. Woodall asked if EOC members could observe the book marking process. Dr. Anderson indicated yes and that two members had requested to do so thus far. Other members are to contact Dr. Anderson if they wish to be observers.

Mr. Robinson asked if DRC had limited the roles of EOC members to observers and why. Dr. Anderson explained the DRC concerns, the need to maintain an independent process by using agreed-upon professional practices and the requirements to follow the federal peer review guidance.

The meeting adjourned.

**SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**August 10, 2009**

Members present: Mr. Stowe, Dr. Woodall, Rep. Anthony, Ms. Bosket, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Sen. Fair, Mrs. Hairfield, Sen. Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin, Mrs. Murphy, Rep. Neal, Supt. Rex, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Willis

I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Stowe welcomed members and guests. He asked each person to introduce him/herself to others present.

II. Minutes of the June 8 Meeting: The minutes of the June 8 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. (1) Palmetto Assessments of State Standards (PASS). Mr. Robinson outlined the EOC statutory responsibility for review and approval of state assessments. He asked Mr. Potter to summarize the criteria which framed the review and the recommendations from that review. Members raised a number of issues and/or asked questions including (but not limited to) the following:

- When items are not aligned, is the flaw/weakness with the item or with the clarity of the standard?
- Is the process for reviewing the assessments new; how have previous assessments been reviewed?
- Why, after ten years, are there still concerns over items?
- What is the process for eliminating items either because of technical or alignment concerns? Are these items eliminated from those used to evaluate student performance?
- How do the ceiling and/or floor effects impact school ratings?

Mrs. Liz Jones, Director of the SCDE Office of Assessment, responded on behalf of the S. C. Department of Education. She distributed four documents: a letter addressed to Dr. Anderson, a CCSSO document on testing, a test design and a time line for test development. Mrs. Jones distinguished between item pools and test forms. She gave an overview of the SCDE processes and the reasons why some standards and/or indicators might not be assessed (e.g., mathematics, standard one). The CCSSO guide was offered as a resource to understand test development. In response to a number of questions Mrs. Jones, Dr. Siskind and Mr. Saunders addressed issues of transition in assessments when the content standards are revised, treatment of flagged items in test development and student score determination. Mrs. Jones indicated that most of the recommendations are consistent with SCDE processes. She indicated the SCDE Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is meeting on August 13 and 14 and the EOC recommendations would be discussed with them.

Mr. Robinson asked Dr. Anderson to outline the three options before the EOC: approve the assessments, defer approval of any or all the assessments or request additional information to include the TAC advice. Mr. Robinson moved that the SCDE be asked to provide additional information and detail on the advice of the TAC including reexamination of flagged items, assurance that items deleted as not meeting technical requirements are removed before test scaling occurs and student scores are calculated. Rep. Neal seconded the motion. The motion passed.

*Mr. Stowe announced a change in the agenda to move the discussion of the 2020 Vision to the lunch hour.*

(2) Darkness to Light: Mrs. Hairfield summarized her memorandum and request presented in Section 3 of the meeting materials. Supt. Rex indicated his strong support. After



clarification that this would not require additional data collection on the behalf of districts, the EOC voted to accept and publicize the statement.

PANEL Discussion: Out of School Factors

IV. Achieving at Higher Levels

Out of School Factors: EOC members heard from educational leaders on three topics related to factors outside the classroom that impact on a student's capacity to learn. Those speaking were:

Rick Noble	Richland County First Steps
Tammy Powlaski	Center for the Teaching of Children of Poverty
Traci Young Cooper	Richland One Extended Learning Department

[Handouts and power point presentations are on file in the EOC offices.]

Members discussed these issues with each of the presenters, including asking for policy recommendations.

*The EOC recessed for lunch.*

V. (Out of sequence due to agenda reordering) Discussion of the 2020 Vision

Mr. Robinson moved adoption; Mr. Drew seconded.

Mr. Willis expressed concern that measure four (no students enrolled in schools rated At-Risk) should be modified to address the concept of no school at risk. Rep. Neal offered wording but also explained that he did not want the phrasing to signal closing or elimination of schools.

Members discussed the use of Work Keys, its potential for replacing HSAP, data collection and familiarity with the instrument. Dr. Rex indicated a need for reciprocal accountability; that is, that inputs and resources must be acknowledged as we focus on a goal. Rep. Cotty suggested that postsecondary admissions should include vocation schools (e.g., cosmetology) as well. Mr. Drew indicated that a statement needed to be made about teaching and the availability of strong teachers in every classroom.

Mr. Stowe proposed that the comments be considered and a statement be presented at the September 21 meeting for EOC ratification.

VI. Achieving at High Levels

In School Factors: EOC members heard from educational leaders on three topics related to factors inside the classroom that impact on a student's capacity to learn. Those speaking were:

Jo Anne Anderson	Research on Reading Performance
Valerie Harrison	SCDE's <i>Literacy SC</i>
Ken May	SC Arts Commission
Robbie Barnett	SC Chamber of Commerce

[Handouts and power point presentations are on file in the EOC offices.]

Members discussed these issues with each of the presenters, including asking for policy recommendations.

Common Core Standards: Dr. Rex outlined the Common Core Standards project jointly sponsored by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers.

He indicated that although S.C. is not a participating state that the state can benefit from the work and adopt the standards.

VII. Member Reports

- (1) Education and Economic Development Act Coordinating Council - Mr. Martin reported on the implementation of the EEDA, including its components of Individual Graduation Plans, Career Development Facilitators and at-risk grants. He advised that the expansion of virtual courses is encouraging; however, not all students are prepared to learn in a virtual environment. He was asked about the work of the Regional Education Centers
- (2) S. C. Public Charter School District - Mr. Brenan reported on the changes in administration; the SCPCSD is negotiating a contract with a new superintendent. The enrollment is growing with most dramatic increases in the virtual schools.
- (3) Charter School Advisory Committee - Dr. Anderson read Mr. Drew's report noting that there are now 39 charter schools, applications from 15 had been reviewed in the current year with 12 accepted, one declined and two pending.

VIII. Common Ground

Dr. Anderson reviewed the Common Ground statewide effort from 2005 forward and outlined progress made around each of the five responsibilities. Mr. Brenan endorsed the commitment in the Common Ground statement. Members suggested additions to the accomplishments. Questions were raised about the broadband access and the state plan for technology.

IX. Priorities for Coming Year

Dr. Anderson drew members' attention to the current year objectives and asked for statements of priorities for the coming year. She shared materials and anticipated costs for projects underway. Supt. Rex suggested the EOC assume a leadership role in the educational funding issues, including revenue systems as expenditures. Sen. Hayes and Mr. Brenan expressed that the EOC work on expenditures and weightings for students was appropriate but that the structure of the revenues streams was under consideration by other groups. Mrs. Hershey indicated that the EOC would benefit from the perspective of higher education, particularly teacher preparation centers. Mrs. Murphy concurred. Senator Hayes suggested that the rulings on the equity lawsuit would impact all of our work.

Mr. Stowe requested that Dr. Anderson develop these ideas into a framework and share with EOC members prior to the September 21 meeting.

Mr. Martin moved the EOC adjourn; Mr. Cotty seconded and the meeting was adjourned.

**SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**September 21, 2009**

Members Present: Mr. Stowe, Dr. Woodall, Rep. Anthony, Ms. Bosket, Mr. Brenan, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Senator Fair, Mrs. Hairfield, Senator Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mrs. Murphy, Rep. Neal, Superintendent Rex, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Willis

- I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Stowe welcomed members and guests to the meeting.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of August 10, 2008: The minutes of August 10 were approved based upon an approval motion by Mr. Brenan, seconded by Mr. Willis.
- III. Action Agenda

- A. Approval of the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards  
Mr. Stowe noted the distribution of the September 17 letter from Mrs. Liz Jones, Director of the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) Office of Assessment regarding SCDE agreement to implement changes outlined in EOC recommendations on the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS). Mr. Stowe accepted the recommendation of the Academic Standards and Assessments Subcommittee to approve the PASS tests in reading and research, writing, mathematics, science and social studies for the six grades. The motion was adopted unanimously.
- B. Establishment of Student Performance Levels  
Mr. Robinson spoke on behalf of the subcommittee. He noted the lengthy discussion in the Academic Standards and Assessments Subcommittee and the requests for additional information. On behalf of the subcommittee he offered the following motion:

The ASA Subcommittee is meeting on Monday, September 28 at 2:00 p.m. to consider the following information:

- Recommendations to the PASS student performance levels which take into account changes within a .5 and a 1.0 standard error of measurement; however, no recommendation should place "met" on PASS below the level of "basic" on PACT (as defined by percentages of students scoring in that category);
- The impact of the working assumption to place the 2009 actual mean school index in the middle of the range for an Average rating; and
- The impact of utilizing three categories of student performance rather than five categories of student performance in the calculation of school ratings.

Mr. Robinson noted the intent of the ASA Subcommittee that a summary memorandum is to be placed on the EOC website not later than 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 24 and that the ASA would accept testimony at its September 28 meeting. The motion was adopted.

Mr. Stowe indicated that, pending recommendations from the ASA Subcommittee, the EOC would meet on October 5 at 1:00 p.m. He asked that arrangements be made so that EOC members could participate by conference call if their schedules precluded travel to Columbia.

Mr. Robinson asked Mr. Dave Chayer, Vice-President for Psychometric Services at Data Recognition Corporation, to present the information from the subcommittee meeting to the full committee. Members asked Mr. Chayer and staff a number of questions regarding both the impact of the recommendations on students and on the calculation of school ratings. Dr. Woodall asked about the vertical linking studies; Ms. Bosket requested the raw scores associated with each cut level.

- C. Ratification of the 2020 Vision  
Mr. Cotty moved, and Senator Fair seconded, an approval motion for the 2020 Vision and related measures and objectives. Mr. Robinson expressed concern with the phrase “participate in a democratic society” noting that the American government actually is a republic. The 2020 Vision was adopted as presented.
- IV. Appointment of a Nominating Committee for the Chairmanship  
Mr. Stowe indicated that he would appoint a nominating committee for the office of chairman and vice-chairman as the current terms expired in December.  
NOTE: Mr. Stowe later appointed Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew and Mr. Martin.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

**SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**October 5, 2009**  
**1:00 p.m.**

Members present: Mr. Stowe, Dr. Woodall, Rep. Anthony, Ms. Bosket, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Cotty, Mr. Drew, Sen. Fair, Ms. Hairfield, Sen. Hayes, Mrs. Hershey, Mr. Martin (via conference call), Mrs. Murphy, Rep. Neal, Supt. Rex, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Willis

I. Welcome and Introductions: Mr. Stowe welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He expressed appreciation for the diligence of everyone involved and their strong attendance at both subcommittee and full committee meetings. He outlined a process for the meeting to include the following: consideration of the minutes of September 21, 2009; receipt of public comment; review of the NWEA study and consideration of the motion before the committee. To the extent necessary each content area may be considered separately.

II. Approval of the Minutes: The minutes of September 21 were approved as distributed.

III. Establishment of Student Performance Levels on PASS

Mr. Robinson, on behalf of the subcommittee presented the recommendations of the subcommittee as included in the meeting packet. Mr. Potter presented information regarding the accompanying data tables. Dr. Woodall asked why numbers in cells for two grade levels of math might be different from those previously distributed. Mr. Potter explained that faulty items were identified and the tests re-scored, giving students credit for their responses.

Dr. Woodall questioned the motion, indicating that she understood the original motion to be slightly different. Sen. Hayes clarified his motion. Dr. Woodall indicated that the spirit of the motion was that PACT Basic was to be equivalent to PASS Met. Members were provided a motion statement reflecting this spirit. The motion on the floor was amended to reflect the equivalency. Mr. Potter identified the data tables associated with the amended motion (attached).

Public Comment: Dr. Debra Hamm spoke on behalf of SCASA/SCSBA. She thanked members for their work and the process of public engagement. She pointed out disagreements she held with the NWEA report. Ms. Hairfield indicated MAP was not aligned with PACT. Dr. Hamm cautioned members from consideration of raw scores. Dr. Rex indicated that the rigor of the NCLB requirement at the MET level was defensible and that PASS was not intended to provide diagnostic information. Dr. Hamm urged comparisons with NAEP. A number of questions were raised regarding the distinctions between lowering standards and redefining expectations for NCLB purposes. The subgroup requirements were discussed. Rep. Neal recommended that the report cards reflect NAEP scores, AYP and regional rankings. Ms. Bosket raised issues about the student barely meeting the criteria for MET and the services and support he or she might receive and would these students be ready for secondary education. Rep. Anthony suggested that the EOC would be realigning expectations, not lowering them. Mrs. Hershey asked why SC did not use a norm-referenced test.

Mr. Robbie Barnett spoke on behalf of the S.C. Chamber of Commerce. He indicated respect for the members and the difficulty of deciding what to measure and how to measure fairly. He outlined the Chamber's goals for education, the work of the Higher Education Study Commission and the needs for a highly skilled work force. He reviewed the progress and accomplishments the state has made over the last ten years. He indicated that the EAA had provided the state with the information it needed to stay on track to high performance. He urged members not to water down expectations and not to lose the year to year comparability. Sen. Fair questioned Mr. Barnett about the perception that we are lowering standards and/or if we were weakening the system. Mr. Barnett urged that actions be in support of ensuring that each student is getting the education he needs to achieve at the next levels. Rep. Neal questioned the perception of

lowering v. realigning. Dr. Rex indicated that SC Chamber has been a great partner and that he hoped that group would explain to others that these were not lowered standards.

NWEA Study: Dr. Anderson outlined the reason for the NWEA study, indicated the number of meetings and times in which the shift from PACT to PASS would impact NCLB AYP determinations. At least two speakers before the EOC had requested the study. She outlined the request of NWEA and acknowledged the comparisons as well as the methodology employed to inform speculations regarding AYP status. The comparison suggests that shifting from PACT Proficient to PASS Met changes the rigor of SC's AYP calculation from the top quarter of states included in the study to the bottom quarter of states included in the study. The study projected AYP designations across a randomly chosen set of schools, applying each state's rules for AYP. Using the PASS standard the projected number of elementary schools meeting AYP jumped from 3 of 18 to 5 of 18. A more dramatic increase was achieved at the middle school level. Members were cautioned that AYP determinations are complex and consider the performance of economic, ethnic/racial, disability, English language status groups of students in a school. Nationally more schools fail to achieve AYP because of the performance of subgroups of the entire school population than because of the performance of the overall student group.

Ms. Bosket asked if there is a balance between the motion and the NWEA study that would move the state more to the center of the distribution. Dr. Anderson indicated that the EOC had authority to move the expectation upward and that data regarding the impact of moving the expectation higher by a half or full standard error of measurement was in their meeting packet.

Actions: Mr. Stowe suggested considering the motion by content area. The members indicated they were prepared to vote on the motion in its entirety. The members clarified that the motion meant the adoption of the "logits" and related technical information attached to the motion (the motion was printed on blue paper and the technical information on a legal-sized document).

Mr. Brenan proposed an amendment to the motion and Mrs. Boskett seconded the amendment. The amendment provided that the EOC return to the book marking recommendations for reading at grade three in order to identify students on the cusp of the performance level and provide them with additional support. Dr. Woodall asked why the requirements were too high. Mr. Brenan responded with information regarding the statewide performance over time and resources available for student support. Ms. Bosket suggested the motion balanced the state's concern with cut scores and with student performance over time. Mr. Drew and Senator Fair expressed support for the motion. Rep Neal, Mrs. Murphy and Supt. Rex indicated the test was not designed to provide diagnostic information, that it is designed for an end-of-year accountability purpose.

Mr. Brenan's motion was defeated by a vote of 9-7. The tally sheet is attached

Mr. Stowe read the main motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 11-4-1. The tally sheet is attached.

Next Meetings: Dr. Anderson provided a tentative schedule through the ratings decision, noting the adjustments necessary since the EOC had moved its decision dates. Mr. Stowe asked her to send out a schedule of meetings through June.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Attachments:

Amended Motion

Statistical Data linked to the amended motion

Vote tally on Mr. Brenan's amendment

Vote tally on the main motion